

THE COMMUNIST

A JOURNAL FOR THE THEORY AND PRACTICE OF MARXISM

No. 8

AUGUST, 1925

3d.

"The weapon of criticism cannot, to be sure, replace the criticism of weapons, material force must be overthrown by material force; theory, however, also becomes a material force, so soon as it grips the masses."—Karl Marx.

PRINCIPAL CONTENTS

The Maritime Struggle and the Craft Outlook.
By THE EDITOR

Completion and Supplement to "Capital."
(Concluded)
By FREDERICK ENGELS

International Trade Union Unity (concluded)
By E. M. HIGGINS

The Home and the Labor Movement.
By G. WINTER

The Australian Labor Movement,
As Seen By AN OUTSIDER

"Our theory is not a dogma, but . . . a guide to action."
F. Engels.

"Without a revolutionary theory, a revolutionary movement is impossible . . . A party can play the role of a vanguard, only if it is guided by a vanguard theory."—V. I. Lenin.

STATE LIBRARY
8 MAR 1925
OF VICTORIA
5
335.40994
C73C

S
335.40994
C73C

Notes of the Month

(THE MARITIME STRUGGLE AND THE CRAFT OUTLOOK)

VIEWING as a whole the struggle of the seamen against the shipping bosses, it can at least be said that they have kept their end up fairly well. With a solid organisation and several militant officials such as the Federated Seamen's Union possesses, this was only to be expected. The dispute arose, as Comrade Tom Walsh has said, "in an attempt by the seamen of this country to secure that ships trading in this country should pay Australian wages and work under Australian conditions... But for the policy of chartering ships under foreign articles, there would have been no 'black' ships which men would not work, and there would have been no deregistration of the Seamen's Union" by the Arbitration Court. The sorry experience of the chartered ship "Volumnia," the brave fight put up by her crew against the attack on Australian conditions her chartering involved, the declaring "black" of the Commonwealth Line ships "Eromanga" and "Dilga" because they contained cargo from the "Volumnia," the final payment of compensation to the "Volumnia" crew, all these things will certainly deter further attempts to break down Australian conditions by chartering overseas vessels. This is a real victory for the seamen, and, like all real victories, it was won by fighting. No less important, it was won by fighting the Seamen's Union with the Arbitration Court. When the seamen began their big strike for better wages and conditions in 1919, the President of the Federal Arbitration Court, Justice Higgins, then said that, if the employers did not resist the action of the seamen, "they and the community would rue the day." On the present occasion, on the other hand, it was the employers who called on the Arbitration Court to resist the action of the seamen by deregistering their Union. And the General President of the Union, Comrade Walsh, having invited the Court to go right ahead without more ado, the seamen were thereupon placed well and truly outside the pale of Arbitration. If we consider all the demoralising effects Arbitration has had on Australian Unionism (cf. Comrade H. Ross's article on "The Last Phase of Arbitration" in this issue), then we cannot but appraise the bold break of the most encouraging events in the history of Australian Unionism since 1919, when Comrade Walsh bluntly told Justice Higgins that his Union did not believe in Arbitration, but in direct action, and the seamen strongly supported him in this attitude. The present complete break of the Seamen's Union with Arbitration should, if the taken proper advantage of by militant unionists, have at least some tonic effect on the whole stagnant Australian trade-union movement. Already even the "Labor Daily" is writing: "Arbitration given the k.o."

THE deregistration of the Seamen's Union at once brought forth the demand on the part of the seamen that the conditions of their late Arbitration Award should now be attached to the ships' articles. This demand for security of their conditions henceforth became the central point of their disputes with the shipping bosses. This main dispute now fell into two sections: that between the seamen and the Commonwealth Line, and that between the seamen and the private shipowners, the principal members of whom are combined in the Commonwealth Steamship Owners' Association. Certain "outside" shipping concerns, like Burns Philp, meanwhile, acceded to the seamen's demand for attachment of the conditions of their late Award to the articles. Then, on July 7, an agreement was announced between the Marine Transport Group in Sydney and the Commonwealth Line. In this agreement, in the conclusion of which Labor Premier Lang acted as "go-between" the Transport Group and Vice-Admiral Clarkson, the Commonwealth Shipping Board undertakes "to endorse the ships' articles and attach thereto the wages and conditions of employment" of the seamen under their late Arbitration Court Award. The Transport Group (Stewards and Pantrymen, Marine Cooks, Butchers and Bakers, Waterside Workers, Coal Lumpers, Ships' Painters and Dockers, and Shipwrights) also agrees "to guarantee the fulfilment of" these conditions of employment, "to be attached to the ships' articles under which the seamen sign on." Despite this, further clauses of the agreement, about which we shall have something to say presently, make it the blackest spot of the whole dispute. The "Labor Daily" termed this agreement a "triumph for Lang." Without doubt it was a triumph for Lang; equally certainly it was anything but a triumph for Trade Unionism.

SIMULTANEOUSLY with the signing of the above agreement, 1200 men were locked out by the management of Mort's Dock because they refused to work the Newcastle Company's vessel "Hunter," a boat loaded, unloaded and manned by blacklegs for a company which has openly declared that it can maintain its services in defiance of every union in the country. After negotiations with the Premier, the Mort's Dock men decided to work with the "black" "Hunter" and "Allan River," in clean up the blacklegs on the waterfront. If this action eventuates, the original firm stand vain. If it does not, then the criticism of their subsequent decision to work "black" ships will have proved doubly justified.

WE have said that the agreement between the Transport Group and the Commonwealth Line, though it provided for the security of conditions demanded by the seamen, was the blackest spot of the whole dispute. At a time, however, when Mr. Bruce was busy with his Deportation Bill and his Bill to enable overseas vessels to engage in coastal trade, the agreement did take the wind out of his sails, permitted the seamen to divide their enemies and to make play with the Commonwealth Line against the private shipowners. The seamen now concentrated against the Commonwealth Steamship Owners' Association, and the latter refusing to concede attachment of conditions to articles, a strike was called on all the vessels controlled by the Inchange combine. Against the seamen's slogan of security of Award conditions, the owners set up the slogan: Abolition of "job control," and the subsequent protracted negotiations hinged about these two points. These negotiations finally resulted in agreement being reached, and receiving general endorsement by the Branches of the Seamen's Union. The net result of the agreement is to secure to the seamen most of the conditions of their late Award; the new agreement, however, also contains certain changes, such as the abolition of the roster system, etc. On the other hand the "job control" policy is not to be pursued by the seamen; just what this is going to mean in practice remains to be seen. From the whole struggle the following gains, consequent on a solid organisation and a (whatsoever its faults) consistent tactical line, emerged: (1) Frustration for the Australian conditions by chartering ships; (2) a blow to Arbitration through the seamen's break with it; (3) securing of substantial maintenance of the seamen's hitherto prevailing conditions, and thus (4) a new base from which to take up the fight afresh; (5) a few more nails in Bruce's political coffin. These are decidedly relative gains; but they represent the most Australian Unionism is capable of achieving at the moment. For the benefit of Mr. "Fordsdale" Campbell and others we might add that the fate of blacklegs is happily symbolised in the blackleg-manned steamer "Awaroa," recently become a helpless derelict in Bass Strait.

MENTION of scabbery brings us back to what we have termed "the blackest spot of the whole dispute." But, before dealing with this, we must first say a few words about some of Comrade Walsh's propaganda in the capitalist press during the dispute. Amongst much that is excellent, Comrade Walsh, in speaking of Soviet Russia, contrasts past despotism in Russia with "its present despotism," and seems further to contrast the Soviet Russian regime with "democratic principles" in Australia, in a way that is rather misleading (cf. the "Sydney Morning Herald" of July 18). We do not wish to make too much of a point contained in a statement written by a busy man, perhaps in a hurry, in the thick of a dis-

pute. But since Comrade Walsh looks "with interest and sympathy" upon Soviet Russia, to quote his own words, we would recommend him to read, if he has not already done so, "The Official Report of the British Trades Union Delegation to Russia and Caucasia, Nov. and Dec., 1924." There he will find, among other things, the conclusion of non-Communist leaders of British Trade Unionism that "the Soviet system of representation and its scheme of constitutional and civil rights, so far from being undemocratic in the widest sense of the word, gives in many respects to the individual a more real and reasonable opportunity of participation in public affairs than does parliamentary and party government" (p. 17). And again: "The franchise and electoral system in Russia can be better understood by approaching it from the point of view of the British Trade Union arrangements than from those of a Parliamentary system" (p. 10). In his propaganda in the capitalist press, Comrade Walsh also states that the Communist Party "has no connection with the Seamen's Union," and that neither he "nor any other official of the Federated Seamen is a member of the Communist Party" (cf. the "Sydney Morning Herald" of July 18 and August 3). It is quite true that none of the officials of the Seamen's Union are members of our Party, although members of our Party in more than one State are rank and file members of the Seamen's Union and, as well as the officials, the rank and file are also important. But since, during the dispute, Comrade Walsh deemed it necessary publicly to dissociate himself and the other officials of the seamen from the Communist Party, he will not now object if, after the dispute, we, in turn, publicly dissociate ourselves from approval of the rotten latter part of the agreement with the Commonwealth Line, "the blackest spot of the whole dispute."

WE have already dealt with that part of the agreement with the Commonwealth Shipping Board designed to secure to the seamen the conditions of their late Arbitration award. The remainder of the agreement, to which officials of all the Unions of the Marine Transport Group save the seamen attached their signatures, constitutes such a remarkable document that it is worth quoting in full. "We further agree," these officials continue, "not to countenance any action of the members of the said union (i.e., the Seamen's Union—Editor.) that would be calculated to either delay or hold up the sailing of any ship during the currency of the ship's articles. Should the Seamen's Union flout the agreement under which they sign on any vessel, and persist in preventing the sailing of ships or exercise job control, this group will bring all possible pressure to bear on the union to observe the conditions aforesaid; and if the union continues in its attitude, it will be isolated from the group. In the event of these measures not being successful, the transport group will not oppose any measures affecting the manning of the ships to prevent their con-

tinued running." Thus the agreement, which began by acceding to the seamen's demand for security of the conditions of their late Arbitration award, ends, if words retain any meaning whatever, by the Transport Group proclaiming its function to be that of policing the seamen in the interests of shipping bosses, to the point of open sanction of scabbery, should the seamen attempt to use their industrial strength to better their conditions.

DURING the progress of the shipping dispute the Communist Party has been very far from bearing, perhaps too forbearing, in its comments on the agreement between the Commonwealth Line and the Transport Group. Right or wrong, we fell into line with the official view of the Seamen's Union in this forbearance (cf. the article in the "Workers' Weekly" of July 31 on "The Only Judd"). But, now that the dispute is ended, we propose to speak more plainly concerning an agreement whose scabby part our Party was solidly against. We cannot allow an agreement, for whose latter part we have no time whatever, to pass unchallenged save by "the only Judd." To do so would be actually to merit his reproach of "prostitution." However, in saying what we have to say, we do not wish to make a parade of either our virtue or our cleverness. Thus we do not propose to moralise over the fact that the day before the announcement of the agreement, Comrade Walsh wrote in the "Labor Daily" that "the right to strike... is the charter" of the workers' liberty; that "when society conceded to the workers the right to form trade unions, it involved the right to practice job control"; and that "if the seamen did not practise some sort of job control, they would very soon be down to the conditions which were in vogue in the ships fifty years ago." Nor do we intend to write a tract upon the theme "Thou shalt not scab," as the most imperative commandment of Trade Unionism. It is sufficient simply to record the flagrant contradiction between these things and the latter part of the agreement. But what does call for further consideration from us is the circumstance that Comrades Walsh, Johnson and Casey, "unanimously supported the agreement," to quote the "Workers' Weekly" of July 31. How comes it that these stalwarts of the finest union in Australia gave their support to an agreement the latter part of which is synonymous with scabbery? The solution to this contradiction contains an instructive working-class lesson.

IN considering the highly significant circumstance that the seamen's militant officials yet supported an agreement scabby in its latter part, we have first to note the fact, already mentioned above, that, unlike the fact, already of the Manne Transport Unions, the other officials are not signatories to the agreement. Secondly, the agreement, despite its contingent sanctioning of future scabbery, did offer the

seamen certain immediate advantages: a slight basis of security of their conditions from which they might operate; the "guarantee" of the rest of the Transport Group to defend this base against attack (the latter part of the agreement is not calculated to inspire confidence in the strength of this "guarantee"); the separation of the Commonwealth Line from the private owners, etc. Thirdly, we have heard the argument raised (anything but a strong one, we fear) that when it came to the point of putting the scabby part of the agreement into actual practice, well, even if some people might like to do so, they would not in fact dare. Fourthly, in the "Workers' Weekly" of July 31 we read: "We approached Tom Walsh and Jacob Johnson, and were told by them that they fully endorsed the agreement, which was necessary to the tactical line they had deliberately adopted." If, in the light of the above four points, we now consider the seamen's struggle, not in its connection with the whole Movement, but from a narrow craft standpoint, it becomes possible to understand how the seamen's officials came to acquiesce in the signature of the agreement with the Commonwealth Line by the other officials of the Transport Group. When we consider the matter from the class standpoint, when we consider the terrible temptation put upon the workers to scab on one another, when we consider the damnable effects of the slightest concession on the part of the Movement, to scabbery, then, as Communists trying to think of the interests of the working class as a whole, we are bound to brand an agreement containing the words "should the seamen flout the agreement under which they sign on any vessel... the Transport Group will not oppose any measure affecting the manning of the ships," as altogether inadmissible. "There are compromises and compromises," Lenin has written. The "propaganda-for-scabbery" part of the agreement is anything but a Leninist compromise. And yet, from the craft standpoint, it is possible to understand how even militant officials, like the seamen's, could come to support such a rotten agreement.

THE errors to which militancy, when combined with a craft outlook, is subject, are exemplified by another incident of the maritime struggle. We know that more than one well-known trade-union militant considered Comrade Walsh's attitude in the Arbitration Court in the matter of deregistration of seamen, a tactical mistake; that, at the moment, it would have been better to avoid deregistration, moreover, that this could have been easily accomplished without real sacrifice, so the employers themselves did not wish to go further than threatening the deregistration of the Union. That militants should adopt this attitude is significant, and no less so because, from a class standpoint, it is wrong. Such an attitude on the part of militants is explicable if we think along very narrow lines; it would then be possible to conceive that the seamen

might have done better to remain within the pale of Arbitration for the time being. But from the class standpoint, and considering all the circumstances, we are bound to be thankful for such breaks with Arbitration. The other view has its root in a craft outlook. The pity is that the root is rotten.

THE gains of the maritime struggle are due to militancy. Its losses are partly attributable to objective conditions, nevertheless, the struggle has not been free from very serious error intimately connected with a craft psychology from which the seamen's militant leaders are also not exempt. The official outlook of most other unions is craft without being militant. The instructive peculiarity of the seamen's struggle is the combination of both elements; its *differentialia specifica*, as Marx would say, is craft militancy. The craft element of this combination makes the militant laboring this point because its implications are infinitely more far-reaching than is generally supposed. Throughout the Australian movement, we find good militants falling into error because their militancy is not free from a certain craft psychology. Thus in Western Australia and elsewhere we find militants taking exception to the decision of the June Conference of Labor Councils in Adelaide to form a Commonwealth Industrial Disputes Committee with wide powers. They contend that this body would be sure to be controlled by the reactionaries, and that its power would be used to sabotage the workers' struggles. From the narrow standpoint of sectional struggles this view may have something to recommend itself. But it is, sadly neglectful of the class aspect; its acceptance, indeed, clearly presumes the impossibility of co-ordinating a wide action. From the class aspect, Comrade Garden's standpoint of "a general staff for the trade union movement" (cf. the "Workers' Weekly" of July 24) is certainly the right one. In this connection it is worth recalling that the British Communist Party has fought consistently for more power for the General Council of the Trade Union Congress, although this power would be sure to be controlled by the reactionaries at the present time. The numerically stronger and more reactionary Amsterdammers in a single world Trade Union International. The attitude of the CPA to the Commonwealth Industrial Disputes Committee is similar. Should reactionaries be in control of this body, it nevertheless provides a far-reaching arena in which Communists can work to supplant them, successfully, in the end. Consciousness of this doubtless contributed to the reactionary-controlled West Australian Labor Conference also turning the proposed Committee down. At any rate, in both the militant and the reactionary opposition to the proposal there is something common. And that common something is the craft outlook.

BUT the ramifications of the craft outlook, and the dangerous errors resulting therefrom, extend far beyond the confines of the trade union movement. The I.L.W., which has suffered a recent revival in Sydney, unceasingly denounces craft unionism. And yet its obstinate refusal "to have anything to do" with politics and political parties reveals but a transformed variety of craft outlook. Workers' political parties themselves have not been free from this outlook. Thus the old Socialist Parties of the Second International, which were apt to see the world solely through the spectacles of the urban wage-worker, often revealed a sublimated craft psychology in their attitude to the toiling population of the countryside. Despite all the teaching of Lenin to the contrary, even Communist Parties have occasionally lapsed into this craft-like attitude. During the recent N.S.W. election campaign, A. C. Willis was on one occasion able to get back on our own Party for laying itself open to a suspicion of this attitude in relation to the farmers. A glaring example of this craft-like attitude was furnished by the Bulgarian Communist Party in 1923, when it would "have nothing to do" with the peasant insurrection against the Zankov military clique which, supported by the urban bourgeoisie, had overthrown the Stambuliski peasant Government in June. This error of the Bulgarian Communist Party has cost the workers of the whole world. The leading workers' party of Bulgaria has had to struggle against this craft-like attitude. The recent polemic against Trotsky, which accused him of "underestimating the role of the peasantry," is an instance of this struggle. Thus in a "Discussion on the Economic Substantiation of Trotskyism," Bucharin writes concerning the "Trotskyist" economics of Preobrachensky: "The reader who is accustomed to deal with the analysis of different ideological shades will here at once recognise the craft-like ideology which does not 'want to have anything to do' with other classes, and does not turn itself about the fundamental problem of proletarian policy, the problem of the workers' and peasants' bloc and of the proletarian hegemony in this bloc. One more short step in this direction, and we arrive at the semi-Menshevik ideology of the perfect trade unionist of the Russian pattern: let us push aside the peasantry, give more concessions to foreign capital, but not a penny to the co-operatives and agrarian hobby riders; let us exercise an increased pressure on the peasantry to the advantage of the 'proletariat,' etc.... This 'theory' (if it had any prospect of 'gripping' the masses, which, happily, it has not) could annihilate the workers' and peasants' bloc, the granite foundation on which the workers' State of our Soviet Union is built" (cf. "Inprecor," January 20, 1925). We might add that there is a strong analogy between the relations of the proletariat to the peasantry in a single country, and the relations of the proletariat of imperialist countries to the nationalist movements of the colonies. And that, just as

in the peasant question, so in the colonial question a craft-like ideology will lead errors. But trades to make analogous grievous errors. But we have said enough to show the tremendous scope and significance of the errors to which a craft outlook makes good militants, who have yet not freed themselves from this outlook, subject.

LET us end where we began, with the maritime struggle and the Australian trade union movement. Scattered throughout the ranks of the latter are a number of good militants, some of whom occupy leading positions in their unions. Too many of these militants belong to no revolutionary political organisation, i.e., to no organisation standing for "the general and permanent interests of the working class, as a whole." They may belong to the Labor Party, but that is a different thing, and in the case of individuals not subject to any form of revolutionary discipline, is apt to develop, not militancy, but opportunism. On the other hand, we frequently find militancy, divorced from revolutionary politics, seeking its expression solely or mainly in the trade union sphere. In such circumstances it is natural for militants, having become so-called "industrialists" to fall victims, more or less often despite themselves, to their craft environment. Their militancy tends to become **craft militancy**. (Certain militants of whom it is more or less true, would stoutly deny this; nevertheless, as Marx has said, "our opinion of an individual is not based on what he thinks of himself.") And this tendency to craft militancy signifies nothing less than militancy's degeneration to a source of the most serious class errors. The remedy for this state of affairs lies in a strong dose of revolutionary politics, which will help to purge the militancy of its craft outlook. And this dose may be taken by way of more union militants realising the need for it, and joining the Communist Party. To the extent that they do so, terms such as those contained in the latter part of the agreement between the Transport Group and the Commonwealth Shipping Board, will become harder to get by. Thus when Com-

Frederick Engels' Last Work

Completion and Supplement to Volume III. of "Capital."

(Concluded from last issue.)

Hitherto we have not spoken of the merchant. We could defer consideration of his intervention until now, when we pass to the transformation of simple into capitalist production of commodities. The merchant was the revolutionary element in this society, where all else was stable, stable, so to speak, by heredity; where, by inheritance and almost inalienably, the peasant received not only his hide of land (Hute), but also his status as freeholder, free

rade Walsh says: "The Communist Party has no connection with the Seamen's Union," we are bound to reply: To the extent that is true, it is just what is wrong with the Seamen's Union. For if its good militants who are outside the Communist Party were to see the wisdom of joining the latter, then the resulting ideological combination would cause the Union's present official view: "The Seamen's Union is present official view: "The Seamen's Union is not attempting to destroy the British Empire, or overthrow the State, merely to secure that their present standards shall not be reduced, and asserting the right of seamen to a greater share of the good things of this world" (cf. the "Sydney Morning Herald" of July 18) "to be brought nearer to Marx's standpoint: "Trades Unions work well as centres of resistance against the encroachments of capital. They fail partially from an injudicious use of their power. They fail generally from limiting themselves to a guerilla war against the effects of the existing system, instead of using their organised forces as a lever for the final emancipation of the working class, that is to say, the abolition of the wages system." Of what incalculable benefit to the working class such a change in the trade union standpoint would be! On the other hand, in the light of local events, we are bound to re-echo the words written by the veteran Bolshevik, Kamenev, in 1920: "The greatest misfortune which could befall the proletarian army after seizing the strongholds of capitalism, would be if the apparatus of leadership proved to be in the hands of men, groups or organisations whose previous work had been carried out only in the sphere of the labor movement." By the "labor movement" although, without detracting from the truth of the above statement, we may in this country include in that designation the Labor Party as well, it is essentially the "narrow sphere of the trade union movement" that Kamenev means.

IN good faith with all those comrades who did their damndest in the fight, these are the Communist lessons we have to draw from the maritime struggle.

or dependent copyholder, or serf, the town craftsman his handicraft and his guild privileges, and each of them, into the bargain, his custom and his market, as well as his skill cultivated from youth up for the inherited calling. Into this world the merchant now stepped, from whom its transformation was to proceed. But not as a conscious revolutionary; on the contrary, as flesh of its flesh, bone of its bone. The merchant of the Middle Ages was not in the least an individualist, he was essentially a

co-operator, like all his contemporaries. In the country prevailed the mark-association derived from primitive communism. Each peasant had originally an equally large hide, with equally large plots of ground of every quality, and a correspondingly equally large share in the rights in the common mark. Since the mark-association had become a closed one, no more new hides were distributed, and, through inheritance, etc., subdivision of hides crept in, accompanied by proportionate subdivision of the mark rights; but the full hide remained the unit, so that there were half and quarter and eighth hides, with half, quarter and eighth rights in the common mark. After the prototype of the mark-association all subsequent earning associations ranged themselves, above all the guilds in the towns, whose order was nothing but the application of the mark constitution to a handicraft privilege, instead of to a delimited area of land. The central point of the whole organisation was the equal participation of every associate in the assured prerogatives and uses of the totality, as is strikingly expressed in the charter of 1527 of the Elberteld, and Barmen "Yarn Livelihood" (Thun, Industrie am Niederrhein II., p. 164 et seq.) The same thing holds of the mining callings, where each claim (Kux) had an equal interest, and was also, like the hide of the mark-association, divisible with its charges and obligations. And the like holds of the mercantile associations, which called oversea commerce into being. The Venetians and Genoese in the port of Alexandria or Constantinople, each "nation" in its own **fondaco**—dwelling house, public house, storehouse, show and sales room, besides central offices—formed complete trading associations; they were shut off from competitors and customers; they sold at prices fixed among themselves; their commodities were of definite quality, guaranteed by public investigation and often stamped; they decided in common upon the prices to be paid to the natives for their products, etc. The Hanseatic traders on the German Bridge (Tydske Bryggen) at Bergen in Norway proceeded in the same fashion, and likewise, their Dutch and English competitors. Woe to him, who sold below the price or bought above the price! The boycott which struck him meant in those days absolute ruin, apart from the direct penalties that the association inflicted on the wrongdoer. There were also, however, still closer corporations founded for definite ends, such as the Maona of Genoa, the mistress for many years during the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries of the alum pits of Phocaea in Asia Minor, as well as of the island of Chios; further, the great Ravensberg trading company, which from the end of the fourteenth century did business with Italy and Spain and founded settlements there; in addition, the German company of the Augsburgers, Fugger, Welsch, Vohlin, Hochstetter, etc., and of the Nurembergers Hirschvogel and others,

which, with a capital of 66,000 ducats and three ships, took part in the Portuguese expedition to India in 1505-6, and thereby netted a clear profit of 150 per cent., according to others, 170 per cent. (Heyd, Levantehandel, II., p. 524); as well as a whole series of other societies "Moropollia," over which Luther waxed so wrathful.

Here, for the first time, we come upon a profit and a rate of profit. Moreover, the efforts of the merchants are consciously and deliberately directed to making this profit-rate equal for all participants. The Venetians in the Levant, the Hanseatic traders in the North, paid each the same prices for his commodities as his neighbours; they cost him the same transport charges; he obtained the same prices for them; and likewise purchased return-freight at the same prices as every other merchant of his "nation." The rate of profit was, therefore, equal for all. In the great trading companies, the division of the proceeds **pro rata** of the share in the capital invested, is just as much a matter of course as the participation in the mark rights **pro rata** of the legitimate share of hides, or in the mining gains **pro rata** of the share of claims. Thus the equal profit-rate, which in its full development is one of the final results of capitalist production, here reveals itself in its simplest form as one of the historical starting-points of capital, yes, even as a direct shoot of the mark-association, which is, in turn a direct shoot of primitive communism.

This original rate of profit was of necessity very high. Business was extremely risky, not only because of the widely prevalent piracy, but because the competing nations frequently permitted themselves all sorts of outrages, when opportunity offered; finally, sales and conditions of sale depended on licenses from foreign princes, which often enough were violated or revoked. The profits had, therefore, to include a high insurance premium. Then the turnover was slow, the despatching of business, tedious, and, in the best of times, which to be sure, were a seldom of long duration, the business was a monopoly trade with a monopoly profit. That the rate of profit was, on an average, very high, is also proved by the very high rates of interest then current, which must, nevertheless, have been lower on the whole than the customary rate of trade profit.

This high and, for all concerned, equal rate of profit resulting from concerted action in societies had, however, only local currency within the association, in this case, therefore, the "nation." Venetians, Genoese, Hanseatic and Dutchmen had, each nation for itself, and at first, indeed, more or less for each individual first, a special profit-rate. The equalisation market, a special profit-rate, rates of profit of these different associations' rates of profit enforced itself in the opposite way, through competition. First of all, in the case of the profit-rates of the different markets of one

and the same nation. Did Alexandria offer more profit on Venetian commodities than Cyprus, Constantinople or Trebizond, then the Venetians would set more capital in motion for Alexandria, and would withdraw this from the traffic with other markets. Then the gradual equalisation of the profit-rates of the different nations exporting the same or similar commodities to the same markets had to follow, in connection with which it very commonly happened that certain of these nations were crushed and vanished from the scene. This process was, however, continually interrupted by political events, as when, in consequence of the Mongolian and Turkish invasions, the whole Levantine trade was ruined due to this cause; while the great geographical-commercial discoveries since 1492 only accelerated this decline, and, finally, rendered it complete.

The sudden expansion of the markets which now ensued, and, connected therewith, the revolutionizing of the lines of traffic, at first brought no essential alteration in the manner of trading. Even the trade with India and America was at first carried on, predominantly by associations. But to begin with, greater nations stood behind these associations. In place of the Catalonians trading with France, stepped, in the American trade, the whole great, united Spain; besides Spain, two great countries like England and France; even Holland and Portugal, the smallest, were still at least as great and strong as Venice, the greatest and strongest commercial nation of the preceding period. That gave to the voyaging merchant, the merchant adventurer of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, a backing which rendered the association's protection of its members, even with weapons, more and more superfluous, and its costs, therefore directly burdensome. And then, wealth now accumulated in a single hand far more rapidly, so that soon individual merchants taking as, formerly, a whole society. The trading companies, where they still continued to exist, mostly transformed themselves into chartered corporations, which, under the protection and supreme authority of the motherland, conquered entire newly discovered lands, and exploited them monopolistically. The more, however, colonies were established in the new territories, principally for reasons of state, the more associative trading retired before the single merchant, and therewith the equalization of the profit-rate became more and more exclusively a matter of competition.

As yet we have only made the acquaintance of a profit-rate for merchant's capital. For only merchant's and usurer's capital had existed as yet; industrial capital was but now to develop. Production was still predominantly in the hands of workers who were in possession of their own means of production, whose labor, therefore, did not yield a surplus-value to any capital. If they had to surrender a portion of the product to others without return, then it

was in the form of tribute to feudal lords. Merchant's capital, therefore, could draw its profit, at least at first, only from the foreign buyers of home products or the home buyers of foreign products; only towards the end of this period—thus, for Italy, with the decline of the Levantine trade—could foreign competition and difficulties of sale compel the handicraft producer of export commodities to dispose of his wares to the export merchant below their value. And so we have here the phenomenon, that, in the retail traffic of the various producers with one another, the commodities are sold, on an average, at their values; but, in international commerce, for the reasons stated, they, as a rule, are not. In complete contrast to the world of to-day, where the prices of production obtain in international and wholesale trade, while in urban retail trade price formation is regulated by quite other rates of profit. So that to-day, for example, the flesh of an ox undergoes a greater advance in price on its way from the London wholesale dealer to the individual London consumer, than it does on its way from the wholesale dealer in Chicago, transport included, to the wholesale dealer in London.

The instrument that gradually brought about this complete change in price formation, was industrial capital. Already in the Middle Ages beginnings of the latter had manifested themselves in three lines of industry, namely, shipping, mining and textiles. Shipping, on the Hanseatic maritime republics, was impossible without sailors, that is, wage-workers (whose operative forms might be concealed under co-operators) the galleys of that time also required guilds of men were wage-workers or slaves. The ore, had in almost all cases, already transformed themselves into joint-stock companies for the workers. And, in the textile industry, the merchant had begun to take the small master weavers directly into his service, furnishing getting it turned into and, against fixed wages, in short, from a mere buyer for his account, called a supplier (Verleger).

Here we have before us the first beginnings of capitalist surplus-value formation. The minority disregarded. As to the shippers, it is self-evident that their profits had to be at least for insurance, wear and tear of ships etc. But how lay matters with the suppliers of the textile industry, who first brought their goods to market, in competition with the commodities of the same kind produced for the account of the craftsman?

A profit-rate for commercial capital was in existence. It was also, at least for the locality concerned, already approximately levelled to an average rate. What, then, could induce the merchant to take upon himself the extra busi-

ness of supplier? One thing only: the prospect of greater profits at the same selling price as the others. And this prospect he had. By taking the small master into his service, he broke the traditional bounds of production, within which the producer sold his finished product and no more. The merchantile capitalist bought labor-power, which, meanwhile, was still in possession of its instruments of production, but no longer of the raw material. Whilst he thus assured regular employment to the weaver, he was able, on the other hand, so to reduce the weaver's payment that a part of the labor-time expended remained unpaid. In this way, the supplier became the appropriator of surplus-value, over and above his previous trade profit. To be sure, he had, on the other hand, also to employ an additional capital, in order to buy yarn, etc., and leave it in the weaver's hands until the piece was ready; for which he had formerly to pay the full price only when he purchased it. But, in the first place he had in most cases already used extra capital for advances to the weaver, whom, as a rule, only to debt brought to the point of subordination to the new conditions of production. And, in the second place, even apart from that, the account stands in accordance with the following scheme:

Let us suppose that our merchant conducts his export business with a capital of 20,000—pounds sterling, or what you deucats, sequins, pounds used for the purchase of these, let 10,000 be used for the purchase of home commodities, while 20,000 are employed in the overseas markets. The capital turns over once in two years; annual turnover equals 15,000. Our merchant now wishes to have weaving done directly for his account, to become supplier. How much capital must he now put in? Let us assume that the time of production of a piece of material of the kind that he sells is, on an average, two months, that is surely very long. Let us further assume that he must pay cash for everything. Then he must put in enough capital to supply his weavers with yarn for two months. As he turns over 15,000 a year, in two months he buys material for 2,500. Let us say that 2,000 of this represents value of yarn, and 500, wages of weaving, then our merchant requires an additional capital of 2,000. We assume that the total capital which he appropriates from the surplus-value which he appropriates from the weaver by the new method, amounts to only 5 per cent. of the value of the material, which makes a certainly very modest rate of surplus-value of 25 per cent. (200 c plus 500 v plus 125 value of 25 per cent. 1200 c equals 25 per cent. p' s' s' equals 125 over 500, equals 25 per cent.)

Then our man makes on his annual turnover of 15,000 an extra profit of 750; in two and two-thirds years, therefore, he has already recovered his additional capital.

In order, however, to speed up his sales and thus his turnover and by this means to make with the same capital, the same profit in a shorter time than before, hence a larger profit in the same time, he will donate a small part of his surplus-value to the buyer, will sell

cheaper than his competitors. These, too, will gradually transform themselves into suppliers, and then the extra profit becomes reduced for all to the usual profit, or even a lower one, for all in all cases increased capital. The equality of the profit-rate is re-established, though possibly at another level, by the cessation of a part of the surplus-value produced at home to the foreign buyers.

The next step in the subjection of industry to capital follows with the introduction of manufacture. Precisely this enables the manufacturer, who in the seventeenth and eighteenth century—in Germany until 1850 almost everywhere—in places even to-day—is still for the most part his own export merchant, to produce cheaper than his old-fashioned competitor, the craftsman. The same process repeats itself: the surplus-value appropriated by the manufacturing capitalist permits him, and, respectively, the export merchant who shares with him, to sell cheaper than his competitors until the new mode of production allows once more, when equalization already in existence, even if it is only locally levelled, remains the Proletarian class, in which the excessive industrial surplus-value is mercilessly lopped off.

If manufacture rose rapidly by cheapening the products, how much more is this the case with great industry, which, with its ever-revolving revolutions in production, forces the costs of production of the commodities lower and lower, and ruthlessly eliminates all earlier modes of producing. It is great industry, also, which in this way definitely conquers the home market for capital, makes an end of the small production and natural economy of the self-sufficient peasant family, eliminates the direct exchange between the small producers, and places the entire nation in capitalist's service. It likewise equalizes the profit-rates of the business, mercantile and industrial lines of business to one general rate of profit, and finally less to one general rate of power proper securities to industry the position of power proper to it in this equalization, removing most of the obstacles that hitherto stood in the way of transferring capital from one line to another. Here, the transformation of values into prices of production takes place for the entire wholesale exchange. This transformation therefore proceeds in accordance with objective laws, without the consciousness or intention of the participants. That competition reduces profits to a general rate to the common level, and so withdraws surplus-value in excess of the average from the industrialist who first appropriates it, presents, theoretically, not the least difficulty. All the more, however, in practice for the spheres of production with much variable surplus-value, therefore with much variable and little constant capital, are, by their nature, composition of capital, are subjected to capitalist precisely those which are most incompletely managed latest and on the other hand, so above all, agriculture. On the other hand, so far as the raising of prices of production above commodity-values is concerned, which is requisite in order to bring the insufficient surplus-

value contained in the products of spheres of high capital-composition to the level of the average profit-rate, this appears extremely difficult theoretically; in practice, however, as we have seen, it comes about most easily and earliest. For commodities of this class, when first they are capitalistically produced and enter the capitalist trade, come in competition with commodities of the same kind, which have been made by pre-capitalist methods, and are

therefore dearer. The capitalist producer can consequently, even if he foregoes a part of the surplus-value, always obtain the current rate of profit of his locality, a rate that originally bore no direct relation to the surplus-value, since it had arisen from commercial capital long before capitalist production existed at all, and, therefore, before an industrial profit-rate was possible.

INTERNATIONAL TRADE UNION UNITY.

By E. M. Higgins.

II.—Where Do the Australian Unions Stand?

[Following on last month's review of the existing international trade union organisations, and of the early attempts to combine against the international capitalist offensive, this article discusses the position which has been reached to date and its significance to the Australian working-class movement.—Editor.]

Russo-British Negotiations.

The Russian unions, finding that negotiations with the International Federation of Trade Unions itself were failing to bring unity nearer, got into direct touch with the British unions, the mainstay of the I.F.T.U. and the most sympathetic element.

A Russian Trade Union delegation to the British Trade Union Congress in September, 1924, received an extraordinarily enthusiastic reception. In his presidential address to Congress, A. A. Purcell (who, incidentally, is chairman of the I.F.T.U.) declared that "we must assuredly make the most of every opportunity, dignified or otherwise, to bring every national Trade Union centre within the four corners of a genuinely united and avowedly anti-capitalist International Federation of Trade Unions."

In November a British trade union delegation paid a return visit to the Russian Trade Union Congress. This visit had two great results. The delegation's report on conditions of life in Soviet Russia was the greatest knock-out delivered to the enemies of the Soviet Government and the traducers of Communism, and was also a dramatic illustration of the new temper of British Trade Unionism, which is coming to look at affairs from the point of view not of British imperialism, but of the international working class. The second result was the establishment of an Anglo-Russian Unity Committee with the object of laying foundations for "international unity in trade union organisation and action." The British Delegation made it clear that they like the Russians "conceive of unity as a unification of all trade union organisations, whether affiliated to any International or standing quite apart from this or that International."

The action of the delegation was endorsed on December 29 unanimously by the General

Council of the British Trade Union Congress, which wrote to the I.F.T.U. "strongly pressing for the convening of an unconditional conference for informal discussion purposes.... as a preliminary to a mandatory conference."

Sabotage.

Since the beginning of 1925 the struggle for world trade union unity has been marked especially, on the one hand, by consistent sabotage from many Labor reactionaries and, on the other hand, by stubborn persistence on the part of the Trade Union Congress of Russia and Britain, the most important members of the two existing Internationals.

The readiness of the British unions to come to an understanding with the Russians has provoked frantic reproaches and abuse from the press organs of the Second International and of the Social Democratic Parties of several European countries, notably Germany and Holland. The attractive "Press Reports" issued by the secretaries of the I.F.T.U. (which provide, by the way, practically the only international news and opinion that are allowed to find their way into the Sydney "Labor Daily") have concentrated on fighting the Russo-British negotiations. Prominent officials of the I.F.T.U. and the Second International have bitterly attacked the British leaders, not excepting Purcell, the chairman of the I.F.T.U. The German General Federation of Trade Unions even proposed to the Hungarian Trade Union Federation that "joint action should be taken against the English delegation." The capitalist press has taken the same line. Purcell complains that "the German and British press—capitalist and alleged Socialist alike—have vied with each other in distorting the Delegation's speeches."

The spokesmen both of capitalism and of Social Democracy are alarmed at the signs that the British Trade Union Movement is deserting imperialism and learning to think internationally.

When the General Council of the I.F.T.U. met at Amsterdam on February 5 the British delegates proposed an unconditional immediate conference with the Russian Unions. This was defeated, as also was a diharred resolution proposed by Oudegeest, the chief secretary of the I.F.T.U. which was to the effect that the I.F.T.U. should "notify the Russian trade

union centre that we regard the whole question as finished, and that we should refrain from any further correspondence."

Under cover of Oudegeest's motion a "compromise" resolution was carried, offering to "convene a conference in Amsterdam with the All-Russian Council of Trade Unions with a view to an exchange of opinions as soon as possible after the All-Russian Council intimates its desire to be admitted to the I.F.T.U." This resolution made no mention of the proposed World Labor Congress, of the declaration of principles and policy sent by the Russian unions to the I.F.T.U. or even of the existence of the Red International of Labor Unions. It thus, by omitting all the central issues of the controversy, and accepting a conference provided the Russians unconditionally join the I.F.T.U., appears to throw on the Russians the onus of rejecting the proposed conference. "Vorwaerts," the daily organ of the German Social Democratic Party, considered this resolution "a shrewd blow at the Bolshevik split-brothers; the entry of the Russian Trade Unions into the Amsterdam International must be preceded by their exit from the R.I.L.U.—which means the end of that body."

A Starting Point for Unity.

While the I.F.T.U. Secretariat contented itself with scoring points over the Russians, putting still more difficulties in the way of unity, the British Unions decided to meet the Russians again.

At the conference in London, April 6-10, complete agreement was come to on all essential points. A Joint Declaration on International Unity was adopted, pointing to the fearful dangers that threaten the whole working class and urging that "the one power which can save mankind from being plunged into another universal catastrophe is the working class itself, if well organised, properly disciplined, self-devoted and determined to fight all who would oppose and prevent its complete emancipation." A Joint Advisory Council was set up, representing the Russian and the British Trade Union movements, for the purpose of dealing with any questions which may arise in connection with the task of promoting International Unity.

This agreement has been ratified by the British Trade Union Congress General Council and the All-Russian Central Council of Trade Unions. The former has undertaken to urge the I.F.T.U. to call "an immediate conference with the representatives of the All-Russian Council of Trade Unions for the purpose of considering the position arising from the discussions," and if the Bureau of the I.F.T.U. refuses, to convene such a conference itself. The T.U.C. will endeavor to promote international unity by using its mediatory influence as between the Russian trade union movement and the Amsterdam Bureau." The All-Russian Council has again made new proposals to the I.F.T.U. for an unconditional unity conference.

That is where matters stand for the present. There is no international trade union unity, but the Red International of Labor Unions (represented by the Russian unions) and the British Trade Union Movement (the mainstay of the I.F.T.U.) are cordially cooperating for the purpose of breaking down the barriers to unity. This, declares Losovsky, general secretary of the R.I.L.U., "means the beginning of a new era, a starting point for the creation of organic unity."

Red Herrings.

That these barriers are strong is shown by the volume of abuse which continues to be hurled at the "mediators."

The capitalist press, particularly in Britain, still urges trade unionists to guard against the criminal campaign that is being undertaken by the General Council of the Trades Union Congress to betray them to "the foreigner." Reactionary Labor leaders, like W. A. Appleton, secretary of the General Federation of Trade Unions, continue to declare that "the British workman is fed up with Russia, and does not care a straw for her," and such statements are religiously cabled as far as Australia.

A diversion is being provided by C. T. Cramp, the British railwaymen's boss, who proposes "international Labor organisation by continents" with the Russians tucked away in Asia, out of the way of the British and German unions.

Another (and a more serious) diversion is being popularised by Ramsay MacDonald and a few other British leaders. Calling forth unsuspected reserves of enthusiasm for "internationalism," they suggest that, if the British unions go ahead with their negotiations with the Russians, they will "risk the smashing up of the I.F.T.U." MacDonald therefore proposes that the British unions should form "closer contacts with the German Trade Unions," whose leaders, in the words of the London "Times," "are, though with difficulty, maintaining a bulwark against the westward spread of Communism among the workers."

A Real Desire for Unity.

These diversions are not succeeding in drawing the British trade union movement away from the path of unity. A. A. Purcell (vice-chairman of the British Trades Union Congress and president of the I.F.T.U.) declared on May Day—"I note that in some quarters we are being asked to establish unity with the German trade unions instead of the Russians. If Mr. MacDonald said as well as the Russians he would only be expressing exactly what all of us in the General Council, I am sure, want. But 'instead of the Russians' means that we are to break off friendship with those who stand for world-wide trade union-unity and the world-wide fight for the eight-hour day, and accept the point of view of those (they are already in the same international as ourselves) whose attitude on these questions has been diametrically opposed to, our own at numerous discussions in

the past. And this we have no intention of doing."

The present chairman of the Trades Union Congress is not afraid to declare that "we have nothing to fear from Russia; they are workers like ourselves." "Trade Union Unity," a monthly magazine, is being published in London by a number of leading members of the Trades Union Congress, to give expression to the agitation for unity against the international capitalist offensive. The British trade union rank and file, vigorously demanding a move forward for bigger wages and shorter hours, at a time when international competition is being used by the boss as an excuse for wage cuts and extensions of the working day, are becoming more and more convinced that success can come only by united action, national and international. The leaders are generally inclined to respond to mass pressure, if only, as the secretary of the British Labor Party's official Research and Information Department admits, in order to prevent the present "leftward swing being led by the Communist Minority Movement."

Developments will be slow, very slow. But the agreement between the British and the Russian unions is a pledge of working-class unity. The way seems open at last to world Labor unity.

Isolation Being Shattered.

What does all this matter to us in Australia? Quite a lot.

The Australian working-class movement has stumbled along fairly carelessly until now, content to grab what it can while the grabbing is good, and indifferent to "remote" things like international developments. The minority which does not take for granted that the world stops at the three-mile limit is generally content to agree with an "advanced" Labor candidate at the recent N.S.W. elections, who declared that, "although having an academic interest in events in other lands we are primarily and pre-eminently concerned with the welfare of our own country," as if it were possible to divide the one from the other.

But to day when international capitalist competition is growing far more acute than ever before, when the bosses are using this competition systematically to drive working conditions in all countries down to the lowest "competitive" level, when London is preparing mass migration schemes that will teach the Australian workers not to expect an "extravagant" wage, and when the world is being wound up for another war, it is becoming distinctly dangerous to consider, as the only real business of the movement, such things as domestic ballot-box scandals or even the immediate struggles for higher wages.

A Question for Study.

It is the "remote" international events which are going to settle the fate of the Australian working class. One of the most important of these events is the present move for international working-class unity, for on it are dependent, very largely, the chances of the work-

ing-class resisting the new dangers.

We in Australia ought to be following this move very closely. Studying it, we get a good cross-section view of the world we live in—the international capitalist offensive, the futility to-day of "old style" sectional trade union organisation, the difficulty of changing such organisation in a hurry without painful preparation, the yellowness of leaders who have forgotten the class struggle, the breath of fresh air which is brought into the movement by those who have learned from Lenin, etc., etc.

We Can Help.

It is not enough simply to "understand" what is going on, to realise, for instance, the evil effects of international scabbery. The Australian working-class movement has a part to play. "Understanding" must lead to organisation, if it is to be real. The present drive for international Labor unity is a challenge to us to get ready at once to fall into line in the general struggle against the boss.

On the one hand, the Australian Trade Union movement can help to advance the movement for unity. This has already been recognised by the Interstate Conference of Labor Councils in Adelaide in June, which unanimously passed the following resolution:—

"That this Conference, realising that the outlook of the working class must be based upon international lines, is of opinion that the workers in this country should take steps to actively associate themselves with the new developments that are now shaping themselves in Europe. Every endeavor should be made to have a representative of the workers of this country in attendance at the Conference which will be held for the purpose of uniting the Trade Union Internationals, and at that Conference this country's representative shall demand that such amalgamation shall take place, because the unification of our forces on an international basis is the only way by which the emancipation of our class can be accomplished." But a resolution like this will soon be forgotten, unless it is discussed in the unions, kept to the forefront, and backed up.

Unity at Home.

On the other hand, now is the time, before the storm breaks, to work for unity in our own ranks, without which the desire for international unity is pointless. This is no abstract question. Craft sectionalism, however pleasing to arbitrationist officials, is no basis on which to fight. Unity can come only when the rank and file force their demands upon the leaders. Now is the time for a bigger effort than ever to work for unity on the job, through the establishment of factory and shop committees which will unite all workers without craft or sectional distinction, and thus to fit the movement for the great struggles ahead.

But if such an effort is not to run into the sand like similar attempts in the past, there is needed also a strong revolutionary political party, a Communist Party, an organisation which will give continuity and purpose to all moves for better working-class organisation.

The Home and the Labor Movement

By G. Winter.

[The following article was originally written for the Melbourne "Labor Call" in reply to articles of Mrs. Adela Pankhurst-Walsh which appeared in that journal. Since Mrs. Walsh has made similar criticisms in Sydney of the Marxist standpoint to the family, we publish Comrade Winter's reply below, although, in order to do so, we have had to hold over until next month the continuation of the ethnological series of articles he is writing for "The Communist." We have also received ten questions from Mrs. Walsh; we will deal with these as space, and the relative importance and urgency of contributions permit.—Editor.]

We are all familiar with the ancient argument that Communism is contrary to human nature, and with the various embellishments thereof.

We have been told that the principles of Communism demand the extraction of gold fillings from the teeth of certain individuals to provide, by some alchemistic process, amalgam fillings for the teeth of others; that under Communism it would be nothing unusual to find a coalheaver comfortably asleep in the bed one usually slept in; and that children will be taken from their mothers long before the due date of natural birth, and carried off in bottles to the State incubators. We quite understand that the moral is, allow yourself to be exploited by the capitalist class; and it comes as a surprise to hear such weird predictions from Mrs. Adela Pankhurst-Walsh, who has said hard things about the capitalist class in her time.

Again, we have heard that "the Marxians throughout the world aspire to become a governing class, dominating the proletariat and impressing upon them their views of religion and morality"; that "the necessity of breaking up the family is a deduction which the followers of Marx, in the Communist camp, draw from his teaching"; with a good deal more about atheism, free love, human nature, and the lack of incentive; but it is not often that such sparkling gems fall from the pen of an alleged Socialist and brighten the pages of a Labor journal.

Mrs. Walsh has discovered, or perhaps conceived, a curious doctrine to which she gives the name of "Marxianism"; she fathers it on Marx and declares the Communist Party responsible for its maintenance, for herself, she repudiates it entirely, and castigates it most bitterly.

One might imagine that "Marxianism" was some sort of travesty upon plain ordinary Marxism; and that Mrs. Walsh was waxing satirical at the expense of certain expounders of so-called "Marxian" theories; but the way she skips from "Marxian" to "Marxianist" proves her to be innocent of satire, and her quotations from Engels show that she considers his friend and collaborator Marx at least par-

tially responsible for "Marxianism."

In her series of articles in the "Labor Call," Mrs. Walsh has little to say against Marxism as a whole, except that it seems to be inconsistent with a belief in God; she is concerned only with one particular aspect of Marxism—that which touches upon the family. Her objections to this aspect of Marxism are levelled against Engels, who dared to assert that the modern monogamous family has a property basis; against Alexandra Kolontay, who said that women should take part in social labor; and against the Communist Party, which advocates motherhood endowment.

Property Basis of Monogamy.

Now the idea that monogamy has a property basis might possibly bring a blush to the cheek of an unborn child, but it is nevertheless a fact, and it is only fair to Engels to state that he is not responsible for it. With all due respect to Mrs. Walsh, she does not appear to understand that monogamy is purely a legal conception, which has little to do with the ideal of life-long and exclusive union. She says: "In primitive times, we are told, there was no monogamous marriage, but group marriage." Only that and nothing more!

According to her conception, group marriage, involving wholesale prostitution of women, passed suddenly to pure monogamy, about the same time as private property became an institution of society; but she objects to the idea that private property had anything to do with it.

According to Morgan, group marriage is characteristic of savagery, pairing marriage of barbarism, and property marriage, in monogamous or polygamous form, of civilisation. To say the very least that could be said, Mrs. Walsh has left out of consideration the whole period of barbarism, during which individual pairing based upon mutual consent was the universal rule. During this period the women, as well as the men, had their own personal property; they rather than the men, owned the household goods and had control over the children; no woman was dependent upon any individual man for her means of subsistence; no child was without a father, for all children had many fathers.

Position of Women and Children Under Barbarism.

Whatever be the origin of individual pairing, it was well established long before the institution of private property, and under the conditions of barbarism women occupied a position of freedom and equal dignity. Private property introduced polygamy for the rich, and celibacy and prostitution for the poor; took away from the woman her freedom and dignity, making her the chattel of her husband; gave the man power of life and death over her and her child-

ren, and the right to sell them into slavery; and condemned the unmarried mother to destitution and shame.

The evolution of monogamy has been towards its dissolution. More and more society has come to recognise the rights of women and children, and the necessity of State assistance towards the upbringing and education of the latter. More and more the State recognises the right of couples to part if unhappily married, and the right of the illegitimate child to live. We, who know the family institution as it is to-day, have no desire to restore even the early Victorian family, which at its best was only a centre of co-operation in a world of cut-throat competition, and more often a group of incompatible persons bound together by sheer economic necessity.

Engels never puts up the possibility of returning to group marriage, which in perfect form is unknown to-day even among the lowest savages. He recognises that the pairing system, and later on monogamy, have resulted in the development of conjugal and paternal love, which at the present time are widespread.

Ideals and Facts.

Our present ideal is that of exclusive union between pairs, lasting throughout adult life. What the ideal of the future may be, we do not know, but we do know that monogamous marriage under capitalism is anything but ideal. Monogamy is purely a legal conception and means nothing more than the responsibility of the individual man for the children of his legal wife.

In the stages of barbarism before the accumulation of private wealth in flocks and herds, things were very different. The children had as their guardians, first, their individual parents; next, the gens, then the phratry, and finally the tribe. They were recognised as social assets, while their mother was recognised as a social worker within gens, phratry, and tribe.

Monogamy took her from social labor and made her the slave and chattel of an individual man; and the process of emancipation for her has been on the one hand the recognition of her child-bearing and nursing activities as a social service, on the other, her actual entry into competition with man in the economic life of society.

It is quite possible that Alexandra Kolontay, in the enthusiasm of the revolution, tried to idealise the condition of Russian women at the time she wrote—conditions of War Communism pure and simple, and no more ideal than the food rationing system to which the Russians had to submit. Nevertheless, the sound kernel of her argument is that woman can never be emancipated until she takes her place in social production along with the man. The bearing and rearing of children is a social service, and occupies a large part of the lifetime of a normal woman, but it does not occupy the whole, and in itself can never be recognised as a social service until the rights and duties of society with regard to the children are admitted upon both sides.

The full realisation of this can only take place under Communism, and will amount to the elimination of monogamy in the legal or property sense. As to the details of the work which women will do, their relations with their children, and their ideals of harmony between the sexes, surely Mrs. Walsh may leave these things to the sexual, maternal, and paternal instincts in which she believes so strongly, together with the social instinct of which she says nothing, and withal, sweet reasonableness! One thing is certain—the woman who is content to live under such conditions upon one or more private individuals, will be recognised as a mere social parasite.

Motherhood Endowment.

The question for us must be, how shall we work towards the elimination of the family retables of to-day, in accordance with the laws of social evolution? Whatever sentiments we may have towards the family of to-day, the fact stares us in the face that the basic wage of the male worker in industry is calculated upon the requirements of only a fraction of a family. How then can the children of the working class, in families of normal size, be brought up in reasonable comfort and decency? How indeed, when the father, even where his wage is above the basic wage, has no security of employment?

A general rise in wages cannot be brought about without a vigorous intensive and extensive struggle such as the workers of the world are too much exhausted to wage. The entry of married women into industry on a large scale would reduce the individual wage and rob the children of what little comfort the mother can provide.

There remains only one solution—motherhood and childhood endowment. The individual capitalist cannot differentiate between married and single men in his wages bill; but the capitalist class as a whole can provide for the stocking of the labor market by more economical means than paying each worker a wage sufficient for himself and half a family.

If the capitalist class can be forced to provide for the working class family by motherhood endowment, they can be trusted to make it a real economy, for themselves, by kindergarten schools, reduction of the individual wage, and further absorption of women in industry. The workers will have new battles to fight, and will be able to see more and more clearly that the real obstacle to progress is the capitalist-controlled State.

For the first time, however, men and women, single and married, will face the capitalist class upon an approximately equal footing, and will no longer be confused with the "narrow and exclusive" interests of the individual family to which every strike is a menace. The exploitation of our women in factories is not a matter of our own device or choice, but under present-day conditions it must necessarily increase, as it is doing. With childhood endowment it would also increase; but as we cannot prevent this, it is well to remember that women will only be able to gain the true proletarian outlook when

they are exploited along with the men. The only check we can place upon their absorption in industry is the demand of equal pay for the sexes.

We see, then, that the question of the family is bound up in the economic struggle of to-day and to-morrow under capitalism. It is no far-off matter which can be left to our descendants to settle for themselves. The question is right here before us—State assistance for the normal family or practical starvation. If the former, then come more problems, and a partial dissolution of the family as we know it; if the latter, then our only hope is swift and certain revolution, ushering in a proletarian State which will be immediately faced with the same problems. The Communists do not advocate the introduction of endowment for the purpose of breaking up the family, but for the purpose of preserving its individual units. It is true that the family

organisation stands in the way of social change, but that is not the reason for undermining it. The average man respects the private family, because it has been able to protect him from a savage world, and provide the ground for parental, filial, and fraternal sentiments.

Nevertheless, for the wage worker under capitalism, these functions can no longer be performed by the private family. More and more the welfare, in fact the very existence, of the child depends upon the development of far wider fraternity, far greater recognition of rights and responsibilities.

We all know the fear of the small proprietor lest his little farm or cottage be taken away from him under Socialism. Of the same nature, selfish and utterly foolish, is the idea of some little family people that Communism will hand over the woman to a group of husbands and divide the babies among the community after cutting them limb from limb.

The Australian Labor Movement

As Viewed by an Outsider.

Coming to Australia from North America, where the proportion of organised to unorganised workers is relatively small, one wonders how, in a country so widely boomed as Workers' Paradise as this is, there can exist such poor working conditions coupled with a lack of militancy on the part of the Trade Unions.

In comparing American conditions with those of any other country it must be borne in mind that the higher standard of life existent in North America was gained in the last quarter of the nineteenth century. The activities of the organised Labor Movement to-day are primarily devoted to maintaining that standard.

Incidentally this is also true of all unions outside the R.I.L.U.

This higher standard of living was occasioned by the rapid industrial development, the consequent steady demand for labor, existing from 20 to 30 years, and the struggles put up by the trade unions during that period.

This improved living standard has also had a retarding effect upon the growth of organization amongst those elements of the working class whose conditions have been improved indirectly as a result of the causes outlined above.

Industrially, the American worker is aggressive—all improvements have to be fought for.

Politically, he is practically in his childhood.

Coming now to Australia, where there have been Labor Governments and where, consequently, one would expect to find a high level of working class intelligence and activity, one is shocked by the docility manifested by the

workers' organisations with respect to wages and working conditions.

Possessing a high percentage of organised workers in relation to the mass, possessing also that degree, at least, of class bias which ensures the return of so-called Labor members to the various legislative assemblies of the country, the Australian Labor Movement as a whole is more backward, is less of a Trade Union Movement than can be said of the workers' organisations in other countries.

In observing the activities of the organised workers one is struck by a peculiar inconsistency which at the same time serves as a key to unravel the contradictions manifested by the movement.

On the one hand, we observe an extremely praiseworthy example of class solidarity as manifested by the recent action of the workers employed at Mort's Dock, Sydney, whilst, at the same time, the same unions attempt to get improvements in wages and working conditions, not in the logical and efficient manner as noted above, but by spending time and money appealing to a Judge in an Arbitration Court.

One thing is evident: The Australian worker has not lost his fighting spirit, but that spirit has been bottled up by the Arbitration Laws and the Award System until it is only manifested in sympathetic action on behalf of other organisations. Even then the full demonstration of that spirit of solidarity is modified by virtue of the penalties appertaining to breaches of the Industrial Courts' rulings.

The submission of the union workers of Australia to these Industrial or Arbitration Courts compels one to question the political intelli-

The Communist

Monthly Journal of the Communist
Party of Australia

(Section of the Communist International)

Editor - - - - - G. Baracchi.
Business Manager - W. S. Stone.

Postal Subscription Rates: Yearly 4/-.
Half-yearly 2/-.
S

Make all Money Orders and Postal Notes payable: Haymarket Post Office, Sydney. Address all Literary Matter to the Editor, and all Business Communications to the Business Manager, at 395 Sussex Street, Sydney.

A Red Mark across this space means that your subscription expires this issue.

THE AUSTRALIAN LABOR MOVEMENT

(Continued.)

gence of the workers and at the same time the calibre of the Party called "Labor."

Whilst not questioning the sincerity or integrity of those who fought to establish the principle of Arbitration, the result of their endeavors has been to chain the workers of this country to a belief in capitalist justice and to thoroughly emasculate the industrial unions.

The workers in North America have for years followed the political henchmen of the financial and industrial capitalists of that country, because they have not as yet recognised the relation between Government and their living conditions.

Whilst this condition does not appear to exist in Australia, in reality it is just as pronounced as in the country before-mentioned. The Labor Party, with its slogan of "Australia First" is just as much a representative of national capital as is the Democratic Party of the U.S.A.

The dependence of the workers upon the operations of these Parties for improvements in living conditions, proves that there does not exist that understanding of capitalism and of the capitalist State which is necessary to the development of a virile, aggressive working class movement.

The only Labor organisation in the country worthy of the name is the "Federated Seamen's Union."

It, at least, realises that the place to effect economic improvements is in the sphere of production, in short, "on the job."

Before any appreciable improvement can be achieved in the Trade Union movement of this country, that movement must follow the lead given by the employers in the case of the seamen—become deregistered, ignore the Arbitration Courts, and build up their unions so that, so long as capitalism remains, they may be able to force economic concessions by virtue of their industrial might.—J.K.

OUR SEPTEMBER-OCTOBER NUMBER.

H. Ross's article "The Last Phase of Arbitration" mentioned in "Notes of the Month," as appearing in this issue, has had to be held over for the September-October "Communist." Likewise "Pacific Workers' Interests," by O., and other articles. Our September-October number will contain special matter commemorative of the First International's foundation.

Literature Dept., C.P. of Australia

395 Sussex Street, Sydney.

The following worth-while books can be obtained at the above address. The prices quoted include postage:—

RED EUROPE

Frank Anstey, M.P. Paper, 2/9.

The title of the book fully describes the condition of Europe, especially during the years 1914-1918. The unspeakable methods of capitalist war propaganda are here completely exposed; the deliberate and diabolic manufacturing of lies is clearly demonstrated. Russia's part in the International Slaughter and the Revolution resulting therefrom, are fully explained. To the uninitiated the book is an eye-opener.

THE CIVIL WAR IN FRANCE.

Karl Marx (with a historical introduction by R. W. Postgate). Art Paper, 3/6.

Even more than "Capital," this book throws light on Marx's attitude to the problem of Socialist strategy. It is a great book, long unobtainable, and now re-issued in a beautiful form. No Marxian student can ignore Marx's book about the Paris Commune of 1871.

REMITTANCES.

Money Orders or Postal Notes should be made payable to R. M. Whellock at HAYMARKET P.O. (NOT Sydney, which is the G.P.O.).

J. HOWIE,
Secy., Literature Dept.

Printed by Tomalin & Wigmore at 1-3 Goulburn Street, Sydney, and published by J. S. Garden, 395 Sussex Street, Sydney, for the Communist Party of Australia.

THE COMMUNIST

A JOURNAL FOR THE THEORY AND PRACTICE OF MARXISM

No. 9

SEPTEMBER—OCTOBER 1925

3d.

"The weapon of criticism cannot, to be sure, replace the criticism of weapons, material force must be overthrown by material force; theory, however, also becomes a material force, so soon as it grips the masses."—Karl Marx.

CONTENTS.

Inaugural Address of the I. International.
By KARL MARX

The Question of the Next War.
By MATADE

Pacific Workers' Interests.
By O.

Polynesian Society.
By G. WINTER

White Gods and Brown Men.
By D. HEALY

"Our theory is not a dogma, but a guide to action." F. Engels.

"Without a revolutionary theory, a revolutionary movement is impossible . . . A party can play the role of a vanguard, only if it is guided by a vanguard theory."—V. I. Lenin.

STATE LIBRARY
8 MAR 1925
OF VICTORIA

335.40994
C730

THE INAUGURAL ADDRESS OF THE INTERNATIONAL WORKINGMEN'S ASSOCIATION

(By KARL MARX)

READ AND ADOPTED AT THE FOURTH SESSION OF THE
PROVISIONAL GENERAL COUNCIL OF THE I.W.M.A.
ON NOVEMBER 1, 1864.

Workers, Comrades!

It is an extremely momentous fact that the misery of the working class in the years 1848-1864 has not lessened, in spite of the unexampled development of industry and growth of trade during this period.

In the year 1850 one of the conservative organs of the British bourgeoisie, one of the best informed papers, predicted that when England's imports and exports rose by 50 per cent, pauperism would fall to the vanishing point.

Very well! On 7th April, 1864, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, Gladstone, charmed his parliamentary hearers with the information that the total import and export trade of Great Britain in 1863 had grown to the sum of 443,850,000 pounds sterling: "An astonishing sum which amounts to nearly three times the total trade of the not distant epoch of 1843." Then he proceeds to enlarge somewhat upon "poverty." "Think of those," he continues, "who stand continually on the verge of pauperism".... "on the stationary wages".... "on the human life which".... "in nine cases out of ten is simply a struggle for existence." He did not speak of the people of Ireland who more and more are replaced, in the North by machines and in the South by sheep, although in that unhappy land even the sheep diminish in numbers though not so rapidly as the men. He did not repeat what the highest representatives of the upper ten thousand in a sudden access of fear had divulged.

When the panic over garrotting had reached its height the House of Lords set up a parliamentary commission to enquire into transportation and penal servitude. In the voluminous blue book containing their report issued in 1863 the truth came to light, and with official facts and figures it was proved that the worst criminals, the convicts of England and Scotland, endured less hardship and were much better nourished than the agricultural workers of those two countries. This was not all. When the Civil War in the United States threw the factory workers of Lancashire and Cheshire on the street, the same House of Lords despatched a doctor into the industrial areas with the mission of discovering the smallest quantity of carbon and nitrogen, in the form of the cheapest

and simplest foods, which was necessary on the average to "prevent hunger sickness." Dr. Smith, the medical authority employed, stated that 28,000 grains of carbon and 1330 grains of nitrogen per week were just sufficient, on the average to maintain a male adult above the level of famine fever, and he also discovered that the sparse diet to which the cotton workers, through the pressure of dire need, had been brought almost equalled this minimum. Take notice now! This same learned doctor was later on once more directed by the Medical Officer of the Privy Council to undertake an enquiry into the mode of living of the poorer sections of the working class. The result of his investigation is contained in the Sixth Report on Public Health, which was published by the command of parliament in the course of this year. What did the doctor discover? That the silk-stocking-knitters, and other workers did not enjoy, on the average, even the famine ration of the cotton workers, did not obtain even the minimum of carbon and nitrogen "just sufficient to prevent famine fever." "In addition," we quote from the official report, "it was found among the families of agricultural laborers in which enquiries were carried out, that their diet was deficient by over a fifth part of the necessary nitrogen and by over a third of the (Berkshire, Oxfordshire and Somersetshire) the average fare of whole parishes did not contain the required quantities of nitrogen." "It must be borne in mind," continues the report, "that want of food is only borne with great reluctance and that people only come down to a famine diet after they have sacrificed many other necessities,.... even cleanliness under such circumstances is costly and wearisome and where an endeavor is made out of self-respect to attain it, there the result will be an intenser agony of hunger. These are painful considerations, especially when it is remembered that the poverty of which we are speaking here is not the well deserved penalty of idleness, but in every case is the poverty of working sections of the population. It must be said that the labor which is recompensed with insufficient rations has, in most cases, actually to a

boundless extent expanded." The report contains the peculiar and unexpected fact "that of the four parts of the United Kingdom" England, Wales, Scotland, Ireland, the agricultural population of England, the most fertile portion, "is by far the worst nourished," nevertheless that even the agricultural workers of Berkshire, Oxfordshire and Somersetshire are better fed than the great mass of skilled home workers in the East End of London.

These are official data published by command of Parliament in the year 1864, during the millennial reign of free trade, at a time when the Chancellor of the Exchequer communicated to the House of Commons the fact that "the condition of the average British worker had improved to such an extraordinary degree as had never before been witnessed in the history of all times and all countries."

With these official congratulations the dry remarks of the official Public Health Report do not harmonise: "The public health of a country means the health of the mass of its population, and this mass can hardly be healthy until its lowest sections have reached a degree, be it ever so modest, of well-being."

Dazzled by the "progress of the national wealth" by the statistical figures which dance before his eye, in the excess of his transports "the Chancellor of the Exchequer exclaims:

"From 1842 till 1852 the taxable income of the country increased by six per cent.; in the eight years from 1853 till 1861 it has expanded by twenty per cent. if we compare the income of the latter with that of the former year. The facts are so astonishing that they appear to be almost incredible".... "This intoxicating increase of wealth and power," further adds Mr. Gladstone, "is exclusively limited to the circle of the propertied classes."

Would you know under what conditions of shattered health, damaged morals and mental ruin "this intoxicating increase of wealth and power exclusively of the propertied classes" was and is produced by the working class, then regard the picture presented in the latest "Report on Public Health" where it deals with the work-rooms of tailors, printers and female confection workers. Compare also the "Report of the Commission on Child Labour" of 1863, where, e.g., the following statements are made:

"The calling of a pottery worker, and this applies both to men and women, has bad effects of a physical and of a psychical nature upon the people and leads to degeneration".... "unhealthy children will in time be unhealthy parents".... "a progressive deterioration of the race is inevitable" and "were it not for a continuous recruiting of the industrial population from the adjoining country districts and marriages between the factory workers and members of healthier sections of the population, the deterioration of the population of Staffordshire would be far greater than it is."

Furthermore consider what is revealed in Mr. Tremeneer's blue-book on "The Grievances of the Journeymen Bakers!"

And who has failed to shudder at the ap-

parently contradictory report of the Factory inspectors, or the still more illuminating information afforded by the Mortality Lists, that the health of the workers of Lancashire, at a time when their means of existence were reduced to the barest famine ration, actually improved because they were, through the failure of the cotton supply, at the same time kept out of the cotton factories; and that the mortality of the children diminished because the mothers at length had the time to feed them on the breast, instead of with Godfrey's opium mixture.

Now for the reverse of the medal! The Income and Property Tax Lists which were laid before the House of Commons on 20th July, 1864, inform us that the persons having a yearly income of 50,000 pounds or over, in the period from 5th April, 1862, till 5th April, 1863, had increased by 13, so that their number rose in one year from 67 to 80.

The same Lists expose the fact that some 3,000 persons share a yearly income of some 25 million pounds sterling, very nearly as much as the whole income of the entire body of agricultural laborers in England and Wales. Take the statistics of 1861 and it will be found that the number of the male landrings in England and Wales has fallen from 16,934 in 1851 to 15,666 in 1861, so that the concentration of the ownership of land in ten years has advanced by 11 per cent. Let the concentration of the soil in a few hands continue to go forward at the same pace and soon the land question will be simplified in the same remarkable way that it was in the time of the Roman Empire, when Nero with scornful laughter made the discovery that half of the province of Africa was the property of six lords.

We have dwelt so long upon these facts "that are so astonishing that they appear almost incredible" because England stands at the head of commercial and industrial Europe. It will be fresh in your minds, that only a few months ago one of the exiled sons of Louis Philippe publicly congratulated the English agricultural laborers upon being in a position so much better than that of their less favorably placed comrades on the other side of the Channel. And in fact, with somewhat altered local color and in diminished measure, the English phenomena are repeated in all the industrial and progressive lands of the Continent. In all of them it is found since 1848 an unheard of development of industry and a never previously equalled increase of exports and imports. In all of them was "the increase of wealth and power exclusively in the circles of the possessing classes truly intoxicating." With them all we find as in England in the case of a minority of the working class a trifling rise of the real wages, that is to say, the quantity of means of existence that can be purchased for the money wage; in the most of cases, however, the rise of the money wage means as little any real increase in well-being as, e.g., in the case of the inmates of the poor-houses or orphan asylums of London, when the cost of meeting their barest physical

needs amounts in 1861 to nine pounds fifteen shillings and eightpence as against seven pounds seven shillings and fourpence in 1852.

Everywhere the great mass of the working class sinks down into still greater misery, at least in relation to the rise of the upper classes in the social scale. And so in every country it has now become a truth, demonstrated to be so for every unprejudiced person, denied only by those who have an interest in misleading others by raising false expectations, that no perfecting of machinery, no application of science to industry, no improvement of the means of communication, no new colonies, no emigration, no opening up of new markets, no free trade and not all these things put together can do away with the misery of the toiling masses; but rather, on the contrary, that upon the present false basis every new development of the productive power of labor must lead to the widening of the gulf between the classes and the heightening of social antagonisms. During this intoxicating epoch of economic progress death from starvation raised itself almost to the rank of a social institution in the capital of the British Empire. In the annals of world history this epoch is characterised by the swifter recurrence, the more expanded range and the deadlier effects of the social plague known as the commercial and industrial crisis.

After the miscarriage of the revolution of 1848 all organisations and papers of the Workers' Parties on the Continent were suppressed by the unsparing use of force. The most advanced sons of labor fled in despair to the Transatlantic Republic and the short-lived dream of freedom vanished in an epoch of industrial fever, moral stagnation and political reaction. The defeat of the working class of the Continent, in some part aided by the diplomacy of the English Government, which then as today acted in fraternal solidarity with the St. Petersburg Cabinet, soon communicated its contagious effect to this side of the Channel. While the defeat of their brothers on the Continent discouraged the English workers and chattered their faith in their own cause it restored once more the somewhat shaken confidence of the landlords and money lords. With shameless effrontery these withdrew concessions that had already been publicly announced. The discovery of new goldfields led to a tremendous emigration, which left behind in the ranks of the British proletariat a gap that could not be filled. Others of its formerly most energetic members allowed themselves to be corrupted by the bait of temporarily better employment and higher wages and "took existing conditions into account." All attempts to maintain or to reorganise the Chartist movement completely failed; the press organs of the working class one after another went under for want of support from the masses and the English working class receded to a condition of political nullity. If there had been before no community of action between the workers of Great Britain and those of the European main-

land, there was now at any rate a community of defeat.

And still the period since the revolution of 1848 is not without its bright side. Here we will only refer to two great events. After a thirty years' struggle, conducted with the most admirable persistency, the English working class were able by taking advantage of a momentary split between the landlords and the money lords to get the Ten Hours Bill passed into law. The great physical, moral and mental benefits that the factory workers have received from this measure, of which one can find proof by consulting the half-yearly reports of the Factory Inspectors, are now recognised on all hands. The most of the Continental governments found themselves compelled to introduce the English Factory Act in a more or less modified form, and the English Parliament itself is forced every year to expand its sphere of influence. However, putting aside its practical importance, the astonishing success of this last measure had another still higher meaning. The bourgeoisie, through the medium of Dr. Ure, Professor Senior and other wiseacres, had advanced the statement in their best-known scientific organs, and had proved it to their own complete satisfaction, that every legal limitation of the labor time of English industry would sound its death-knell, and that it could only exist vampire-like by sucking human blood and especially the blood of children. In olden times child murder was a secret rite of the religion of Moloch, but it was only practised, perhaps, once a year on the occasion of great festivals and, besides, Moloch had no express preference for the children of the poor.

This struggle over the legal limitation of the working day raged all the more violently, the more it, apart from the alarm of avarice, actually centred around the great antagonism between the blind rule of the law of supply and demand, the political economy of the bourgeoisie, and production ruled by social foresight and insight, the political economy of the working class. And for that reason the work-Act was not merely a great practical success, it was at the same time the victory of a principle. For the first time in the clear light of day the political economy of the bourgeoisie suffered defeat at the hands of the political economy of the working class.

Yet a still greater victory of the political economy of labor over the political economy of the capital stands before our eyes. We speak of co-operative factories which, especially of the "hands" without any other assistance, are established. The value of these great social experiments can hardly be estimated high enough. Through deeds and not by arguments the workers have proved that production on a large scale and in harmony with the progress of a modern science can be carried on without the existence of a master class, who employ a class of "hands"; that for industry to bear fruit, it is not necessary that the means of labor should be monopolised as a means of dominating the

workers and exploiting them; that, just like Slavery and Serfdom, so also Wage-Labor is only a transitory, subordinate social form which is destined to vanish before associated labor, which will accomplish its work with willing hand, vigorous mind and cheerful heart. In England the seeds of the co-operative principles were sown by Robert Owen; the worker-experiments made on the Continent were in fact the practical outcome of the theories, which if not conceived in 1848, were at any rate then loudly proclaimed.

At the same time the experience of the period from 1848 to 1864 proves undoubtedly (what the most intelligent leaders of the working class in the years 1851 and 1852 had already thought of the co-operative movement in England) that, however correct in principle and useful in practice co-operative labor is, still, whilst it is limited to the occasional experiments of narrow circles of isolated workers, it can never acquire the strength necessary to hold the **geometrically progressive** increase of monopoly in check, nor to free the masses, nay, even to lighten considerably the weight of their misery. Perhaps this is just the reason why some kinds of bourgeoisie, philanthropic, fine talkers of the bourgeoisie and even some of the cunning tradesmen of political economy have suddenly turned round and are now in a disgusting fashion coquetting with this same co-operative system, which they formerly though vainly sought to kill in the germ by scoffing at it as a mere utopia of dreamers or by damming it as a Socialist heresy. In order to free the workers the co-operative system requires to develop on a national scale and, following from that, the lords of the land and the lords of capital will continue steadily to use their political privileges for the defence and perpetuation of their monopoly. Instead of furthering the emancipation of the workers, they will act so as to bring every possible obstacle in the way. It was spoken from their soul when Lord Palmerston called scornfully to the defenders of the rights of the Irish tenant farmers in the last session of Parliament: "The House of Commons is a house of landowners."

Therefore to conquer political power is now the great duty of the working class. This appears to have been understood for simultaneously in England, France, Germany and Italy indications of a revival are to be seen and in all these countries attempts at the political re-

organisation of the workers' party are now being made.

One element of success is possessed by the workers—their great numbers. But the mass can only bring their pressure to bear when an organisation has gathered them together and knowledge guides them. Former experience has shown how neglect of the bonds of brotherhood, which can unify and encourage the workers of the various lands in all their struggles; for freedom to steadfastly stand by one another, leads to the punishment of the workers through the frustration of their unconnected attempts. Urged by recognition of this, workers of various countries have on 28th September, 1864, at a public meeting in St. Martin's Hall founded the International Association.

Still another conviction inspired the assembly. If the freeing of the working class of the various nations demands their brotherly working together how shall this great aim be reached while a foreign policy is carried on which is directed to the furthering of infamous purposes, arouses national prejudices and in robber wars squanders the goods and blood of the people? Not the wisdom of the ruling class, but the heroic opposition of the English working class saved Western Europe from the disgrace of sending a military expedition for the perpetuation and extension of slavery on the other side of the Atlantic Ocean.

The shameless applause, the sham sympathy, or the idiotic indifference with which the upper classes of Europe received the conquest of the Caucasian mountain fastnesses and the assassination of heroic Poland by Russia; the monstrous, unresisted encroachments of this barbarous power, whose capital is St. Petersburg and whose influence exists in every Cabinet of Europe, have taught the working class that their duty lies in mastering the secrets of international politics, in keeping a watch upon the diplomatic actions of their governments and, when necessary, in opposing such actions with all the means at their command. Where they are unable to forestall designs of their governments, the workers must unite in denouncing these designs simultaneously, and make the simple laws of morality and right which should regulate the relations of private persons, prevail as the supreme law governing the intercourse of nations. The struggle for such a foreign policy is embraced in the universal struggle for the emancipation of the working class.

"Proletarians of All Lands! Unite!"

The Question of the Next War.

By **MATADE.**

The article by Comrade Pepper in the "Communist International," No. 10, seems to have found support in more countries than one. The foundation of his article, i.e., that "we must remain alive to the growing possibility of an

imperialist war against the U.S.S.R. but one must not be blind to the growing possibility of a break, perhaps a conflict, or even a war, between American imperialism and British imperialism," is wrongly interpreted in Australia.

The possibilities of a conflict against the USSR are forgotten, and no attention has been paid to Pepper's statement that "We do not intend to assert that a war between England and America is already imminent." The statement by Manuilsky in a subsequent issue of the same journal that, "moreover, one cannot have a correct perspective without taking into consideration the contradictions which are rending the whole capitalist world. The rivalry between America and Great Britain is the main trend of these contradictions along which the forthcoming world conflict will develop," will strengthen this belief, that the only conflict which lies ahead is war between America and Great Britain.

In some quarters we find these two articles have already led many to the conclusion that the next war must be between America and England.

With this we entirely disagree! But, before we state the actual facts as they are working themselves out in world diplomacy, or attempt to draw any conclusions, a few points must be elucidated.

One fact has to be borne in mind when reviewing the present day world situation, viz., that individual direct action or war is impossible between two large powers, that is, between two large powers only, because war would no sooner be declared and entered upon than every other power would be drawn into the affray. In fact, it is always the case that, for some time beforehand, sides have already been chosen and camps divided. This fact is of vital importance when reviewing the world situation, because, in knowing which set of powers are allied together, their strength can be determined; and, by knowing the strength of the set of powers allied against this former set, the relative strength of the opposing forces may be approximated beforehand.

In an earlier stage of capitalist development an alliance between a set of powers was easily understood. In present day capitalism the matter has altered somewhat, chiefly because the world has become smaller to the larger powers. Prior to the last war an alliance existed between France, England and Russia, and, from the disclosure of secret documents made by the Russians after the 1917 Revolution, it was evident that the foundation of that alliance was an agreement between these powers to divide the world amongst themselves. Capitalist decline was not so marked then as now. And it is common knowledge that France was to extend her boundaries to the Rhine; Russia was to have control of Constantinople and the Straits, etc., etc. Here was an agreement where the countries allied together saw eye to eye with one another in the extension of their hegemony over the world.

Not so today! Capitalist decline has advanced a lot in the last few years, and the more capitalism declines the blinder the bosses become to the real cause of the trouble. The bosses are so blind that they can see only from their own nationalistic viewpoint.

The reason for stagnation and decline in their own country is interpreted by the fact that they are excluded from such and such a sphere over which some other power happens to have a monopoly. They will not admit that the cause of the trouble lies in the capitalist mode of production. They are blind to the fact that industry has developed to that stage where the present mode of distribution can no longer absorb what production can turn out. If industry is to develop in their own country, they think they must develop their hegemony over the whole world. The final stage of capitalism has for its foundation the fact that every power feels that the further development of industry is only possible if it can dominate the whole earth. We have reached that stage where every power can only look upon the advancement made by another power in one light, viz., that it is raising itself to a position from which, if allowed to develop further, it will crush the former power out of existence. It is this circumstance which whispers into the ears of the capitalists the same message in every country: "Conquer the whole world!" This has an important effect upon any alliance which may be entered upon by the world powers to-day. To sum up: notwithstanding the circumstance that one set of powers may find themselves allied together against another set of powers, the fact stands out—that there is also a clash of interests between the powers so allied as to form a given set.

These facts go to prove that although every large power is interested mainly in its own country securing the hegemony of the whole world, still, individual action is impossible in the present stage of capitalist development. Immediately war is declared between two powers, the remaining powers have two courses to them. They can take advantage of the strike out for themselves; or they can ally themselves with one of the two opposing sides at war.

Realising this, let us now return to the question that the next war **MUST BE** between England and America. The best method of analysis is for us to assume war to be declared between these two countries. The question immediately arises is—what will be the attitude of the remaining powers? The question seems to loom the most important with the people; we will consider that first.

Japan is the power under consideration. What would be her attitude in the event of a war between America and England? Would England? She has already declared that "She will protect her own interests in the Pacific, catspaw of England." This seems to lead one to the conclusion that Japan would not ally herself with either of the two contending powers. Why? Because Japan thinks that should America and England go to war she would have a free hand in the Pacific. You say not? Well, let us see.

Commander Ishimura of the Imperial Japanese Navy has just written a remarkable book with the following more remarkable title: "If Japan and America should fight Japan would not lose." America, more guns; Japan, more speed.

Ishimura's opinion is that "America possesses a better number of guns, but this disadvantage to Japan is partly compensated by the faster speed of the Japanese fleet, besides a larger number of torpedoes, and faster cruiser battleships." "It is very doubtful," he goes on, "whether the American squadrons can fully display their fighting power in the western Pacific, unless the Americans have faster vessels to outpace the Japanese cruiser-battleships. Victory will lie more in the skilful strategy displayed than in the actual fighting power of the ships."

"It is apparent that America lacks light cruisers badly. According to naval lessons learnt from past battles, there should be at least two light cruisers to each ship of the main force."

In a Parliamentary speech of the Australian Prime Minister it is clearly demonstrated that by April, 1929, Japan will possess the largest number of light cruisers in the world. Mr. Bruce quoted the figures of the present Parliamentary Secretary for the Admiralty upon the number of cruisers and submarines on the effective list as follows—

	March, 1925.	Cruisers.	Submarines
Britain	..	43	61
U.S.A.	..	29	115
Japan	..	28	44
France	..	16	45

	April, 1929.	Cruisers.	Submarines
Britain	..	32	31
U.S.A.	..	10	122
Japan	..	40	79
France	..	19	69

These figures are for effective submarines and cruisers built right up to date, and capable of being used in attack as well as defence. The being used in attack at the end of May this year, stated that Japan's new aircraft-carrier, the AKAGI is of 26,900 tons displacement, has a speed of 28 knots, and accommodates 50 aeroplanes. She is armed with ten 8-inch guns. "The and sixteen 4.7-inch quick-firing guns. "The Akagi is virtually a light battle cruiser as well as an aircraft carrier," says the British, her hitting power surpasses that of the British, French, and American cruisers now being built. "In the Akagi, as in the cruiser Furutaka, the Japanese have trumped all their rivals by increasing the ratio of fighting power to tonnage and producing ships capable of delivering heavier blows than larger vessels of other navies."

Hector C. Bywater, in his "The Great Pacific War," admits that in the first stages of the war between America and Japan which he pictures as eventuating in 1931, Japan would strike a successful initial blow, wiping out all the

United States possessions in the China Sea, including Guam.

These facts are well worth pondering over. An associate of the Institute of Naval Architecture and member of the United States Naval Institute admits that, upon the facts as they exist in the Pacific, Japan would win the first rounds. A Japanese expert is confident that the Japanese navy could defeat the American. And the Japanese yellow press seems to be confident that, given certain conditions, they could defeat the combined forces of England and America.

If this be so, then, I ask, what hope would either England or America have against Japan if they were engaged in a conflict with each other? The answer seems obvious.

Japan is so situated strategically that she is impregnable, and, in the event of a war between America and England, she would think an excellent opportunity had arisen for her to extend the Japanese Empire in the Pacific.

Whilst the English and American navies would be busy fighting each other, the Philippines, the East Indian Archipelago, China, the Dutch Islands, etc., would be unprotected, and there would be nothing to stop the Japanese from taking the lot, including the much talked about Singapore base.

So much for the Pacific Question; let us now return to the European situation.

The first fact which strikes us when we turn to the European situation is agreement between England and France. Why, I ask, are France and England coming together? What has happened that they should sink their differences? Why has their position changed from rivals to friends in so short a time?

It was only yesterday that war between these two powers was narrowly averted. And to-day England's Admiralty has so changed its outlook that the much talked about **AIR FORCE** (which was to be used against France) has, for the time being, been dropped, and the building of cruisers has become the order of the day.

What does all this reveal but that there is a stronger combination of powers in the world than England and France which has forced them to sink differences and come together. Against whom?

This is also clear. The cables from London, August 10, inform us that "The Berlin correspondent of the 'Petit Parisien' learns that a conference of Russian and German representatives, held at Berlin recently, drew up an addendum to the Treaty of Rapallo. The terms of the agreement have been kept secret, but are believed to determine the lines of future Russo-German collaboration in the event of Germany entering the League of Nations, or signing a security pact." And the Sydney "Sun" of August 17 contains the following special cable: "Redoubling its efforts to prevent Germany accepting the proposed security pact and joining the League of Nations, the Soviet is proposing a further discussion of a plan for a Jap-Russo-German alliance."

This is the set of powers which England and

France are afraid of! Back in June, 1923, the Australian papers were full of talk of such an alliance. The articles by arrangement with the "Morning Post" were written by a special correspondent sent from London to China, Singapore, and the Far East generally, for the purpose of studying these problems on the spot. The conclusions to be drawn from these articles are summed up in the third instalment under the heading of "Present Balance of Power." It says:

"Russian power in the East at present is almost entirely a propaganda one. Any clash of arms, however small, in the Far East, based upon an understanding between Russia and Japan, could not but have a reflex action in India, where sporadic unrest or even mutiny would materially cripple the assistance that England could give to the Far Eastern affairs.

"It is worth while pointing out that large German interests in China, which perforce were abandoned during the war, have entered a period of resurgence. There have been hints at an understanding between Germany, Russia, and Japan in these matters. Such a combination could not be expected to favor Anglo-American influence in the Far East, and might even create a solid bloc which would successfully squeeze out even well-established business. Germany is actively connected with Russia in Europe, both as regards future trade enterprises and with respect to hostility to other Western nations. Russia is seeking to recapture her Pacific position, not at Japan's expense, but in harmony with her.

"Both groups naturally desire to win over a large share of the present Anglo-American influence and interests. Although the partners to these alliances may be strange bed-fellows, yet, from the similarity of their aims, they may, in combination, do irreparable damage before coming to blows amongst themselves. Which ever way the problem is viewed, **IT CANNOT BE SAID TO BE FAVORABLE TO THE PRESENT BALANCE OF POWER IN THE PACIFIC.**"

The article by F. Britten Austin in the "Empire Review" of April, 1925, leads one to the conclusion that he fears the Jap-Russo-German combination could stand up against the combined forces of their opponents successfully. He accepts the statements published in the German paper "Lokalanzeiger" that the Jap-Russian agreement of January, 1925, contains a secret clause binding these two countries together for future military purposes. To him the facts are established that "Japanese strategists are convinced that given certain conditions, the Anglo-American combination CAN (capitals his) be faced and successfully. Because of the fact that neither the U.S. nor Great Britain (until Singapore is completed) possesses first-class naval bases in the Western Pacific, Japan counts confidently on a naval superiority over all comers in the strategic area concerned—Japan, if thrown on the defensive, can only be defeated by blockade in a long war.... Japan could not fight a long war against

a first-class power upon her own resources. **SHE MUST SECURE BEHIND HER AN OVERLAND ROUTE TO EUROPE.**" This he maintains is supplied by a joint agreement of the Japanese and the Russians to use the Siberian railway as a back door into Germany.

England and France are not at all favorable to this combination of powers—and the coming Pact conference will determine just how strong the bonds are which bind the latter powers together. If Germany stands behind the agreement with Japan and Russia the European situation can be easily seen. With such an agreement firmly established it is plain that Austria, Bulgaria, Turkey and all the smaller fry would again ally themselves to Germany.

The European position reveals the exact situation which is being worked up at the present moment. It does so because it determines the sides on which the contesting powers will find themselves allied when the affair breaks loose.

If Germany refuses to sign the security pact or enter the League of Nations, unconditionally, the following nations must henceforth be classed as a combination of powers, viz., Germany, Japan, Russia, Austria, Turkey and Bulgaria. In the writer's opinion, America would be the last country in the world to join such a combination. But to return to the question. If Germany refuses to join the League of Nations unconditionally, **WHAT THEN WOULD BE THE RESULT IN EUROPE OF A WAR BETWEEN ENGLAND AND AMERICA?** England, having her powers taxed to the utmost in defending Canada, Australia, India, and the rest of the Empire, could give no assistance to France. Herein lies the significance of the whole affair.

Let us consider the matter more closely. In the last war we had what was called a balance of powers. This meant that Germany was bounded upon the one side by Russia and upon the other by France. But, if Germany refuses to join the League of Nations unconditionally this will be all upset, because Germany allied to Russia is a stronger Germany—potentially—than she was before the last war.

In the event of a war with America, England would be unable to render assistance to France, consequently, Poland, Czechoslovakia, and all the smaller States formed at the close of the last war **COULD NOT WITHSTAND AN ATTACK UPON THEM BY THE RUSSIAN AND GERMAN ARMIES COMBINED.** It would only be a short space of time before all the vast country from the North Sea to the Pacific Ocean would be under the control of this combination of powers.

Though England is allied to France against the Russo-Jap-German combination, still, she will not agree to stand behind France in securing the integrity of Poland and the other smaller States. Here we see disagreement between England and France still existing although they are allies. **ENGLAND WILL NOT BE A PARTY TO MAKING FRANCE STRONGER THAN HERSELF,** although she

realises that Poland and Czechoslovakia, etc., cannot withstand a combined Russo-German attack.

England sees full well that if the alliance between Germany, Russia and Japan stands unshaken, Germany will be potentially stronger than ever from a military standpoint.

If the Japanese were left to seize the Philippines and Guam, and take Hong Kong and Singapore, Russia, Austria, Bulgaria and Germany could wipe out the smaller States, and, with the assistance of Turkey, take Suez, cut the Empire in halves, seize England's oil supplies, and at the same time stand up to the French army.

THUS IT BEHOVES US TO LOOK THE FACTS FULLY IN THE FACE BEFORE WE DECLARE FROM THE HOUSETOPS THAT THE NEXT WAR MUST BE BETWEEN ENGLAND AND AMERICA.

IF GERMANY SIDES WITH RUSSIA AND JAPAN THE FACTS WILL BE ESTABLISHED BEYOND DOUBT THAT THERE ARE CERTAIN POWERS IN EUROPE AND ASIA WHICH HAVE AN AGREEMENT BETWEEN THEM, AND THAT, ALLOWED A FEW YEARS OF DEVELOPMENT, THEY ARE SO SITUATED THAT, IN THE EVENT OF WAR BETWEEN ENGLAND AND AMERICA, THE TIME WOULD BE OPPORTUNE FOR THESE POWERS TO STRIKE OUT AND TAKE THE WHOLE OF EUROPE AND ASIA FOR THEMSELVES.

Realising this, comrades must ask themselves the following question a thousand times before they make up their minds that the next war **MUST BE** between England and America:

WOULD ENGLAND AND AMERICA BE SO FOOLISH AS TO GO TO WAR WITH EACH OTHER, THEREBY CREATING FOR THIS COMBINATION OF POWERS AN EXCELLENT OPPORTUNITY TO RISE STRONGER IN EVERY WAY THAN ENGLAND OR AMERICA COULD BE, WHICH EVER OF THEM WON?

In the event of Germany refusing to sign the security pact or join the League of Nations **UNCONDITIONALLY,** it behoves us to ponder over the above question.

Now to the other proposition. What if Germany renounces her alliance with Japan and Russia, and joins unconditionally? What then? Must the next war be between England and America? Decidedly not.

Here again the European question decides the way in which the opposing forces will be grouped in the coming conflict. If Germany joins with France, England, America and Italy, it becomes apparent that the whole world is united against the U.S.S.R. and Japan.

It is also clear that if Germany joins unconditionally Japan is not going to allow herself to be isolated.

The Japanese Cabinet has already declared that "WHEN the Pact is perfected the way will

be open for a general acceptance in some form of the spirit of the Protocol, and also for President Coolidge's desired second naval conference, which Japan will welcome."

It thus becomes evident that, in the event of the French, German, British and Belgian diplomats coming to terms, Japan is not going to stand by the U.S.S.R. Hence the actual facts which are working themselves out in Europe go to prove that the next war will not be between England and America. They show that the alliance between Russia, Germany and Japan is going to be tested, and, if Germany is going to stand alongside Russia and Japan the next war will be between this combination and the rest of the world.

If, on the other hand, Germany consents to renounce all connections with the U.S.S.R., Japan will do likewise and the next war will be that of the whole imperialist crew against the workers of the U.S.S.R. But this agrees with Comrade Radek's proposition, and Comrade Chicherin has already declared that Britain's efforts to conclude a security pact with Germany and other powers are in reality directed against Russia. Such an agreement will not strengthen peace.

Upon the Chinese situation he again stated: "As People's Commissary for Foreign Affairs, I cannot pass over in silence this unusual speech of a member of a Government with which we are in normal relations. Lord Birkenhead is actually trying to break off diplomatic relations between us and England. His speech, therefore, is extremely aggressive. It suggests the demand for a highly inimical step against us. **ONE STEP FURTHER AND WE SHALL BE AT WAR.**"

These are the conclusions which are to be drawn from the diplomatic relationships existing in the world to-day. And, in reviewing the whole world situation, it becomes apparent that we are faced with war in the very near future.

If the Russo-Jap-German alliance is maintained it will lead to war. If it is broken, the result again will be war, but with this difference. If the trio can be broken up and a united front of all the capitalist powers can be formed against Russia, war will be forced sooner than it would be against the combination.

The master class are blind to the forces which are at work in capitalist society; however, they understand that the interests of all the powers are clashing more sharply than ever before. They are also aware that if war is resorted to revolution may be the consequence; hence they imagine that the first step to safety is to smash the revolution, which they identify with Soviet Russia. They think that, having succeeded in doing this, the time will then be ripe for them to fight their own battle, and see which of the world powers is going to dominate the whole world. They are blind to the forces which are at work consequently the present imperialist diplomats are in reality "digging their own graves."

Pacific Workers' Interests.

(That White Australia Aphorism.)

[The resolution of the recent Interstate Conference of Labor Councils at Adelaide, which "recommends to each State Council that arrangements be made to hold a conference in Australia of all industrial and political bodies (i.e., of workers—Ed.) bordering on the Pacific in the month of January, 1926," renders the reflections contained in the following article especially timely.—Editor.]

When, as now, the big capitalist states which operate Asia prepare obviously and intensively for military conflict, and the Imperial and Colonial Labor Parties have long since become eager instruments in that preparation, it would seem late to set about the formulation of methods to meet and exploit these conditions. Something slender was devised in 1921, in the form of a specific function of the Council of Action. However futile this establishment proved, it was evolved to meet a mood, and, in its turn, it could have been utilised to achieve a powerful alliance between the workers of the Pacific lands. But that much time has been lost by that failure is of small account beside the fact that the conditions in India and the East and in Australia to-day demand the active interest of the militant members of the working class, and to an increasing degree present opportunities for propaganda and organisation.

It follows from the class character of the events daily agitating the East, and the inevitable conflict ahead, that the task of leading the Australian workers in their relations with the workers of Asian and Pacific lands cannot concern itself with any isolated political aphorism such as, for example, White Australia. This aspiration, which should be well understood, was in its origin an expression of workers' objection to a specific strikebreaking or scabbing force, and is in its present stage of evolution or survival a mere political plaything of the bourgeoisie. It has too long been regarded with embarrassment by organisations professing working class leadership. Such bodies failed to grasp the elemental fact that the destruction of the Australian workers' economic standards was quite effectively to be achieved by the capitalist processes under the legal machinery set up and maintained by the Labor Parties themselves; that the intervention of "hordes of Asians" was quite unnecessary in the industrial undertakings of the country. As a matter of everyday politics they failed to realise, too, that White Australia required no tribute since its reality had gone, since right throughout North Australia the immigration of Asian people had been intensively and openly proceeding.

The policy, if it can now be so called, had a considerable influence early in the settlement of this British colony. The Labor Party later adopted it as its special ward. In the war of the big capitalist states White Australia was finally shown to be a threadbare garment. In the

Peace Treaty debate in Parliament W. M. Hughes announced that in pursuance of the pact made by the Federal Labor Government of 1916 (known as the Fisher Pact), Japan had advanced her bases 1800 miles nearer the Australian coasts, and this was to be established as one of Japan's rewards for collaboration against the German capitalists. The Labor Opposition at that time, somewhat fearful of the judgment of the workers on its wartime deficiencies, raised a hypocritical howl of protest against this very logical consequence of the collaboration, even as it now wails about the Brisbane operating in Chinese waters.

The All-Australian Trade Union Congress of 1921 showed plainly that only in the press and in schools, with the "substitution" of the Australian Jack for the Union Jack, had the bourgeois elements of the Labor Party been able to maintain the White Australia idea. Whenever sea captains drunkenly told how they introduced Asians in the northlands, they were given a nominal fine; the occasional arrival of the wife of some Chinese produced a newspaper fuss; Sir Henry Barwell and a few squatters were rudely criticised by the local and British capitalist press for their "indiscipline" in demanding the formal abandonment of the policy; in the newspaper business "White Australia" remains a subject for stock argument whenever regular news is scarce. All this does not imply that "White Australia" remains a popular conception with the masses who read newspapers, and that one must walk warily where it is mentioned. It merely indicates that the organs of capitalist propaganda—press, pulpit, and platform—concur in a campaign to distract the workers' attention from the reality that immediate conditions evoke. To think that homage must be paid to White Australia in working class activity would be as sound as to think that the Germans were responsible for the war and as industriously and spectacularly inculcated as the former in the popular mind. In short, White Australia survived merely as a publicity slogan.

At the War's end the daily class warfare in the workers so far in advance of the carried Labor Party that the more calculating of the official members sent out now notorious overtures to resulted in the All-Australian Congress of Trade Unions. Here again the hangover, or, one should say, the slobber, of democratic ideology (senile White Australia) was transmuted with- into too many awkward questions through the newly-formed Council of Action, to organisations of the countries concerned and to decide a course of action for mutual preservation and protection. Whether the objective was

the infantile "general strike at the outbreak of war" or a more serious organisation of the Pan-Pacific workers on an international basis I do not know. I can find no records of the Council's doings and only scanty references to the decision. Yet, such a decision by an All-Australian workers' conference was evidence enough that organised workers were in the mood to cast aside the state of mind suggested by the aphorism White Australia. It was evidence enough that, while safeguarding their immediate gains in the class struggle, they were prepared to make material efforts to help their Asian brothers.

The opportunity for Eastern contact was excellent. Chinese workers were in rebellion at strategic points in China's industry. Sun Yat Sen correctly interpreted the Chinese social movements, and devoted himself to the organisation of the workers and peasants. His old political reputation and his new leadership of the masses brought him in direct touch with the Opposition Labor Party of Britain—a peculiarly interesting turn considering the British capitalist interference in China. That the Opposition Labor Party of Britain failed Sun Yat Sen is not surprising when we know that the Australians' Eastern fraternal mood was more directly stultified by our own Labor bourgeoisie. If after the "White Australia" and general war confusion anything could have redeemed the so-called leftists of Labor from utter reaction, the exercise of this function of the Council would have done it. But a certain degree of redemption of political reputation had been achieved by the Labor bourgeoisie in merely meeting the Conference. However propitious the time they refrained from action. Why?

Was it that the Council of Action was merely confused this time as the Labor Party of old, or that it feared some party schism? No. The time was merely too propitious for a material gesture to Asian workers: the step would inevitably have stirred a train of workers' organisational contacts of revolutionary trend. The Labor Party Lead would have been embarrassed not with any particular or active action of workers in the unions, but with its capitalist friends who had been so good to it during the war. That was the real dread. Something such always is the determinant with the A.L.P. in a crisis.

Hence, much as "White Australia" may be revived, and "Right" and "Justice" are—a tiny locus for inexperienced workers, the former presents no inviolable tradition for the A.L.P. masses and the trade unions. It is no sacred province where angels of the working class need fear to tread. To Communists it can present no difficulty. A move towards union organisational contact with the workers of the East would be again, as it was in 1921, a repudiation of "White Australia." No concern should ever be given it in debate, no concern should ever be presented for such as would effectively workers' press except such as would effectively exhibit it as sheer humbug. About us to-day all the conditions are favorable for such rude exposure.

The A.W.U. Executive has taken a reactionary step towards bolstering the "White Australia" aphorism by declaring against the admission of Italian workers. It has countenanced the Australian talk of race conflict in the North and evaded its logical task of going out and organising all immigrant elements. The British Labor Party, to the plaudits of our own A.L.P. and members of our Council of Action, has loyally observed the rules of imperialist capitalism in China and India. To save its face (just as in the Peace Treaty debate) the A.L.P. makes a squeal about the Australian-manufactured Navy co-operating to cow the militant workers of China, with whom the Council of Action in 1921-2 should have made contact. At the last A.L.P. Federal Conference Theodore's suggestions were adopted in the direction of greater naval and air armament (really a substitute for that "unpopular" Empire Navy, and a complement to Singapore). The Queensland Labor Government's first reaction to the Singapore proposition was to ask the War Office to incorporate Australian timbers and steel in its construction. The Wills-Lang Government, as its first act, voter thousands of pounds, not for workers' aid but for the entertainment in Sydney in September of the Empire Press Congress—a body of avowedly capitalist journalists brought here with as much class purpose in the Eastern connexion as lies in the synchronising visit of the United States Fleet. Only this month the Sydney "Sun" published a picture of Australian naval officers at tea with Japanese naval officers and their wives—all cooperating to keep Chinese militants from worrying White Australian and White European investments. Of propagandist opportunities there is no lack.

Persistently the Communist should utilise in speech and print every incident, "home" and "foreign," that will clarify for the Australian worker his common cause with that of the exploited workers of the East, with whom he has unduly long been kept in false relation, and against whom the Labor Party will one day ask him to shoulder a gun. No tactic can correctly regard "White Australia" as a political force or as a popular conception to which homage should be paid (even when concerned with safeguarding hard won class gains locally). Every activity must conceive, not only within the Communist International, but also and especially within the general organisations of workers of the respective countries, the creation of bodies of exchange and consultation. Ultimately as objective there must be a regular body emerged from all the national Pacific union organisations, which will give and maintain radical direction and shape the international activity of Pan-Pacific workers. Everything rests with the militants.—O.

* The Council of Action consisted of: J. Curtin (W.A.), H. E. Holland (N.Z.), J. M. Baddeley (N.S.W.), E. J. Holloway (Vic.), A. C. Willis (N.S.W.), T. Moroney (Q'land), J. L. Scullin (Vic.), J. S. Gardner (N.S.W.), R. S. Ross (Vic.), R. Blakely (N.S.W.), F. W. Birrell (S.A.), and A. Higgins (Tas.).

† Curtin wired to "Daily Standard," Brisbane, April 15, 1924, in controversy on Council of Action: "The fact

Polynesian Society.

By G. Winter.

The Polynesian terms of consanguinity are put forward by Morgan as fundamentally true to the consanguine family. These terms include several which stand for marriage relationship, and one term (unknown in Hawaii) which stands for collateral descent, such terms must be considered, of course, as being of later development than the terms for direct blood-relationship.

To put Morgan's argument in brief, the Polynesian system is a simple classification by generations, all persons of one generation standing in the same relation to all those of another, if in any way connected by blood.

Thus, my own grandchildren and those of my brothers, sisters, and cousins, are Mokokopuna (using the Maori form) to me and my generation, while all members of this generation are "Tupuna" to them. My children, and those of my brothers, sisters, and cousins, are "Tama" to us, and we are "Matua" to them.

In the single generation the terms of relationship differ essentially from those of European peoples, and the significance of this difference has been partly overlooked by Morgan himself. It is not only true, as Morgan points out, that cousins are included in the brother-and-sister relation, but further, the gender of a term is determined by the sex of the person speaking or spoken of as having the relation; and in the case of persons of the same sex, the respective ages of themselves or their parents are taken into consideration.

My brother is Tuakana to me, and I am Teina to him; my male cousins are also Tuakana or Teina to me, not according to our respective ages, but according to the ages of our respective parents; further, the terms Tuakana and Teina

are of masculine gender only because I, the person related to, am a male. When used by a female, they refer to her sisters or female cousins.

As a male, I speak of my sisters and female cousins as Tuahine; they refer to me as their Tungane. Now, in the consanguineous family, the purely fraternal relation could only exist between persons of the same sex. The same term would be used, therefore, by males in respect of their brothers and male cousins, and by females in respect of their sisters and female cousins. Within the same generation and the same sex, distinctions of age would determine priority and authority, so that from the one term there might arise two. Hence the double form Tuakana-Teina, which is masculine or feminine according to circumstances, but always expresses a fraternal relation between persons of the same sex. In the consanguine family there would be no distinction between brothers or sisters on the one hand, and cousins on the other. In Polynesia, the only difference which appears in language is the use of Tuakana and Teina, between cousins, without regard to the respective ages of the individuals concerned; this in itself shows that there was a practical difference, and further, that individual paternity was well known.

Further, in the consanguine family the conjugal relation existed between all persons of opposite sex within the generation. The man's sisters and female cousins would be, collectively, his wives, and he would be their husband. Correspondingly, we find in the Polynesian language that the terms for "man's sister" and "woman's brother" are quite different from the terms for a woman's sister and a man's brother—which, as before stated, are identical.

Just as the fraternal relation existing between persons of the same sex became crystallised in the double term Tuakana-Teina, so the conjugal relation existing between persons of opposite sex became crystallised in the terms Tungane-Tuahine. That these terms express a sex relationship—even if a prohibited one—cannot be doubted, as the words Tane and Wahine (male and female, or husband and wife) are plainly seen in their construction.

Exactly the same differences from European classification appear in the terms for marriage relationship, brothers-in-law and sisters-in-law being classified according to the sex of the speaker. Here we find again the same terms used in respect of a man or a woman, according to whether the relations of the speaker towards such persons were purely fraternal or potentially conjugal. Moreover, the origin of the words for a woman's brother-in-law and a man's sister-in-law—Au-tane and Au-wahine respectively—is obviously the conjugal termin-

ology. In Hawaii, where "Punalua" marriage persisted, brother-in-law and sister-in-law were "Kane" and "Wahine"—husband and wife—and in Maori the prefix "Au," placed before "Tane" and "Wahine" obviously implies "potential." The two customs, of marrying the wife's sisters as they attain maturity, and of taking the deceased brother's wife, are so widespread that they are known to ethnologists by special names—the sororate and the levirate respectively. Both of these customs are relics of group marriage, and particularly of what Morgan calls "Punalua" marriage.

Granting that this existed in Hawaii—one of the many temporary homes of the Maori race—the conclusion can hardly be avoided that as the wives of brothers became individualised, the sister-in-law was distinguished from the wife by a special term based on the word "wife," and thenceforth addressed her brother-in-law by a corresponding term based on the word "husband."

A similar hypothesis with regard to the sister and female cousin, based on the theory of the consanguineous family, explains the Polynesian terminology for blood relations within the single generation. As regards the other terms of blood relationship, they are quite plainly simple divisions of generation from generation—a reflex of the law of generations which is the expression of consanguineous organisation.

The case for the consanguineous family, in so far as Polynesian consanguinity is concerned, could not possibly be stronger. At the same time, it seems remarkable that a comparatively advanced, though isolated, race like the Polynesian should be the only one to preserve this evidence.

The Polynesians as a race had outgrown the class system and the Punalua family, but had not developed the gens. What, then, was the basis of their social organisation?

Taking the Maori tribe as typical, we find it to be an association of persons, occupying a distinct territory, and, in general, speaking a slightly different dialect from those of other tribes; recognising a supreme chief (known as the Ariki) in time of war; and tracing descent from a common ancestor or ancestral group.

The tribe itself was subdivided into a number of more or less isolated communities, known as hapus. These occupied fortified villages in various parts of the tribal territory, and were self-supporting in the economic sense, though a hapu very often assisted another hapu by supplying necessities of life, as well as by providing military support. The kinship bond was closer between individuals of the hapu than between individuals of the tribe.

The hapu itself consisted of a number of groups known by the name of "Whanau"—a word meaning "to give birth," and often translated "family." The whanau, however, was not an individual family such as the modern unit of society. It was a group of brothers, possibly including cousins, together with their respective wives and children. Each of these had his own house, and his own wife or wives; but from the

point of view of the hapu, the children of any of them were children of the whanau.

All the evidence is against the idea that the wives of brothers were held in common, or that a man had any rights over his brother's wife during the lifetime of his brother; but the children of such brothers were, in a sense, held in common, and every man had definite responsibilities and authority with regard to the children of his brother. This system is not Punalua marriage in Morgan's sense, but its origin in Punalua marriage is unmistakable.

Next to the parents, the father's brothers and the mother's sisters were the guardians of the child. The former were within the whanau; the latter belonged to the other whanau. Next to them, the father's sisters, who belonged to the whanau by birth, but to the whanau of their respective husbands by adoption; and the mother's brothers, who belonged to another whanau, had similar rights and duties. The four sets of individuals, therefore, related by blood to the parents, were all guardians of the child, and it is in this sense that the word "matua" is used.

As compared with the gens, the whanau has important similarities as well as differences.

It is, in the first place, a kinship organisation, which again fits into the tribe. In the one case we get gens phratry, and tribe; in the second, whanau, hapu, and tribe, the basis of all being kinship, or brotherhood on an ever-widening scale.

The essential difference between the American gens and the Polynesian whanau is the line of descent, which is maternal in the one case, and paternal in the other. This seems to link the whanau with the gens of the old world, which, at least in historic times, traced descent in the male line. But according to Morgan and Engels, this difference between the American and the Old-world organisation was brought about by private property, at a much higher stage of development than the Polynesians had reached. If the maternal gens shows the typical line of development, then in this respect the Polynesians are not typical, and paternal descent must have been brought in for other reasons than those stressed by Morgan. In its results, this difference produces many dissimilarities. In the American society, the authority of the father over the child is slight, and that of his relatives practically nil, as all of these individuals are outside the gens. In Polynesian society, the father and his brothers within the whanau have a much greater authority; his sisters, who are adopted into other families upon marriage, have a secondary claim; while the mother's sisters, who may or may not have been adopted into the whanau, rank along with the father's brothers, and her brothers, in a different whanau, have their own special rights and responsibilities. The whanau, then, can never have been such a distinct unit as the gens, which permitted no authority outside its own membership.

The idea that in Maori society the child be-

is the unions failed to give the Council any basis of real existence. Its officers were controlled for the greater part of their energies, by other bodies, and were without funds or influence (?). The Council became a name rather than an entity. If it failed in the Pacific matter, Davies, which is absurd. My own personal view is that the average industrial union lacked the leadership when delegates at All Australia Conference became reactionary Action was a failure because the leaders on which it stood—namely, vigorous backing by the constituent unions in Sydney cuts the heart out of Australian-wide policies. No plan demanding Commonwealth unity can succeed while Sydney remains a running sore and a propaganda factory for the anti-Labor press to stampede the workers in other States (11). As to the Pacific, it will become a cockpit of great imperialist conflicts if Australian industrial leaders do not speedily fashion a Commonwealth industrial authority whose decisions will be respected, and whose leadership will be such as to rally the masses to the Council at the end of the first year, and stand on it. The marks of exclamation, etc., are not Curtie's.

longed to the mother more closely than it belonged to the father is often based upon a single sentence from Maning's "Old New Zealand," the context of which does not support the claim. What Maning stated was, that in the event of accident to a child, the father was liable to be raided by the relatives of its mother—which of course was more likely than that he should be raided by his own relatives.

As regards exogamy, the rules of marriage restriction were individual rather than collective, and differed greatly from place to place and even from time to time. There appears to be sufficient evidence that the marriage of cousins was disapproved of, if not prohibited within certain degrees, and this would render the whanau practically exogamous.

Of totemism—the superstitious reverence of a particular group for a particular animal, plant, or natural object—there is hardly a trace. The various whanau, hapu, and iwi (tribes) were generally called after their ancestral founders, or nicknamed from some incident in connection with these. The disappearance of the weird mysticism in which social groupings are veiled in earlier stages shows, in this case, a clear understanding of paternity and the functions of social organisation. Polynesian mysticism is worthy of a special study, as it comes between the misunderstanding of procreation, characteristic of savagery, and the misunderstanding of ethics characteristic of civilisation.

The whanau was too small a unit to have a council worthy of the name, though undoubtedly the adult members often met in conference and discussed family affairs. In these matters it is certain that the women had as much say as the men, but the foremost person

in authority was always the eldest of the group of brothers, and when he was dead this authority passed to his eldest son. Here, in the distinction between the elder and younger of two brothers or sisters—tuakana and teina—we find the beginnings of hereditary rule and primogeniture. They spring naturally from society wherever descent is traced in the male line, and where there are important social functions capable of being transmitted, and carrying with them special rights and privileges.

Property is not the only source of social inequality; property itself is a consolidation of multifarious claims, made by the individual upon society, and finally culminating in the claim of exclusive possession of material things. With regard to these latter, the Polynesians were as communistic as the Iroquois, or more so, but in matters of authority and rule they were far more advanced towards the institutions of civilisation, and the primitive democracy so aptly described by Morgan in the case of the Iroquois, showed already in the Polynesians many of the initial stages of aristocracy.

Hence, in the hapu, which was only an expanded whanau, we find one or more individuals claiming, as eldest sons of eldest sons, the rank of "rangatira"; and in the tribe, which is an expanded hapu, instead of the elected war-chief we find the hereditary "ariki."

Along with this, there is a very real democracy, based upon group councils, which decides all matters affecting the welfare of the tribe and its members, except the actual conducting of military defence and aggression, which was entirely in the hands of the ariki and his supporting chiefs.

White Gods and Brown Men.

The Fate of Captain Cook.

Capitalist propaganda promotes hero-worship, and there is something fascinating in this story of an empire-builder who was actually worshipped by a primitive people but made the fatal mistake of being found out. When the workers of modern Europe learn the lesson which even the simple Hawaiians were able to grasp there will be a fall of more false gods.

Australia, being a young nation, is lacking in national heroes. The master-class loves to idolise its lackeys when they are dead, but even bourgeois ideology can hardly hold up the chain gang and the convict cell as objects of veneration. Our best families do not boast of having come over in the first fleet, but there is one national hero who is much honored in the land. He is our most ancient, for he it was who took possession in the name of the British crown. Bourgeois heroes, like wine, improve with age. The older they are and the less known about

them the better. Rome does not canonise its saints till they are long dead.

Of course, Captain Cook was a great sailor and made three very important voyages of discovery but having given him his due it remains to be said that he was no more than a restless arrogant, harsh, and stupid British naval commander. The myth that he met his death at the hands of cruel and treacherous savages who added cannibalism to their other moral depravities is a most pernicious one. The cannibal story is so obviously false that—to his credit—even Captain King, who wrote part of the third volume of Cook's Voyages, does not countenance it. He says distinctly that the natives showed horror of the suggestion. The Hawaiians were neither cannibalistic nor inhospitable. They were living in a state of barbarism, similar to that of the North American Indians when Columbus landed, and subsisted mainly on fish and taro root.

It has never been claimed that Cook discovered Australia, but it has been asserted—and falsely—that he discovered the Hawaiian Islands. There is abundant proof to the contrary. In the first place the ancient Hawaiians must have made voyages in their open canoes which would have appalled some of England's most intrepid navigators. Their traditions are very circumstantial and indicate that their ancestors migrated from a far distant land. They are a finely proportioned race of people and with their light brown skins and straight hair would pass as Italians or Spaniards. Long before Cook's advent the venturesome voyages had ceased and the group had become isolated. An inter-tribal feud was raging at the time of his arrival.

Hawaiian tradition indicates that in the thirteenth century "the white chief with the iron knife" was wrecked on the coast of the island of Maui. Three men and two women were saved by a chief who went out in his outrigger canoe through the surf. These were probably Japanese. The captain of the ship carried a long sword which became renowned throughout the islands as "the wonderful iron knife." Of course, it may be objected that tradition is not written history, but in this case the details of the story show its genuineness. In the first place we have accounts of the wonderful contrast between the knife and the crude native weapons of wood and stone and we have the further statement that "nothing was taboo to the strangers." Such details could not emanate from the barbarian imagination alone. But with regard to the arrival of a man and woman, who lived on the land of Hawaii and inter-married with the natives, tradition is supported by Spanish historical records. In October of the year 1527 three Spanish ships were fitted out by Cortez, the conqueror of Mexico. They sailed from Zacatula, Mexico, for the Moluccas. One only, under the command of Saavedra, reached its destination. A storm drove the squadron far north and two of the ships disappeared. In his "Brief History of the Hawaiian People" Alexander says—"It seems certain that a foreign vessel which was wrecked about this time on the Kona coast of Hawaii about this time on the Kona coast of Hawaii was one of Saavedra's missing ships." From this ship the white man and woman mentioned escaped.

However, the first definite historical record of a visit to the Hawaiian Islands by European ships is that of the Spaniard Juan Gaetano who, passing through the northern Pacific, who sighted the group in 1555 and marked it on his chart as "Los Majos." He noted their peculiar mountain formation (Islas de Mesa—or Table lands), named one island "The Unfortunate" and three others "The Monks." It is believed that he passed on without entering into contact with the natives as he saw no signs of gold and silver, which were the objects of the Spaniards.

I do not suggest that Cook ever claimed to have discovered the islands, but considering that Gaetano's voyage antedated his own by

over 200 years it is very foolish to put forward that claim for him. In 1743 Lord Anson captured a Spanish ship from Mexico near the Philippines and found on it a copy of Gaetano's chart. On the return of Lord Anson to England this chart was published with an account of his voyage and Cook must have surely known of it.

Cook sighted the islands in January, 1778, while on a voyage in the northern Pacific. He proceeded northwards and returned in November of the same year. Sailing along part of the coast of the islands of Maui and Hawaii, he traded with the natives and finally anchored in Kealakekani Bay, Hawaii. Great consternation was caused by his arrival and there is no doubt that the natives worshipped him and his crew as gods. To them he was the re-incarnation of the god Lono and there are detailed accounts of the procession to the temple where he was set up with every mark of superstitious awe. It will be remembered that Hawaii was a self-governing State till annexation by America in 1898 and in the first native history of the tragedy, which was printed in the Hawaiian language in New York, he is referred to all the way through as Lono. The ships were freely supplied with provisions; the sailors made free with the native women, introducing diseases which were at once broadcasted owing to the tribal family relations, and disputes soon arose, partly owing to the disgusting conduct of the sailors and partly owing to thefts from the ships. One thing which greatly incensed the natives was the stupid and wanton action of the commander in breaking down the temple fences and carrying away the wooden idols for fuel. The incident is thus described by John Ledyard, an American seaman and world traveller of repute who was with the fleet:—

"When Cook had ascended the Morai he once more offered the hatchets to the chiefs. It was a very unequal price if the honest chiefs would have accepted the bribe and Cook offered it only to evade the imputation of taking their property without payment. The chiefs again refused it. Cook then added another hatchet and, kindling with resentment, told them to take it or nothing. Kikiny, to whom the offer was made, turned pale and trembled as he stood but still refused. Cook thrust them into his garment that was folded round him and left him immediately to hasten the execution of his orders. As for Kikiny, he turned to some of his menials and made them take the hatchets out of his garments, not touching them himself. By this time a considerable concourse of the natives had assembled, under the walls of the Morai where we were throwing the wood down, and were very outrageous and even threw the wood and images back when we threw them down, and went to greater lengths. We prevented them proceeding to greater lengths. However, it so happened that we got the whole into the boats and safely on board."

The editor of Ledyard's writings adds the following comment:—

"This story is told differently by Captain

King who wrote that part of Cook's third voyage which relates to the Sandwich Islands. As he represents it, no objection was made to the proposal for taking away the enclosure of wood that surrounded the Morai and even the images were tumbled down and carried off under the eyes of the priests without any resistance or disapproval on their part. This would seem improbable. The Morai was the depository of the dead, the place where the images of the gods were kept and solemn ceremonies performed."

In passing, it may be noted that King was not ashore when Cook was killed, but Ledyard was and took part in the battle. The fleet sailed away on February 4 but were compelled by a storm to return and re-anchored in the bay, February 11, 1779. This time the reception was hostile. Ledyard says:—

"Our return to the bay was as disagreeable to us as it was to the inhabitants, for we were reciprocally tired of each other. They had been oppressed and were weary of our prostituted alliance and we were aggrieved by the consideration of wanting the provisions and refreshments of the country which we had every reason to suppose would now be withheld from us. . . . When we entered the bay, where before we had the shouts of thousands to welcome our arrival, we had the mortification not to see a single canoe and hardly any inhabitants in the towns. Captain Cook was chagrined and his people were soured."

Soon after a boat was stolen by the natives and Cook went ashore to arrest one of the chiefs with the intention of holding him hostage till the boat was returned. The natives gathered in force and resisted the intended arrest. A scuffle followed and the natives, either through courage or through ignorance of the deadly nature of firearms, stood firm against the volleys and by sheer weight of numbers overpowered the white men and killed Cook and four seamen. Here is the quaint narrative of a native chief from W. D. Westervelt's "Hawaiian Historical Legends":—

"Then that chief struck Lono with his spear and knocked him down on the lava beach. Lono cried out because of the hurt. The chief thought: 'This is a man and not a god and there is no wrong'. So he killed Lono."

The body was carried off and cut up for distribution among the chiefs as an object of worship. Later some of the bones and flesh were recovered by the British and committed to the deep

I cannot do better than close this narrative with an account of an incident connected with the visit of a great Australian imperialist to Honolulu. Sir Joseph Carruthers lectured in that city on the greatness of Captain Cook, and his reception was distinctly chilling. This

rattled Sir Joseph and he set out to vindicate his hero. He delved into historical records and, after returning from a visit to the scene of the tragedy, made another speech, of which (see signed article in "Daily Telegraph," October 4, 1924) he says:—

"My remarks were greeted with the utmost enthusiasm, which was renewed when Mr. Westervelt, a leading citizen of Honolulu, rose and said that he believed every word I said."

Knowing that Mr. Westervelt is something more than a leading Honolulu citizen—that he is, in fact, the chief living authority on Hawaiian history—I wrote to him enclosing Sir Joseph's article and his reply speaks for itself. Here it is:—

"Honolulu, Hawaii, November 5, 1924.—My Dear Mr. Healy,—Your recent letter from Australia has been received and read with great interest. I thank you for calling my attention to the statements made by Sir Joseph Carruthers. If he meant that I publicly endorsed his historical statements concerning Captain Cook he has made a great mistake. There were two things in which I agreed with Sir Joseph Carruthers. The first was in regard to his statement that Captain Cook was a great man and had accomplished a fine world's work in his voyages, and the second was the endorsement of his proposition that a wreath should be placed on Captain Cook's monument. There was no endorsement whatever of any statement freeing Captain Cook, or his people, from any blame for whatever wrongs they did while residing in these islands—Yours truly, W. D. Westervelt"—D. Healy.

The Communist

Monthly Journal of the Communist Party of Australia

(Section of the Communist International)

Editor - - - - - G. Baracchi.

Business Manager - W. S. Stone.

Postal Subscription Rates: Yearly 4/., Half-yearly 2/.

Make all Money Orders and Postal Notes payable: Haymarket Post Office, Sydney. Address all Literary Matter to the Editor, and all Business Communications to the Business Manager, at 395 Sussex Street, Sydney.

A Red Mark across this space means that your subscription expires this issue.

THE COMMUNIST

A JOURNAL FOR THE THEORY AND PRACTICE OF MARXISM

No. 10

NOVEMBER—DECEMBER 1925

3d.

CONTENTS

The Collapse of Capitalism (I)	By V. I. Lenin
Transitional Demands	By G. Winter
Polynesian Society	By H. Ross
The Last Phase of Arbitration	By W. P. Earsman
The British Coal Crisis	Book Review
Questions and Discussion	



THE SEDITIONISTS



"The population of London would lynch the Government on the lamp-posts."—Lord Birkenhead: 1914.

EDITOR'S NOTES.

The release from Garden Island of Walsh and Johnson marks the period in that phase of the Class Struggle in Australia, which commenced with the strike of British Seamen against the encroachments of the Incheape Combine.

The deportation court investigations, carried on by a hand-picked commission of the Federal Government, followed by the General Elections, occupied the centre of the stage to the detriment of the maritime struggle. The continued statements opposing industrial action emanating from the principal actors in the deportation and electoral arenas necessarily had a weakening effect upon the men on strike, and upon the support accorded them by the organised workers throughout the country.

The return of the Bruce Government, with a practical mandate against the militant workers completed the breaking down process upon the morale of the striking seamen.

The arrest and imprisonment of Walsh and Johnson enabled the Shipping Combine to bring their rebellious slaves to heel.

The bidding of the Incheape Combine having been successfully carried out, it became incumbent upon the custodians of the Constitution to restore the faith of the toiling masses in that much-twisted fabric.

The impartial character of British Justice must again be displayed to a befuddled and befuddled people.

The Deportation Act of the Federal Government is challenged successfully. By the unanimous finding of the High Court, Walsh and Johnson are ordered released from custody.

Because the needs of Imperialist interests do not, at this time, require the carrying out of the deportation order.

It must be borne in mind, however, that the Deportation Act is not a dead letter. The Party which framed it has been returned to power stronger than before. They are supported in any move directed against the militant workers by the anti-working class activities of the Labor Governments.

It is therefore incumbent upon the members of the trade union movement that greater attention be paid to the co-ordinating and strengthening of the activities of their organisations, to the end that a determined resistance may be displayed against the repressive activities of the representatives of Capital, whether in the form of the Nationalist or so-called Labor Governments.

The action of the Lang administration in prohibiting the sale of working class literature in the Domain marks a further step in its decline from a Labor Party Executive to that of a supine tool of Capitalist interests. The gulf dividing the Labor Cabinet from the workers who support it becomes wider and wider.

A re-orientation becomes necessary. This can only be accomplished by the industrial bodies forming its base discarding the present opportunists who mislead the Labor Party and themselves reforming it upon the basis of the Class Struggle.

With this issue Comrade Baracchi severs his connection with "The Communist"

All editorial work in connection with this issue, excepting the editorial page, has been performed by him.

J. NELSON.

THE ICONOCLASTS.

Now this is the word of the heathen brown
And he speaketh wise and well;
When you sing of the great white god you sent
Go chant his praises in hell.

Yes, he is a nation's idol now
And we are but niggers brown,
But above your shout the truth will out
And you cannot hold it down.

We were a simple island folk
When there came from a land afar
Ships that spoke with fire and flame
And iron tongues of war.

Long had we heard of a great white chief
To lead the Hawaiian race,
And we trembled now as it seemed to us
We had met him face to face.

We led him to the temple gates;
We trembled where he trod;
We shared our food with his hungry crews
And worshipped our newfound god.

For men are white and men are brown
But ever the cunning ruler;
And wise was he who said of us
That men are mostly fools.

How did those heroes play their part?
Well, we were but niggers brown—
And like all false gods set up by fools
They promptly took us down.

They levied our food and they stole our wives;
They rioted in the land,
While their leader never taught restraint
Or lifted a checking hand.

So it chanced one day that our blood ran red,
That was a fateful hour—
Loss or boss whom the people doubt,
Woe to your tottering power.

Down on the sand their leader fell
And his face was livid white.
'Look at your god!' a warrior cried,
A god that bellows in fright.

So we slew that god and we chased his crew.
We were iconoclasts,
And men shall sing of our blasphemy
As long as Hawaii lasts.

So this is the song of the heathen brown
And the factory slave as well;
For a lying joss and a swindling boss,
Go chant their praises in hell.

—D.H.

THE COLLAPSE OF CAPITALISM.

By Matade.

I

Having shown the classes which capitalist development called forth, they next showed the relationship of these classes to each other; and in doing this they explained the basis of capitalist society, i.e., the exploitation of the workers by the capitalists. The sole object of the capitalists in society is the accumulation of this surplus wrung from the exploited workers. Their slogan is "production for accumulation's sake."

In order that an ever greater accumulation of this surplus-value might be achieved by the capitalists they were continually improving the means of production, along with which went the improvements in technique, machinery, etc., which have marked the capitalist era. What greater tribute could be paid to capitalism for this achievement than the following from the Manifesto:—"The bourgeoisie, during its reign of scarce one hundred years, has created more massive and more colossal productive forces than have all preceding generations together. Subjection of nature's forces to man, machinery, application of chemistry to industry and agriculture, steam navigation, railways, electric culture, steam navigation, railways for telegraphs, clearing of whole continents for cultivation, canalisation of rivers, whole populations conjured out of the ground—what earlier century had ever a presentiment that such productive forces slumbered in the lap of social Labor?"

The Manifesto, however, did not stop here. It traced the increase in the productive forces of society and predicted the results which would accrue from the further development of capitalist production. "Modern bourgeois society," says the Manifesto, "with its relations of production, of exchange and of property, a society that has conjured up such gigantic means of production and exchange, is like the sorcerer, who is no longer able to control the powers of the nether world whom he has called up by his

The apologists of the capitalist system are repeatedly telling the world that the rotten state of affairs which exists to-day is not the result of capitalist development. All this misery, starvation and degradation which has been prevalent for the last few years, they say, has been brought about by an accident—the last war; and, so effective has this propaganda been, that this erroneous viewpoint has been unquestioningly accepted upon all sides.

The Communists entirely disagree with this clap-trap of the master class, and, in so doing, wish to point out that the first Manifesto of the Communist Party (written by Marx and Engels nearly eighty years ago) already explained that the present stage in capitalist development was inevitable.

The economic analysis of the capitalist system which was laid down in the Manifesto is, at bottom, as correct to-day as ever. Starting with an explanation of the class struggle—the basic and motive force of the whole course of social evolution—they next turned their attention to the death of Feudalism and the rise of Capitalism, explaining that "the bourgeoisie, historically, had played a most revolutionary part."

Along with the death of Feudalism and the rise of Capitalism there developed the modern working class—the proletarians—who have no other way of procuring their livelihood than by the sale of their laboring energy. This, they pointed out, had simplified the class struggle. In Ancient Rome there existed four distinct classes, in the Middle Ages, six, and in almost all of these classes, again, subordinate gradations. In contrast with this, in the bourgeois epoch, society was divided into two more splitting up into two hostile camps, into two great classes directly facing each other: Bourgeoisie and Proletarians.

spells. For many a decade past the history of industry and commerce is but the history of the revolt of modern productive forces against modern conditions of production, against the property relations that are the conditions for the existence of the bourgeoisie and of its rule. It is enough to mention the commercial crises that by their periodical return put on its trial, each time more threateningly, the existence of the entire bourgeois society. In these crises a great part not only of the existing products, but also of the previously created productive forces, are periodically destroyed. In these crises there breaks out an epidemic that, in all earlier epochs, would have seemed an absurdity—the epidemic of overproduction. Society suddenly finds itself put back into a state of momentary barbarism; it appears as if a famine, a universal war of devastation had cut off the supply of every means of subsistence; industry and commerce seem to be destroyed; and why? Because there is too much civilisation, too much means of subsistence, too much industry, too much commerce. The productive forces at the disposal of society no longer tend to further the conditions of bourgeois property; on the contrary, they have become too powerful for these conditions, by which they are fettered, and as soon as they overcome these fetters, they bring disorder into the whole of bourgeois society, endanger the existence of bourgeois property. The conditions of bourgeois society are too narrow to comprise the wealth created by them." Crises break out. In the early stages of capitalist development their occurrence was sporadic and accidental; then their occurrence became more frequent, about every five years. After that the lengths of time separating the periods of stagnation from one another were about ten years. Finally the stage was reached where every succeeding winter brought up afresh the great question "what to do with the unemployed?" By 1900 capitalism had reached complete stagnation, because, since that date capitalism's development has been marked by one prolonged crisis.

The intellectual babblers of the master-class tried to disprove the economic theories of Marx and Engels, but latter-day facts prove that Marx' and Engels' analysis of earlier capitalist development was correct, and because of this fact they were able to foretell what course capitalism would take in the progress of its further development.

Having laid bare the cause of crises they asked: "How does the bourgeoisie get over these crises?" Their answer to this question forecasts a stage in capitalist development where crises would be replaced by the stage which has existed since 1900, i.e., one long period of depression. They replied: "On the one hand by enforced destruction of a mass of productive forces; on the other, by the conquest of new markets, and by the more thorough exploitation of the old ones. That is to say, by paving the way for more extensive and more destructive crises, and by diminishing the means whereby crises are prevented."

Let us probe this matter a little deeper. We will start with the means of "getting over" crises last referred to in the above answer, i.e., "the more thorough exploitation of the old markets."

This further exploitation of the old markets led to the growth of monopolies in industry and finance. 1860-70 saw their inception—but only in a small way. After 1873 they began to develop rapidly, but even then they were exceptional phenomena, not established institutions. Since 1900 they have become the very foundation of all economic life. Thousands of isolated firms were smashed and driven out of business; others amalgamated; some were paid to cease producing; any and all means were used to further this monopolisation of industry until a few powerful concerns succeeded in gaining control over the production, etc., within the old markets." The banks played an important role in this justification of industry, because the centralisation of banking into a few institutions reduced the number of establishments to which a business may turn to obtain credit. This made large business more and more dependent upon a small number of powerful banks; and, through the financial oligarchy which was erected, the development was headed directly for monopoly.

These powerful trusts and combines carried on their "more thorough" exploitation of the "old markets" until everything worth while controlling was under the control of a few monopolist concerns.

The other method, "the conquest of new markets," has led to Imperialism. Let us trace this development.

When the mercantilists of the free trade era were playing the predominant role in society the colonies were considered "millstones around industry and finance, however, altered all this, for with the rise of monopoly the fear arose that colonies "would be fruit which would only cling till they ripened."

It has been shown that monopoly began to develop from 1860/70 onwards, and that, by the listed fact. When we come to an established "conquest of new markets" which, in reality, was the division of the earth amongst the world's powers, we will show that whilst industrialisation and finance were in the process of centralisation the keen struggle for territory was at its highest peak.

When the monopolist stage of development was reached the cry for work (always increasing in volume and intensity with every crisis) gave the bosses considerable preoccupation. Conditions had changed! The credit facilities of the big monopolist banks, allied to, and sources necessary for putting all to work. But! They were confronted with another problem. Their sole object in society was to augment their capital. All that interested them was the further exploitation of the working class. After justification had been attained,

the great question which confronted the monopolists (when crises broke out) was not the putting of the workers to work, but—where can the goods which these workers will produce if put to work be disposed of at a profit to us? That was the question which troubled the monopolists, and Cecil Rhodes, the financial magnate who, along with Joseph Chamberlain, laid down England's imperialistic policy, replied to this question in the following manner: "I was yesterday in the East End of London and witnessed a meeting of the unemployed. After listening to all the wild talk and cries for bread, bread, I went home and reflected upon what I had seen and heard, and came to the conclusion that imperialism was more imperative than ever.... Here is my solution for the problem: If we are to save the forty million inhabitants of the United Kingdom from a murderous civil war, we, the colonists must secure new territory to be occupied by the growing population where we can find markets for our goods manufactured in our mills and factories. It is all a question of food supply. If you do not want a civil war you must become imperialistic."

This scramble for territory was at its highest peak about the time the monopolists were coming to power. It was between the years 1860 and 1880, and, significantly enough, in the last twenty years of the nineteenth century England entered her greatest period of colonial conquest, while France and Germany secured most of their colonial possessions between 1880 and 1890. Thus the same period which marked the rise of trusts and monopolies, and therefore, of imperialism, is marked by a keener struggle for colonies. When free competition was especially flourishing in England, i.e., from 1840 to 1860, the bourgeois politicians who were in the saddle opposed any sort of colonial policy, and considered that it would be necessary for England to grant her colonies their independence, to let them secede entirely. After 1876 colonial empires grew by gigantic leaps and bounds. Here are, in condensed form, the figures arrived at by Morris in his book upon the "History of Colonisation":—

Years	ENGLAND.		FRANCE.		GERMANY.	
	Area. Millions of sq. miles.	Popu- lation. Millions.	Area. Millions of sq. miles.	Popu- lation. Millions.	Area. Millions of sq. miles.	Popu- lation. Millions.
1815-1830	7	126.4	0.02	0.5	—	—
1860	2.5	146.1	0.2	3.4	—	—
1880	7.7	267.9	0.7	7.5	—	—
1899	9.5	309.0	3.7	56.4	10	14.1

To bring this picture up to date Lenin compared the areas and populations of the mother land with those of the colonies in 1876 (the lands with which marks the end of the development of pre-monopolist capitalism) and with those of the colonies in 1914. Here are the figures:—

	Colonies 1876		Colonies 1914		Motherland 1914		Totals.
	Area. Pop.	Area. Pop.	Area. Pop.	Area. Pop.	Area. Pop.	Area. Pop.	
England	22.5	261.9	31.5	393.3	0.3	46.5	33.8 440.0
Russia	17.0	133.9	17.4	33.2	5.4	136.2	33.8 169.4
France	—	—	—	—	9.5	55.5	0.3 39.6 11.1 95.1
Germany	—	—	—	—	2.9	12.5	0.5 64.9 3.4 97.2

U. S. America	—	—	0.3	9.7	9.4	97.0	9.7 106.7
Japan	—	—	0.3	0.7	0.4	53.0	0.7 78.8
Totals	40.4	273.8	65.0	523.4	10.5	437.2	81.5 960.8
Colonies of Other Nations (Belgium, Holland, etc.)	—	—	—	—	—	9.3	45.3
Semi-Colonial Lands (Persia, China, Turkey)	—	—	—	—	—	15.5	361.2
Other Nations	—	—	—	—	—	28.8	289.0
Totals for Entire World	—	—	—	—	—	130.9	1657.0

In 1876 three powers had no colonies; and a third one, France, had hardly any. In 1914 those four powers had acquired a colonial empire of 14.1 million square kilometers, or approximately one and a-half times greater than the area of Europe, with a population of some 100 million souls. The colonial possessions, however, were unevenly divided. If we compare the colonies of France, Germany and Japan, three nations which did not differ greatly in area and population, we see that France acquired three times as much land as Germany and Japan put together. And in 1914 the total for England's colonies exceeded the combined totals for those of Germany, France, Japan, Russia and the United States of America put together in regard to area, and was three times greater than them in population.

The most noteworthy fact of the period in question is: by 1900 the division of the world was complete. All the unoccupied land on the planet had been taken possession of.

Some idea of the keenness of the struggle for "new markets" at the close of the nineteenth century can be seen from the following published in the "Nineteenth Century" magazine for the year 1899:—

"It seems that since 1850 we (i.e., England) have ourselves taken hold of nearly four million square miles of territory, mainly for the service of trade. To seek, and seize, and hold, and exclude is the chief pre-occupation of the surrounding nations. And now it has almost come to this, that for every mile of good unappropriated trade territory there is a claimant ready, and ready with his guns. New markets now have to be fought for. Nations that need them and would have them must go armed into diplomatic conflicts which, as we know by recent and very pointed experience, may turn in a moment to war outright."

The above clearly portrays that a fundamental change had occurred at the close of the nineteenth century. All the "seeking and seizing" of the unoccupied lands having been accomplished, the next development was the exclusion of the other nationals. This position was clearly demonstrated in the conflict between Russia and England over railways in Persia.

Russian ports, as everyone knows were important for a certain part of the year, thereby interfering with the free movement of her commerce to and from the outside world. One of her means of gaining an outlet for her commerce was a proposed railway from St. Petersburg via Tcheran in Persia to Chahbar on the coast of Persian Baluchistan.

England's policy of the exclusion of other nationals from the spheres over which she

dominated can best be explained by the speech of the then Viceroy of India—Lord Curzon:—
 "...such aggression (upon the part of Russia) could only be prosecuted in the teeth of international morality, in defiance of civilised opinion, and with the ultimate certainty of a war with this country (viz., England) that would ring from pole to pole."

Another Russian line was proposed from St. Petersburg to the Persian Gulf via Baku, in opposition to which the English diplomats gained a new agreement from the Persian Shah in 1860 "prohibiting all railways in Persia for ten years more"; and during the next ten years England's diplomats were given a promise that at the expiration of the "Ten Years' Agreement" no railways would be built in Persia without the consent of Great Britain.

Coupled with these Russian projects in Persia was the report of Mr. Bourne from China to Lord Salisbury in England to the effect that France was surveying a line into Hunan. It was feared, as a glance at the map will show, that with Kwangtung, Kwahgse, Hunan, Kwei Chaw, and Szechuan in their hands, the French would straddle the Yangtze and erect a barrier between British India and the Yangtze Valley. But at the same time, a still greater fear existed of France pushing on her sphere of influence in China till she and her ally—Russia—met. If this was accomplished England feared that Russia and France would then try to drive her out of India.

A significant fact at the time was the increase in naval and military activities. When the Russian scare at Herat broke out (just on top of Russia loaning two and a-half millions to the Persian Shah) Frederick Greenwood (at one time editor of the "Pall Mall Gazette," and later founder of "St. James' Gazette," a strong conservative paper, now "The Evening Standard and St. James' Gazette") wrote the following in the "Nineteenth Century," pp. 176-7, February, 1898:—"These Russian troops at Kushk on the Afghan frontier may be compared with the march of troops upon various points marked out as advantageous for giving battle. But that is not enough to say, 'There is a march of troops upon selected points of that character. ... Here in Persia we may see, almost as plainly as in the Crimea when war was declared, the preparations for a great Russian camp. Beyond, and less secretly active, the Russian advance goes on upon its two lines of route to

borders of our Indian Empire; its base assured, its depots and connecting roads and railways all but completed for the hour of attack.... there is nothing to distinguish this advance from the hostile march which Kitchener is making on Khartoum. Nothing but an illusion of space and time conceals the fact that it is as much an operation of war, in active progress, and all but finished."

On naval matters writers of that day were telling the people of England that Russia was building an extravagant number of cruisers which could only be used against England; and that the movement in Russia and France towards cruiser construction unquestionably revealed hostility to England.

When Kimberley was seized a fear existed in England that Russia and France would take advantage of England's hands being full with the South African war. It was feared that these two powers would make an attack upon India, China, Egypt and Morocco. The extent to which the impression had permeated thoughtful minds upon the subject can be seen from the following from the "London Economist," May 10, 1900: "The nations of Europe have, in fact, no interests involved in the (South African) matter, except their general interests in weakening Great Britain.... Russia and France no doubt would like to see Great Britain weakened.... Russia as the results of a successful war (against Great Britain) might acquire India or China, and France might obtain Egypt and Morocco, so completing a magnificent power on the Mediterranean."

However, a decisive step was taken by England in 1904, when Colonel Younghusband was sent to Tibet to force certain concessions from the Tibetans at the point of the bayonet. These concessions laid down that no foreign power could interest itself in any way in Tibet, permission to send a representative, even unofficially to Tibet, without the sanction of Great Britain, being prohibited. The purpose of this expedition was to prevent Russia from gaining any influence in Tibet and thereby paving the way for meeting the French sphere of influence in Szechuan.

In the midst of all this clashing of interests, and when war seemed possible at any moment, we witnessed these conflicting powers coming to an agreement. Why?

(To be continued.)

Lenin on Transitional Demands.

[The following extract from an article written by Lenin, October 1917, on the subject of the program debates which occurred in the Russian Communist Party at that time, has been translated by us from the German Communist journal "Die Internationale," where it

was subsequently republished. It constitutes a slap in the face administered by the strong hand of Lenin to all those "revolutionists" who will not hear of a revolutionary working-class party having anything to do with what we loosely term in English, "immediate demands."—Editor.]

...From the general part of the Program dealing with principles we pass to the Minimal Program. Here we at once come across the outwardly "very radical" and utterly inadequate proposal of Comrades N. Bucharin and V. Smirnov, to do away with the Minimal Program altogether. The division into a Maximal and a Minimal Program is said to be "obsolete," it is useless, for the question is one of the transition to Socialism. No Minimal Program whatever, but simply a Program of the transitional measures to Socialism.

This is the proposal of the two comrades mentioned, who, nevertheless, have not, for some reason, decided to submit a corresponding project (although the tasks and the agenda of the next Party Congress, which anticipate the revision of the Party Program, plainly placed these comrades under the obligation of framing such a project). It is possible that the authors of the apparently "radical" proposal have themselves become irresolute.... However that may be, their opinion must be tested.

In consequence of the war and the disorganisation of their economy, all countries are compelled to pass from monopolist capitalism to monopolist State capitalism. That is the objective position. But in a revolutionary situation in a revolution, monopolist State capitalism passes directly into Socialism. In a revolution it is impossible to go forward, without going to Socialism. That is the objective position which has been created by war and revolution. This our April Conference has established by advancing the slogans of the "Soviet Republic" (political form of the dictatorship of the proletariat) and the nationalisation of the banks and trusts (the basic measure of the transition to Socialism). Up to this point all Bolsheviks are in agreement with each other and of one mind. But Comrades N. Bucharin and V. Smirnov want to go further and throw away the Minimal Program altogether. That would mean to act contrary to the wise advice of the wise proverb which says:

"Boast not, when you go into battle, but boast when you come from it."

We are going into battle, that is, we are fighting for the conquest of political power by our Party. This power would be a dictatorship of the proletariat and the poor peasants. When we take over this power, we will not only be afraid to step out beyond the bounds of the bourgeois order, but, on the contrary, we clearly, straightforwardly, precisely and everywhere de-straightforwardly, beyond these bounds, declare that we will go out to Socialism, and that that we will go fearlessly thither through the Soviet our road leads even thither through the Soviet Republic, the nationalisation of the banks and trusts, workers' control, the general obligation to work, the nationalisation of the land, the confiscation of the inventory of the large landowners, etc., etc. In this sense we have given a program of the transitional measures to Socialism.

But we ought not to boast when we go into battle, we ought not to throw away the Minimal

Program, for that would be equivalent to the empty boast: "We will make no demands on the bourgeoisie, but will realise them ourselves, we will perform no petty work within the frame of the bourgeois order."

That would be an empty boast, for it is first necessary to conquer power, and we have not yet conquered it. It is first necessary by deeds to realise the transitional measures to Socialism, to carry our Revolution on to the victory of the international Socialist revolution, and then, "when we come from the battle," the Minimal Program can and should be thrown away as unnecessary.

Can we at present guarantee that it is no longer necessary? This is certainly impossible, for the simple reason that we have not yet conquered power, have not put through Socialism, and have not yet witnessed even the beginning of the Socialist world revolution.

We must go firmly, boldly and without vacillation to this end, but it is ridiculous to declare it reached, when, as everybody knows, it is not reached. The throwing away of the Minimal Program is equivalent to the declaration, the proclamation (more simply said, the boast) "that we have already conquered."

No, worthy comrades, we have not yet conquered.

We do not know whether we will conquer tomorrow or somewhat later. (I am personally inclined to the opinion that it will be the case to-morrow—I write that on October 6 [October 19, by our reckoning—Editor], 1917—and that we can be too late with the taking over of power, but to-morrow is still to-morrow and not to-day.) We do not know how quickly after our victory the revolution will come in the West. We do not know whether after our victory there will still be temporary periods of reaction and victory of the counter-revolution; there is nothing impossible in that, and therefore we will, when we have conquered, construct a "triple line of trenches" against such a possibility.

All this we do not know and cannot know. No one can know this. And therefore it is ridiculous to throw away the Minimal Program, which is necessary so long as we still live within the frame of the bourgeois order, so long as we have not destroyed this frame, have not laid the foundations for the transition to the Socialism, have not beaten the enemy (the bourgeoisie), and when it is beaten, have not annihilated it. All this will come, and will come, perhaps, much quicker than seems likely to many (personally, I believe that it will begin to-morrow), but it is not yet here.

Let us take the Minimal Program in the political sphere. Its calculations are based on the bourgeois republic. We add thereto that we do not confine ourselves to the bounds of the latter, but fight forthwith for the higher type of the Soviet Republic. Thus we must do. We must go for the new Republic with unlimited boldness and resolution, and I am certain that we will so go forward to it. But in no case must the Minimal Program be thrown

away, for, firstly, we have still no Soviet Republic; secondly, the possibility of "restoration attempts" is not excluded, they must first be experienced and overcome; thirdly, in the transition from the old to the new temporary "combined types" are possible (which the "Rab. Puti" rightly indicated some days ago), e.g., the Soviet Republic together with the Constituent Assembly. All this must have its day, and then it will be time enough to throw away the Minimal Program.

The case is the same in the economic sphere. We are all agreed that the fear of going forward to Socialism is the greatest baseness and treason to the cause of the proletariat. We are all agreed that the fundamental first steps in this direction must be such measures as the nationalisation of the banks and trusts. Let us first put into practice these and similar measures, and then we shall see. Then we shall see better, for the practical experience will immeasurably widen our field of vision, the practical experience which is a million times more

valuable than the best program. It is possible and even probable and even indubitable that here too the transition will not be made without "combined types"; e.g., we cannot at once either nationalise the small concerns with one or two wage-workers, or place them under a real workers' control. Their role may be small to the vanishing point; through the nationalisation of the banks and trusts they may be tied hand and foot; all that is true; but wherefore throw away the Minimal Program so long as vestiges, however slight, of bourgeois relations still remain? As Marxists, who go boldly into the world's greatest revolution and at the same time soberly estimate the facts, we have no right to throw away the Minimal Program.

If we should now throw it away, we should thereby have proved that we had already lost our head, before we could conquer. But we dare not lose it, either before the victory, or during the victory, or after the victory, for if we lose our head, we lose everything....

POLYNESIAN SOCIETY

In Comparison With America.

According to Morgan, the Polynesians, having reached the second stage of savagery, lived under group marriage, and had not discovered the gens. The correct view is, that they had reached the first stage of barbarism, lived under syndiasmian marriage, and had left the primitive gentile form far behind. It is true that they had not the gens in its American form, and we must enquire the reason for this, pointing out the relation between this form and that which most nearly corresponds to it among the Polynesians.

The gens is fundamentally a group of women, looking upon themselves as sisters, with their gentile brothers and the children of the female element. In its first stages, the rights of the husbands of these women were not individual rights, and could be terminated at any time. We may even look upon the husbands as wandering hunters, who remained with the gens only as long as they were welcome and brought in a plentiful supply of game. In the course of time marriages became far more exclusive and permanent, but the husband never became a member of the gens into which he married. His relation to his own children was considered more remote than that of their mother's brothers. To the latter, rather than to their fathers, the children looked for authority and protection, and no property rights or rights of social position could pass from father to son.

The Maori "whanau," on the other hand, is essentially a group of brothers, with their own sisters and their own children. Their wives, though adopted, as it were, into the "whanau," do not attain full rights of membership, but retain to some extent the rights of the several

whanau from which they came. Hence it was quite common for a man to take up residence with his wife's family, even when she belonged to a different tribe.

In the first stages of the whanau, the rights of the men were communal. This is the "punalua marriage" of Morgan's theory, traces of which were found in Hawaii. Though communism of wives was almost unknown in Polynesia, the form of the whanau itself shows that it must have existed in the past.

The children of the whanau were, in a sense, held in common by the adults. They yielded obedience to the brothers of their fathers, as well as to the individual fathers themselves, and the eldest brother of the group had more authority over them than the father himself. Similarly they looked upon their mother's sisters as very close relations, and in many cases, such sisters were the wives, if not of the father, then of some of his individual brothers.

The mother's brothers had a more remote claim, being outside the whanau altogether, though they might take it upon themselves to raid the father, where any calamity befell the child. The father's sisters, having left the whanau when they married, had a still more remote claim.

The similarities of gens and whanau are more important than the differences. In both, will of the parties is individual, but terminable at the will of the parties. In both, the parents have some claim upon the children, but by no means an exclusive claim. The child has, in fact, a large group of natural guardians, including the father and mother, and in varying degrees, their brothers, sisters, and other relatives.

The essential point seized upon by Engels, that before private property, exclusive rights and responsibilities of parents were unknown, is exemplified in both types of social organisation. Looking upon "marriage" as a social institution for the protection of women and children, both forms might even be called by the name of "group marriage," in spite of individual rights of cohabitation.

Considering now the differences between the two forms, we find that these spring from the fact that in the American form the gens centres around a group of women, and in the Polynesian form it centres around a group of men. In other words, the latter, like the gens of the ancient Greek and Roman tribes, has descent in the male line.

Morgan concluded from the facts at his disposal that after the domestication of the animals and the cultivation of food plants on a large scale, in Europe, the line of descent had been changed from the female to the male side. Many things point to that conclusion—for instance, the close relation of a man to his sister's son, pointed out by Engels among the Teutons. Such a development may have been common to the great mass of European and Asiatic peoples, but the single example of the Polynesians shows that it was not universal.

In all parts of Polynesia descent was traced in the male line, and social organisation framed accordingly, though the natives had not reached the stage of development at which Morgan supposed the change in the line of descent to have taken place.

This is no contradiction of Morgan's theory. In Australia and Melanesia there are many tribes which trace descent in the male line, but their social organisation is such that this makes little difference. When it comes to a range of rights and duties on a much higher scale, the line of descent will be determined according to the methods of subsistence, being according to the male or the female side according to whether males, or females, form the more stable element in society.

Where the males must travel long distances in pursuit of game, leaving their wives and children and household goods behind them, the women form the more stable element, and the family organisation centres around a group of women.

Where the life of the tribe is settled, where fishing and horticulture are the principal arts of subsistence; where war is frequent, and migration means ocean transport of the men, women, and children together, the family organisation centres around a group of men.

The latter mode of life is not typical of the mass of humanity, which lived on continents and passed through ages of time in the hunting and gathering stage. At no stage of their prehistory did our ancestors live under similar conditions to those of the Polynesians. The American Indians and the cattle-rearing stage of the Europeans then lies a gap in our definite knowledge, and upon this gap a study of the Polynesians may throw light.

The Polynesians were below the Mexicans and Peruvians in development; but the little we know of the so-called civilisations of these latter—so ruthlessly destroyed by Christian Europeans—tells us practically nothing of the origins of private property or hereditary rule. The Polynesians, however, who are classed by Professor Jenks as having patriarchal institutions, are in this respect higher than the Americans, while in respect of private property they are lower than the ancient Europeans.

Patriarchal government is a higher form than the primitive democracy which Morgan revealed among the Iroquois, however nearly the latter may have approached to ideal freedom. Patriarchalism is the foundation of aristocracy, and aristocracy, with brief and local exceptions, was the principle of government from the birth of civilisation to the death of feudalism.

The equality of the individual members of the gens, as Morgan points out, reflected itself in the liberty and fraternity of the Iroquois Confederacy of tribes. The same principle applies, in lesser degree, to the whanau and the Maori tribe. In the first place, the whanau, as a group of brothers, the eldest nearly always assumes authority. In the second place, the constant practice of warfare often require the for the exigencies of an individual, and the unruly obedience of his followers: The questioning of war among the Polynesians, and frequency of war among the Maoris, brought about especially among the Maoris, a more autocratic system of government than that of the American Indians; and the rule of descent in the male line determined its hereditary form.

Unlike the American Indians, who traced descent in the female line, the Polynesians looked upon rank and privilege as capable of passing from father to son. The group of brothers, from father to son, were all approximately equal, were all "tauhou" approximately equal, were all "tauhou" equal, and the eldest was "taukana" to each other, but the eldest was "taukana" to them all, and therefore highest in rank. Moreover, the rank passed on to his children, in varying degree according to their age. The children of the group were "taukana" and "teina" to each other, whether they were brothers or cousins; but whereas among brothers these titles were based upon their own respective ages, among cousins they were based upon the ages of their respective fathers. The eldest son of an eldest son was therefore "taukana" to all his male cousins, and on the death of his father took the highest rank in the whanau.

With the passing of generations, the whanau, or family group, became a "hapu," or village community, and the head man, or "rangatira" of the hapu was the direct lineal descendant of its founder, through a succession of eldest sons. He was, in fact, "taukana" to all the men of his own generation within the hapu.

Similarly, when the hapu expanded into an "iwi," or tribe, its grand chief, or "Ariki," could trace his descent through a long line of eldest sons to the tribal ancestor, whose name the sons to the tribal ancestor, whose name the tribe commonly bore. In all this there is no

trace of Gotemism, or suggestion of animal descent, such as we find among the Australians, because the laws of procreation were well known and individual marriage well regulated.

Along with this hereditary principle, which resembles that of present day monarchy, goes a system of public meetings and councils, in which the women participate, and a high regard for individual liberty and dignity, resembling the primitive democracy of the Iroquois far more than the autocracy or oligarchy which is generally associated with hereditary rule. As

among the Iroquois, the head man of the tribe was only a war-chief, and had little authority over the arts of peace. The voice of the people determined the question of peace and war, and the chief himself, in spite of his rank, could be deposed by the people. Here, then, we see only the beginnings of hereditary autocracy; and we see them in war. From this we gather that long-continued war always means the death of liberty and democracy. In a state of war, national or civil, dictatorship is an absolute necessity.—G. Winter.

The Last Phase of Arbitration.

Hamstringing the Australian Workers.

On surveying the early industrial history of Australia, one is struck by the contrast between the semi-peaceful period that now exists and the latter half of the last century, when the class struggle raged with great fury in every corner of the continent.

But the class struggle has by no means diminished, on the contrary, it has greatly intensified, in keeping with the development of industry. Mighty unemployed armies throng the industrial centres of the big cities, or carry their bags along the roads outback in hopes of finding a master. But a pacifist policy is the dominating tendency throughout the ranks of the working class.

None but a bourgeois knave would suggest that the prevailing apathy was due to a more equitable distribution of wealth among all classes, for statistics show the concentration of wealth into fewer hands going on apace concurrently with the general impoverishment of the workers.

How then can we explain the failure of the rank and file workers to respond to their miserable conditions without indicting the reactionary industrial and political mercenaries whose reformist practices of Arbitration and conciliation have sapped the vitality of the Australian workers and delivered them to the tender mercies of the master class?

"Australia's Awakening" (?)

The history of Australia from the miners' revolt at Eureka in 1854, down to the close of the century, was indeed marked by almost uninterrupted open clashes between the militant workers and the growing power of mine owners and pastoralists.

In his entertaining story of old times entitled "Australia's Awakening," W. G. Spence, union secretary and politician, tells of these innumerable conflicts, the fights for small wage increases, shorter hours and safety in mines, the bitter repressions, gaoling and beating up by police, and the display of military force

employed to subdue the famous maritime strike of '90.

Spence depicts these incidents in true journalistic style, and while describing the development of trades unionism, he supplies us with a key to the understanding of the part played by the trades union bureaucracy in spragging the militancy of the workers, thereby assisting to stabilise the power of the rising capitalist class.

A more appropriate title would have been "How We Lulled the Workers to Sleep."

Fightless Officials.

While recognising the valuable work done by the pioneers in the days of Trade Union infancy, one can't help noticing the changed tone of the stalwarts under the combined influence of the economic security of a paid position and the fear of the law.

Spence emphasises that his fellow officials were not the lawless persons they were painted; they did not wish to make unreasonable demands ate men who tried to impress upon the boss class that negotiations with them would be more profitable than strikes to both sides.

Right at the beginning of his official career, he dreamed of some method of settling disputes by peaceful means; some way whereby capital and Labor, meeting as equals, could thrash out difficulties to mutual satisfaction.

Yet we read in the above mentioned volume p. 53: "The Pastoralists' Union is without doubt the most bitterly unscrupulous organisation in the world, hence we find them carrying out the most complete system of boycott it is possible to conceive of."

These are the people with whom we should conciliate in conjunction with the Government, which is criticised as follows on p. 187:

"The Trade Unionists of Australia have received far worse treatment than those of the cruel and unjust, and judges have displayed a bias that can only be characterised as class hatred."

Freedom by Statute.

Many attempts were made to settle disputes by "agreements," but the master class generally wished to maintain their own weapons—scabs, police and military.

But the great maritime upheaval of 1890 gave a great impetus to the propaganda for peaceful settlement of disputes, and, after much legal meandering, Compulsory Arbitration was adopted by the Legislatures.

Spence hailed the new move with great satisfaction and maintained that much depended on the judge, who "must be well acquainted with economic questions and the ideas and aspirations of Labor...."

He instances the splendid pioneering work of Judge Backhouse, who visited New Zealand to report on similar Legislation, but he had evidently forgotten that on a previous page (184) this judge is reported to have sentenced Broken Hill Strike Leaders in 1892—two to 2 years, two to eighteen months, one to nine months and one to 3 months. This judge certainly understood the "aspirations of Labor" and the best means of subduing them.

The initial decisions of the Arbitration Court were acclaimed as a great victory for Labor; but when the machinery was properly established, a host of legal luminaries adapted themselves to the new conditions, and proceeded to weave a net around the trusting workers.

Trade union officials ceased to act as working class organisers, but blossomed forth as amateur lawyers whose time was master and his in basking in the presence of a crumb to appeal flunkys, and begging a crumb to appease their members, while maintaining a solid front against any rank and file attempt to overthrow arbitrationist limits.

A Weapon of Coercion.

And to-day we look on the handiwork of the pioneers and stalwarts of the past, and, instead of an instrument of peaceful negotiations, we see a monster of coercion, holding in its power the mass of the working class even more completely than did the Inquisition of old.

The Masters and Servants' Act that has served the master class for centuries is now only used to intimidate miners and seamen; but only used to intimidate miners and seamen; but the Arbitration Court enables armies of workers to be disciplined and driven back to work under vile conditions pending the decision of overpaid class-biased parasites.

The experiences of the Iron Trades Unions in the Federal Court recently did much to dispel the illusion many workers as to the efficacy of the Court, and to demonstrate its close relation to the capitalist class.

Australia will soon be faced with a period of depression caused by competition with the Dawes Plan slaves of Europe, the Arbitration machinery will be forced to show its time for with the master class, and it surely is time for all honest officials of the workers to unite in lining up the masses in opposition to this avowed weapon of the exploiters.

But Arbitration presents a splendid field for obtaining a livelihood for a host of impetuous industrial advocates and professional union officials who desire above all else to perpetuate "class struggle legalism."

At the present time when capitalism approaches its climax, when millions of European workers have been converted into coolies for the enrichment of the House of Morgan; when the international economic chaos is leading to another world war, the yellow traitors of the trade union bureaucracy cringe at the foot of the Arbitration Joss and traitorously divide the workers with the new weapon—L.

Arbitration Agreements.

A typical example of the operation of Arbitration in its last stage is provided by the Newcastle Ironworkers, whose objective for many years has been a Federal Award.

Recently the Engine Drivers on Walsh Island became involved in a strike, and the Ironworkers were called on to decide whether they would work with scabs.

The officials explained the penalties that would follow a stoppage of work; the Federal claims would be struck off the list and the union would be fined £200. Then the wavering rank and file were left to decide, and the result was, one more victory for Arbitration and the defeat of the Engine Drivers.

Then the Broken Hill Proprietary Company decided that the ironworkers employed at the Newcastle Steel Works should be isolated from the rest of their fellow members, and obliging officials completed an agreement which effectively harnesses them to the conditions of the notorious Steel Works Industry Award in return for a paltry wage increase.

Similar "agreements" have been arranged with Rylands Ltd. The South Maitland Railways, The South Australian Railways and others. And so the process will go on until the workers are split up into numerous independent groups; then the Federal Court will boldly and with confidence, issue an award on a low scale in keeping with the ideals of the Australian Master class.

The "Open Shop."

These agreements secure for the employer exemption from the provisions of the Award, and only apply to members of the union concerned for whom preference is not provided.

What a mighty weapon employer, who can embrace to the unscrupulous on his own terms, while play non-unionists on his own terms, while the Arbitration Court is in the background, is not satisfactory.

The Court for an alteration."

The actions of the Arbitration Court in the recent shipping disputes reveal its true character as an instrument of coercion, and the Seamen's Union has pointed the way to a repudiation of Conciliation and a general return to active participation in the class struggle.

Arbitration agreements are the latest means for dividing and weakening the working class

forces, and are the very negation of the class struggle.

Every militant worker should wage war on these reactionary practices and their traitorous sponsors, and work for a fighting policy means of marshalling the workers for immediate

economic demands, to stave off the international offensive of capital and to lead the workers towards the defeat of capitalism and thence on to Communism.

HECTOR ROSS.

The British Coal Crisis and its Lessons.

By W. P. Earsman.

Everybody realises today that the British coal crisis is not past and that the next few months will see the culmination of it. But what we have to consider is, was it only a coal crisis, or was it an absolute break-down of capitalist production. Further, was the result achieved for the coal miners alone, or for the working class, as a whole?

We must return to the days just after the war, and trace the present development, if we are going to understand it and value the situation correctly.

It was in 1919 when the Coalition Government found itself faced with a coal crisis, which it had not the slightest idea how to handle. This Government, believing any port was safe in a storm, appointed the Sankey Commission to make an inquiry into the coal situation. By this means the Government thought it might find a way out and an excuse to reduce the miners' standard of living. Further, that the said enquiry might be the means of covering up the capitalists' inability to carry on the industry. But the miners' leaders did their work so thoroughly, that the chairman of the Commission was helpless to in any way assist the Government and had to declare for nationalisation.

The miners were in high glee and for the next two years lived on the promises of that Commission till 1921 arrived and then they were very rudely awakened.

In this year the capitalists believed their "day" had arrived and decided to give battle to the miners. The ground was cleared for action and the mine-owners with the assistance of some sections of the working class, after a few weeks, gave the miners a thrashing and drove them back to the pits on conditions which were humiliating to any body of men. It is needless to recount the treachery of those days, but nevertheless we must never forget it, because those traitors have never repented and if given an opportunity, will do the same again.

From this time on the different sections of the workers were dealt with in turn by the master class and their conditions worsened, principally because of their failure to see the necessity of standing by the miners.

Now we have arrived at 1925 and once again we have the battle-field as our stage. As in 1921 the front trenches are filled with miners, but in 1925 the miners have behind them

battalions of reserves from the workers in other industries, who have not forgotten the experience of 1921. They therefore, decided to go forward ready to enter the firing line if necessary.

Here we must stop and take a review of our forces and examine our position on the battle field. Up to the beginning of July it appeared as if the battle to be fought, would be similar to that of 1921, and only turn out a skirmish or an economic fight. But with the passing of a few days the whole aspect of the battle front had changed. The fighting army had been augmented by the battalions of other workers, which meant that instead of a skirmishing party or an outpost of the workers' army going to battle, the whole army had drawn up on the battle field, and formed itself into columns ready to give fight on the word of command.

It was a magnificent sight and I think we are entitled to say that no general staff could have felt prouder of its army as each day passed, with the joining of more battalions, until the whole army was ready to march. Don't, for one moment, imagine that we had no soldiers, who would have liked to turn back, or no officers who were ready to betray us to the enemy if an opportunity offered. Oh yes; we had traitors in our camp, some of them we knew and some we didn't. Even in our general staff there were some we didn't know, and they had failed to see where we were marching. They still thought it was a skirmish and failed to observe that with the commencement of the battle, our front would be extended and our objective changed from an economic to a political objective.

At the last moment the enemy offered a truce and an armistice has been agreed upon, giving us a breathing space and sufficient time to again examine our position. While the parleys are taking place it is up to us to still strengthen our position because we know, that sooner or later, we will have to fight. The enemy in the present truce hope to be able to weaken our forces and with that accomplished give us another thrashing. This must never be permitted, therefore the breathing space must be fully utilised to see that the rank and file of our army understands its position and the strategy which will be necessary to attain our ob-

jective, should we have to go to battle at a later date.

First and foremost we must understand the technics of the position. When our force was only composed of one battalion of the workers' army—the miners, it was only able to act as a skirmishing party, with a very short front and small objective, that of some economic demand. This could not be otherwise when the rest of the army was not supporting or co-operating with the fighting line. Therefore, the short front, an economic fight on the question of wages or hours as in 1921.

In 1925 it is true the miners are the skirmishing party but behind there is an army all ready to support and co-operate with the skirmishing party. The moment the battle begins the general staff must be compelled to utilise its whole army by extending the fighting front and making our objective a greater one. To use the whole army to take the same position as the skirmishing party set out for, is ridiculous, so we must have something more than wages and hours for our objective and this is what we must understand.

No army uses its heavy artillery in the firing line when the objective can be obtained by machine-guns, or its 18 pounders to blow up an outpost. To put the question in plain language, with the other trades unions joining the miners' union in the struggle and deciding to support them, our objective must be changed to support them, fit in with the whole army, so that to suit and fit in with the whole army, but the not only will the miners be satisfied but the working class be satisfied. It has now become an active struggle of the working-class, and not of the miners. If this is so, then our objective to meet the demands of the whole working class cannot be maintained on an economic front alone, but must be extended to a political front, wherein the whole working class will receive some benefit. The fight now is along the whole front, so it becomes now a struggle for power.

Why is this so? First, because production has completely broken down. Secondly, there is no capitalist power able to make the wheels turn round, so as to continue production. Even the Government has failed because it is confronted within society, with a force stronger than itself, which controls the productive forces. This militant force, recognising its own power and its control of production, must pass to the political stage and consolidate its power by laying claim to the political machine.

In fact should it fail to take over the political state, then it will have let loose on society a state of anarchy and mob rule. The struggle for working class domination has begun.

Should the Trades Unions' Congress Executive be successful in this struggle, it does not for one moment mean that a real Workers' Government will be formed. It is true we will march quickly and if it were possible to overcome all opposition at a stroke it would be possible to set up right away a Workers' Government. It is just in these changing conditions that the full shortcomings of our leadership will be seen, if they haven't appeared before. Once again it must be pointed out that our Leadership is not all we desire. We have many colors among our Leaders, from Yellow to Pink, and just at this time we will have to give special attention to them. Their time will have arrived and all the influence and power they have will be exercised in selling out to the enemy by a compromise. We owe many lessons to turn to, for experience and all that has transpired during the past few years in Germany, if we have studied it, will assist us at this time.

Still, we will have arrived at a stage wherein we will be much nearer our real objective. Many months and perhaps years will pass before we have attained for final aim.

During the breathing space we have, the work of the Advance Guard—the Communist Party—will be very strenuous because of our work among the masses, teaching and assisting them. Also not forgetting the Trade Union Leaders. We must see to it that they understand the mass route we are travelling, until such time as our party has become the party of the masses and taken over the leadership. It is only when the Communist Party is at the helm, that the workers will have any kind of guarantee that their interests are first and foremost. There we are out for complete emancipation. There must not be any trafficking in the workers' interests.

In the months ahead of us every ounce of energy must be exercised to bring new members in. No opportunity must be missed to get new recruits. Time is the essence of the get new recruits. Time is the essence of the contract and we must get this mass party out of the present circumstances.

The time is now and we have an opportunity when a re-organising campaign will consolidate that influence we have created.

On to a Mass Party is our slogan.

BOOK REVIEW.

"The Marxian Economic Handbook and Glossary."

Why are we often asked by persons seeking understanding of the social problem: where can we find theories of Marx simply and correctly stated, in form suitable to beginners? Again and again we have replied "Value, Price, and Profit," "Socialism Utopian and Scientific," and

"The Communist Manifesto." But these works, they reply, are by Marx and Engels themselves; is there no expositor of Marx who has understood his meaning so well as to be able to put it forward in more suitable form for the average reader? Or, when the smaller works of

Marx and Engels have been read, and the reader has absorbed as much as he can assimilate for the time being, is there nothing to bridge the gulf between "Value, Price and Profit" and the three weighty volumes of "Capital"?

Certainly, there are expositors galore, and some of them are quite readable; one can skim through them, and gain food for thought, and a surface understanding of the social problem. Nevertheless, a close study of such expositors will generally reveal contradictions between one part and another, or between one expositor and another, together with such faulty reasoning and confusion of terms that the more closely they are studied the more the student is likely to be misled.

Speaking as a student and an associate of students, I say without hesitation, and I hope without egotism, that all the expositors of Marx whose works appear in English, from Aveling to Bogdanoff, contain misinterpretations of Marx. The two writers I mention are two of the best, and from the stilted summarizations of Aveling to the unspeakable vulgarizations of Spargo there are all kinds of writings upon Marx, good, bad and indifferent, but none without error.

It would, I think, be a mistake to turn down the expositors upon that account. Even the works of Marx—if we are to accept the corrections offered by W. H. Emmett in the recently published "Marxian Economic Handbook"—are not without errors of diction, punctuation, etc. Worse than that, such errors are not always due to the translator or the printer, but alas! in some instances to Marx himself, who incorrectly stated his own theory.

When we have gone so far with our friend Emmett as to admit that in some of his corrections he is undoubtedly right, our faith in human infallibility will be so shaken that we may have to admit that in some cases, both where he corrects and where he tries to expound Marx, Emmett himself may be wrong.

Be that as it may, Emmett is not in the same category with the vulgar and slipshod writers upon Marx, whose works, for the most part, he ignores; and where he draws attention to errors of Aveling, Boudin, Uttermann, De Leon, Hyndman etc., he does so in clear and dignified fashion, and proves his case every time. To point out such errors, in a work which no student can afford to ignore, is in itself a useful contribution to proletarian thought—especially at a time when small text-books which embody just the same errors are always appearing on the market.

"The Marxian Economic Handbook and Glossary" is just the book the student requires as an introduction to the first volume of Capital. There is no other work like it in existence; and it has this positive advantage over all others, with the exception of Aveling's "Students' Marx"—it does not set out to save anyone the trouble of reading Capital for himself, but rather to point the way to a thorough-going study of that work itself.

"Capital" is not easy to read and understand; it is worth reading and understanding, and no second-hand exposition can take its place as a basis of reasoning upon the problems confronting the working-class. But whereas every-one admits its importance, the limited number of those who even claim to understand it, shows that generally speaking, it cannot be appreciated or understood without the assistance of men who have devoted years to its study. We all know W. H. Emmett to be one of these men, and we can say that his recently published work in the hands of anyone determined to study Marxian economics, would be far more effective than any teacher, other than a first-rate man.

Emmett lays down the scheme of the First Volume in tabulated form; he unravels the threads of Marx's argument, which the reader of Capital is so prone to lose; he explains terms; he sweeps aside small errors of print and translation; and he gives due emphasis and stress to passages which are of great importance though often overlooked; one of these passages, as he points out, has practically escaped the observation of all the expositors of Marx—that which points out the Fetishism of commodities, and the secret thereof. Emmett rightly castigates a "Sydney quidnunc"—who, by the way, once wrote a letter in the "Common Cause," and now wakes up to find himself famous—who coined the phrase "Brain-bewildering Fetishism of Commodities." The whole thing is absurdly simple—

"The human relations (between industrial persons) which obtain in commodity-producing society are presented, not as what they really are, but only as relations of the society's industrial products (commodities) or only as 'Values.'"

That's the idea, all right; but to get the full appreciation of that idea one would have to understand all about the relations between persons, the interchange of commodities, and the ideology of the capitalist world. Therefore, the more one comes to understand, the more clearly he perceives the truth of this generalisation, and its importance in the study of sociology. Thus, the very idea of value—a mystical power contained within the commodity itself—is fetishistic and absurd. The bourgeois objection to the Marxian theory of exchange—that commodities do not exchange in accordance with the amount of labor which point when we see that, as Emmett points out, Marx never said that, as Emmett points out, concept of value does not correspond to the reality of price is true; it does correspond, however, to the reality of social labor.

In a footnote on page 52, Emmett says: "But value," the value consists of the socially necessary labor."

Here, I do not quite agree with the wording. The law of value may be put into words, "Commodities tend to exchange in direct proportion to the social labor-time required to

produce them;" and this is called a law of value, because the word "value" implies that there is some kind of reality underlying price. This reality, which is misconceived as a force or power contained in the commodity itself, is in fact, nothing more nor less than the labor of men within the social division of labor.

It appears to me that Emmett somewhat overstates the unreality of value. He says, "Value is imagined by the human mind with commodities as a kind of strength inherent in them, even as a material property or a material essence of them." This is quite correct, and elsewhere he makes it clear that there is a "social reality" behind the commodity, to which the scientific concept of value will corollate. But in the footnote already quoted, he says, "There is not in 'the law of value' any question of proportions in which the commodities exchange. The 'law of value' is one matter; the various laws of exchange and of

exchange-value proportions are quite other matters."

I do not think Mr. Emmett would assert that there is no connection between these matters; or that my statement of the law of value, with direct reference to the proportions in which commodities exchange, is incorrect; or that a scientific law is any more than the statement of a tendency.

The correspondence columns of this journal, some months ago, dealt with a query arising from what was, I think, a misconception of Mr. Emmett's meaning upon this same matter. No man, however clear his writing may be, is safe against misinterpretation, and the fact that Marx is so much misinterpreted says nothing against his logic.

Mr. Emmett sets out to interpret Marx; I say nothing against his understanding, but I should like to see him use the columns of this journal to make his own meaning clear upon this particular matter.—G. Winter.

Questions and Discussion.

[Under this heading we will endeavor to answer any questions put to us by our readers, and will also publish brief statements submitted by them of views for which we are not necessarily responsible.—Editor.]

A Workers' Paradise?

E.H. (Melbourne) writes: "The invasion of Australia by Henry Ford has begun. In a relatively short time Ford works will be humming merrily in the different Australian States. Doubtless these works will embody similar distinctive features to those in America. Already in Victoria Ford's agents have acquired the his only hotel in the vicinity of the site of his works (no beer-soaked stiffs for Henry Ford!). And labor leaders like E. J. Holloway are heard to speak of him in almost reverential tones. Thus the Ford "problem" is already at our very doors.

The experiment of Henry Ford—for his "work" within capitalist society is nothing else but an experiment—has, in other countries than infrequently been made in other countries than America—as a single example may be mentioned the Karl Zeiss Institute in Jena. Gotten the Karl Zeiss pettyfogging capitalism of many. But to the pettyfogging capitalism of Australia it is still new. Not because it creates however, repays itself, but because this for the workers a paradise, but who trouble paradise creates a contented class struggle or themselves devil a bit about the sort they revolution, since for anything of the sort to no longer feel the slightest need. The Ford problem is, therefore, not at all so hard to solve. The wonder, Henry Ford, is engaged in diverting the workers from the class struggle. It is quite clear why, throughout America, nay, throughout the world, Henry Ford is so popular. All employers, the entire capitalist world, has

an interest in praising him: see, even in the capitalist world such a paradise is possible. They all profit from this diversion from the revolutionary struggle. They call him simply Henry "He has done more than any other man on earth to give the working class the right help and sufficient wages," said I. H. Anderson, the president of an American trade union. "His workers honor him as a benefactor," wrote a bourgeois newspaper in Germany. "The war. What do election speakers in before the United States do to win the sympathies of the workers for their party? They declare themselves in complete accord with the principles of Henry Ford.

Henry Ford introduced the eight hours' day in his factories of his own free will. He did this at a time when everywhere in the United States the twelve hours' day was still worked. To every worker in his works a minimum wage of six dollars a month and a half are sufficient the wages of a Ford motor car. But it is not the relatively high wages and short hours alone that make him such a favorite with the workers. "We educate a man not only in how more money is to be earned, but we begin for the first time to educate him in how it is to be spent," declares one of the many pamphlets which the Ford works have published. To this in which the Ford's one of the many pamphlets end forty men are employed in the popular welfare alone, "good specialists in how to do show fare," who have nothing else to do but show the workers how they are to furnish their homes comfortably, how they are to live hygienically,

The Communist

Monthly Journal of the Communist
Party of Australia

(Section of the Communist International)

Editor - - - - - G. Baracchi.

Business Manager - W. S. Stone.

Postal Subscription Rates: Yearly 4/.,
Half-yearly 2/.

Make all Money Orders and Postal Notes
payable: Haymarket Post Office, Sydney.
Address all Literary Matter to the Editor,
and all Business Communications to the
Business Manager, at 395 Sussex Street,
Sydney.

A Red Mark across this space means that
your subscription expires this issue.

A Workers' Paradise?—Continued.

how they are to guard against moral lapses, how they can invest their money most safely, and the like more. But they are not merely counsellors. They go right into the homes of the workers, see to it that there are no disharmonies in their married life, that the children attend a good school, that the house-keeping is done cleanly, that the man does not, perchance, squander his money on wine or women. A new piece of tutelage, therefore, in the "education" given by the employer. One to which Henry Ford, as the benefactor of his workers, has, perhaps, the right?

What is Ford's principal production? Motor cars? "In the first place we produce men," says Henry Ford, that is to say: We turn out pliant tools of capitalist production. A pamphlet of the Ford works, which is devoted to making propaganda for the "Universal Tractor," contains an introduction from the pen of Henry Ford himself. Of what does he speak? Of the quality of the tractors? Of their cheapness? About such things he says not a word; he merely compares the Chinese coolie with the Ford worker, he enumerates all the blessings that all enjoy who work for him. Propaganda for the blessings of his capitalism!

The Ford works have their play grounds and sports grounds, their cinema, their giant hospital, etc., but it is of his schools that Ford is most proud. There is an English school for foreigners—free of charge, of course. At another school hundreds of untutored workers have been taught to be highly qualified labor powers. Naturally, a capitalist knows better how to give the workers this kind of culture

than the clumsy educational apparatus of the State.

Every week, in all American picture theatres a new Ford film, which shows to everybody the "Paradise" of the workers, administers a further dose of the poison of diversion.

All this Henry Ford has done for his workers? He has not done it as a private person! He has done it as an exponent, as a representative of his class. Large capital is trustified and interrelated. And it needs such a diversion manoeuvre. Superfluous the question whether Henry Ford's works so prosper that he can to a certain extent "share" with his workers. At the bottom thereof are the interests of a general capitalist principle... Ford, the "friend of man," stands revealed as one of the capitalist wolves in sheep's clothing."

PERIODICAL.

THE SOVIET UNION REVIEW (formerly
Russian Information and Review).
Published Weekly. Price, 4d.

Containing accurate presentation of authentic information on all subjects concerning the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics, with a view to a better understanding and the development of trade and normal relations.

STORM

By Karl Liebknecht.

[In the Spring of 1917, Karl Liebknecht wrote the short poem of which we have made the following literal translation. He wrote it in the penitentiary of Luckau, where he was imprisoned by the military rulers of Germany for nearly two years. In its lines resounds the call of the subsequent revolutionary movement amid the storms of which this proletarian hero met his death.—Editor.]

STORM, my comrade,

You call me!

I cannot come yet,

I am still chained!

Yes, I too am Storm,

Part of you!

And the day will come

When I break the chains,

When I in turn rage,

Rage far and wide,

Storm o'er the earth,

Storm through the lands,

Storm unto men,

Men's heads and hearts,

Storm-wind, like you!

THE COMMUNIST

A JOURNAL FOR THE THEORY AND PRACTICE OF MARXISM

No. 11

JANUARY—FEBRUARY 1926

3d.



Lenin Speaks before the Marx-Engels Monument
in the First Workers' Republic.

CONTENTS

Notes of the Month	The Editor
Fragments From Australian History	C.J.S.
The State Revolutionaries	J.K.
Morgan and His Critics	G. Winter
Imperialist Transformation of Democracy	Leon Trotsky
Locarno and Aix-La-Chapelle	W. N. Ewer
Scarborough Conference	Losovsky

Notes of the Month

"THE FUTILITY OF ISOLATION."

The decision of the Chief Secretary for New South Wales to permit the sale of working-class literature in the Domain, that is, literature sold by the Communist Party and the I.W.W., follows upon a decision of the Labor Council of N.S.W. to defy the Government upon this issue.

Therein lies a distinction with a moral. For some months members of the I.W.W. have been arrested, fined, and imprisoned for selling the literature of their organisation. Literature which advocates the more intensive organisation of the working class industrially, and proposes the abolition of capitalism, by so-called "direct action."

Whilst we must admire the heroic gesture of those who were prepared to face prison for insisting upon freedom of the press, it remained but a gesture. Its organisational results were practically nil.

The policy of the I.W.W. in splitting themselves off from the regular Trade Union Movement, wherein, like it or not, are to be found the mass of the organised workers, prevented them from broadening the struggle and thus bringing pressure to bear upon the forces of Government.

When the ban was placed upon the Communist Party, at a time when the British seamen were on strike, when the two leading officials of the Australian Seamen's Union were held on Garden Island, the question of the tactics to be pursued came up for discussion.

The objective conditions were (1) the return of a reactionary party to power in the Federal House, and (2) the evident and expressed desire of the official leader of the Labor Party to isolate and crush the Communist Party.

These being the conditions the situation demanded—not a further weakening of the militant forces by isolated action and heroic gestures, but a rallying of the Trade Unions of the State in defence of working-class privileges.

The correctness of that policy has been brilliantly borne out by the retreat executed by the Chief Secretary with reference to the sale of literature in the Domain.

Not in the setting up of ideal unions, not in the providing of heroic examples in isolation—but in the patient, steady organising work amongst the masses, in the organisations to which their development has brought them.

Truly, the structure of these Unions act as a check upon further advances; yet they represent the ideological development of their members.

Within and amongst them must the work be carried on to change the content of their thought process, and not from the rarified atmosphere of some Olympian height.

"THE OFFENSIVE."

In conjunction with all the capitalist powers and their colonial appendages of dominion status, Australia, in the shape of its Federal Government, is taking the logical steps towards working-class suppression following upon that formation of the united front of capitalism known as the Locarno Pact.

That agreement between the powers engineered by British diplomacy, whilst apparently intended to provide for pacific relations between the European powers, is actually a weapon forged against the First Workers' Republic and in consequence against the working class the world over.

In Australia, pet dominion of British Imperialism—more British than Britain—the Federal Government has announced its intention of bringing in legislation designed to crush the militant section of the working-class movement.

We are not concerned for the moment with that phase of the legislation aimed at so-called unconstitutional bodies. It is that section referring to the stoppage of transport and industry which is of immediate importance.

This is distinctly aimed at the most militant sections of the Trade Union Movement, the Maritime Workers and Miners' Union.

The iron heel of capitalist dictatorship is commencing to manifest itself more openly. The need of crushing the workers to a lower level, in order to maintain the average rate of profit in the face of increasing competition, necessitates the dropping to some extent of the democratic cloak and the more open and ruthless crushing of the militant workers.

With the crushing of the revolutionary parties, as is intended, and the hamstringing of the militant trade unions, the path is cleared for the launching of an offensive against Soviet Russia and the Far East, in which the participation of Australia could be assured under the slogan of a "White Australia."

Unfortunately for our imperialist masters and fortunately for the workers, we are living in 1926—not 1914.

The Communist International now occupies the place in the eyes of the workers formerly possessed by the decadent Second International.

Trade Union delegations have visited the Soviet Republic and have reported favorably as to the conditions there. Powerful Left-wing movements have grown up in the Trade Union Movements of the higher developed countries.

The farmers' organisations of the American wheat-growing areas have had delegates at the Krestintern (the Peasants' International).

By and large the forces of progress have advanced to the detriment of reaction.

In face of the attack about to be levelled by the Australian section of British imperialism it is essential that closer organisational ties be

effected between the various workers in industry. Preparations for defence developed in order that the Nationalist, and other Governments, may learn that while we are weak in the field of politics as yet, we have the capacity for strength in the sphere of production.

Locarno and Aix-la-Chapelle

By W. N. Ewer.

To see a painting clearly one must stand well back from it. Proverbially at close hand one cannot see the wood for the trees. And so it is in politics. The near view of events is often, even generally, singularly incorrect. One is a little bewildered by the detail, a little bemused by the chatter of the moment.

And so this business of the Locarno Treaties will, I think, become a little more understandable if one moves a little away from it—say a hundred leagues and a hundred years in space and time. Forward we cannot go, except in imagination; so let us try backwards. I think we may find Charlemagne's old capital of Aachen in the autumn of 1818 a curiously useful spot and time for our purpose. For at that time and in that place there was also a Conference of the Powers in being: the Conference of Aix-la-Chapelle, as English history books, preferring the French name for a German town, usually call it. A pleasant Confarference—"I have never seen a prettier" wrote one of the protagonists to his wife.

The first point we shall note is how curiously like is the Conference of Aix-la-Chapelle, seen like is the Conference of Locarno.

At close hand, to the Conference of Locarno, a great war had been finished a few years before. A great Imperial power had been beaten by a Grand Alliance. She had been condemned to pay to the victors reparations beyond her capacity. Armies of Occupation were in her Rhine territories. She was still, though she had changed her form of government, a half-pariah State, suspected of harboring projects of revenge, tallen regime, of harboring projects of revenge.

How to obtain reparations, how to assure the armies of occupation, how to settle which had manence for the treaty settlement which had ended the war, how to bring the outcast nation back into the European comity, how above all to obtain "the best security for a durable peace": these were the ostensible purposes of Aix-la-Chapelle, as of Locarno.

Even in the details the parallels are eerily precise. The intervention of the bankers—at small profit to themselves—in the Reparations settlement; the canvassing of great schemes uniting all Europe in a pact of guarantees; the successful insistence of British statesmen that "all notions of general and unlimited guarantee must be abandoned in favor of limited agreements"; the worry caused to those same statesmen by the aversion of British public opinion to any European commitments; their constant pre-occupation with the necessity of

finding formulae which would enable them either to justify their acts to, or to conceal them from, Parliament. At Aix-la-Chapelle, as at Locarno, they even debated the questions whether a guaranteeing power might march troops across Europe to enforce a guarantee, and whether the Council of Allied Ambassadors should be liquidated or retained in being for a little while.

Aix-la-Chapelle, like Locarno, was a triumphant success. Difficulties which had appeared all but insoluble vanished in a new atmosphere of goodwill. There had, indeed, to be care exercised in draughtsmanship. But the requisite formulae were forthcoming, and the unanimity was wonderful. The Reparations tangle had already been solved by the good—and remunerative—offices of Messrs. Baring and their colleagues. But it was the merit of their Conference to have solved the even more vexing problems of peace and security. The withdrawal of the armies of occupation was ordered; France was welcomed again into the comity of nations. A nice mixture of idealism and common sense created a European unity without sacrificing national independence. An equally fine balance satisfied at once those who wished Britain to play her due role as a guarantor of the new peace and those who dreaded her assumption of European obligations. Above all the mists of suspicion and mutual fear which had hung over the Continent had been dissipated and replaced by a purer atmosphere. Castlereagh, who had so ably about the same time secured the peace of the world and safeguarded the interests of his country, returned in triumph to receive the thanks of his Sovereign, the congratulations of his colleagues and the applause of Parliament. Only a disgruntled and disreputable opposition group dared to criticise the work of the Conference and to impute sinister motives to the activities of the peace-making diplomats.

So Aix-la-Chapelle appeared to those who saw it close at hand, just over a century ago. "It is a compact between the five principal European powers for the preservation of universal peace."

But, seen at a distance, as we see it now, this assembly of conferences has quite another aspect. We have the double advantage of being able to judge it by its fruits and of having access to much that was carefully hidden at the

time both from American Ambassadors and from the public. Diplomats were no less cautious and secretive folks in those days than now. And the real purposes of the diplomacy of the conference were discreetly hidden. Castlereagh, in particular, hampered—as his Prussian, Austrian and Russian colleagues were not—by the constant fear of Parliament, had over and over again to remind them of the need for discretion. And so, as Gentz, who acted as secretary of the conference, noted, “they carefully avoided giving opportunities for malevolence or indiscretion by putting into the formal documents wishes or declarations of which each carried the principle in mind, but the enunciation of which would have provoked vexatious and hostile criticism.”

Aix-la-Chapelle, as we see it now, was not at bottom concerned with the preservation of universal peace, but with the preservation of the old order against the menace of “the democratic principles”—the phrase is Castlereagh’s—“but too generally spreading through Europe.” It was the prelude to Peterloo, to the Six Acts, to the Carisbad Decrees, to the armed suppression of the popular movements in Spain and Italy. It was the Alliance of Governments against peoples. If the Powers agreed to forgo or to settle peaceably their differences with each other, their motive was not pacifism but fear. They laid aside their quarrels in order that the old regime—whether autocratic or oligarchic—might present a united front towards the new danger. Gentz in his confidential memorandum to Metternich on the achievements of the Conference is nakedly frank. “The nucleus of organised strength which this union presents is the barrier which Providence itself seems to have raised to preserve the old order.” While Metternich himself, in writing to his Emperor just before the Conference, notes peace, “and that the first notion” must be peace, “and that the fundamental idea of peace is the security of property.”

Not peace then, but universal oppression, was the outcome, and indeed the prime purpose, of the Aix-la-Chapelle Conference. It is often assumed that in this regime of oppression the British Government refused to play its part. That is a delusion, carefully created and fostered by Castlereagh for political reasons. On position weakened. The opposition became stronger and more vigorous. He did not dare to join overtly in the repressive activities on the Continent. But he gave them all the support he dared. “He is,” wrote the Austrian music who is at church: he wishes to applaud self wrote to Metternich, “pleased to see evil germs destroyed without the power to give our way far more by our actions than by our words.” At home the Liverpool-Castlereagh government did its bit enthusiastically. Peterloo follows Aix-la-Chapelle in its list of honors.

Seen from far off, in historical perspective, the Conference of Aix-la-Chapelle, then, presents an appearance very different from that which it presented to observers near at hand. The professions of peace are seen to have been mere rhetoric. The rulers of the Great Powers are seen to have come together not under the urge of lofty ideals but under the pressure of a common fear. Their alliance was a bond not of peace, but of resistance to the common danger threatening their prerogatives. A “faïsciau moral” Metternich termed it. The phrase has a prophetic and sinister aptitude. The English for “faïsciau” is “bundle”; but the Italian is “fascio.”

Is it otherwise with Locarno, whose “close-up” appearance presents so curiously close a resemblance to that of Aix-la-Chapelle? Step back, clear of the illusions of the moment, clear of the rhetoric, clear of the glittering atmosphere. Is not Locarno at a distance still singularly like Aix-la-Chapelle?

The statesmen of Locarno talk the same sonorous platitude as the statesmen of Aix-la-Chapelle. But their assurances are as valueless as those of their predecessors. Mr. Chamberlain and M. Briand, Herr Stresemann and Signor Mussolini, are no more pacifists and idealists at heart than were Castlereagh and Metternich. Not even the sunshine of Lake Maggiore can bleach the Ethiopian skin of diplomacy. And these men who have for years been devotees of force and exponents of Imperialism have not changed miraculously in an hour.

The governments of the four great Powers of Locarno, like the governments of the five great Powers of Aix-la-Chapelle, are reactionary governments, concerned above all at the present juncture for the preservation of the old order against clearly threatening dangers. And it is this preoccupation which has driven them into a temporary unity. As France in 1818, so Germany in 1925 is brought into the fold, not from any Christian motive of forgiveness, but from the fear lest isolated she may lend aid and support to the opposition.

The dangers which threaten the established order to-day, though more complex, are not dissimilar from those which threatened in 1818. Then there were the democratic movement at home and the national resurgence in the Mediterranean countries. To-day there are the working-class movements at home, the national awakenings in Asia and Northern Africa. And there is also Soviet Russia.

England is conscious that she must strain every nerve if she is to hold her Eastern Empire in subjection. France is already hard pressed in Syria and Morocco. Italy is by no means sure of her existing colonies and yet is greedy for more. All of them are faced at the same time by internal economic difficulties—haunted by the fear of working-class revolt. It is a situation imperatively calling for a truce to inter-governmental quarrels and for a closing of the ranks. Equally it calls for the conciliation of Germany and for her inclusion in a

common system with her late enemies. For there is clear danger lest an ostracized Germany may lean towards Russia, may lean towards Turkey, may use her renescent economic strength, and the influence which it gives, to combat instead of to support the Allied domination in the East.

It is this need for a united front which explains in particular England's Locarno policy; and it was English diplomacy, skilfully working in Berlin, which started the whole business. For Germany and for France there are evident advantages in the pacts themselves and in the assurances—as to the Rhineland, as to commercial credits and so on—which accompany them. But for England, Locarno is, on the surface, all give and no take. She has made expensive military obligations. She has made expensive financial promises. Directly she gets no return. But indirectly she gets that which she needs most of all—the assurance of support, or at the least of benevolent neutrality, in her struggle to hold her Eastern Empire.

It is in the East that the key to British foreign policy lies, as it has lain for a century past. India, the new Empire between India and the Mediterranean, and the quasi-Empire in China are her chief concerns. Even the hostility of British Imperialism to the Soviet Union is based far more upon Asiatic anxieties than upon class prejudices. Russia is regarded in Downing Street as the “traitor” power, the blackleg of Imperialism. Her deepest crime is that she has broken the European phalanx. She has dared to treat Asiatics as comrades and partners, not as exploitable subjects. She has “gone native.”

The March of Revolution

BRITISH WORKERS ORGANISING FOR COMMUNISM

REVIEW OF THE SCARBOROUGH CONFERENCE

In No. 15 of “The Communist International” an important article appeared on the British Trade Union Conference held in Scarborough in September last. In the course of the article Comrade Lovozovskiy writes:—

The British Trades Union Congress in Scarborough is another step to the Left of the entire British Labor Movement.

The congress veered mightily to the Left with respect to a very delicate question. It is Labor Movement—the Colonial question. It is a well-known fact that for a long time but British proletariat was not only the actual but also the ideological participant in the exploitation of the Colonies. To the average British trade union leader the existence of the Colonies was a matter of course and at the congresses of the British trade unions and of the Labor Party, decisions were based on the assumption that the existence of the British Empire and the enslavement of the Colonies are an un-

Persia and Afghanistan it is hoped may be penetrated and controlled. That leaves in Western Asia two strong powers which are at least potential enemies, and whose very existence provides an inspiration and a rallying point for the nationalist movements within the Eastern Empire. To isolate those two powers—precisely as Metternich aimed to isolate the democratically-tending States of Spain and Naples—is the obvious first task of British diplomacy.

And for that a rapprochement with Germany is as essential to Chamberlain as was a rapprochement with France to Metternich. Germany in isolation and conscious of her ostracism might seek alliance with Soviet Russia, might re-establish intimate relations with the new Turkey. Perhaps at the moment the second was the more dreaded possibility. Locarno puts an end to both. Russia must abandon any hope she may have had in Berlin. Turkey must face the Mosul issue knowing that she cannot look for German support, either diplomatic or financial or technical. Britain can face her Eastern problems without fear of complications in the West. The Imperialist Powers, having called a truce to their own dissensions, having agreed to forget old grievances, can present—precisely as after Aix-la-Chapelle—can present—a discontent at home and to a united front to their dependencies. The internationalism of the one as of the other will be no math of a sharper conflict between repression and revolt. The West is preparing not for the East, millennium but for the struggle with the East. It is as the prologue to that struggle, not as the epilogue to the German war, that the historian will see Locarno.

changeable fact. There had not been a single decision in the history of the British trade union movement touching upon the question of the independence of Colonial countries. It was necessary for the British Labor Movement to experience the war, the Versailles Peace, the Dawes Plan, permanent unemployment and the beginning of the disintegration of the right Empire, to come to the recognition of the right of the enslaved Colonies to separation. The leader of the reactionary, Thomas, dared British Trade Union Movement at this Conference to unfold his Colonial philosophy at this Congress. What he used to say in his capacity of Colonial Secretary he was afraid to say from the platform of a workers' congress. It is one thing to give an interview in the capacity of Cabinet Minister, to speak at bourgeois banquets and to sing the praises of the great British Empire, promising to protect the goods grabbed by the British bourgeoisie, and another

thing to come to a workers' congress and to prove that the enslavement of hundreds of millions of Colonial workers is profitable to British workers.

The decision of the Scarborough Congress to support the Colonial peoples in their struggle, even for separation from the Empire, represents a turning point in the British Labor Movement. It means that considerable sections of the British proletariat begin to understand that the freedom of the workers of the mother country cannot be built up on the enslavement of Colonial workers.

The Scarborough Congress took up a fighting attitude on the question of factory and workshop committees. It is a well-known fact that the reactionary trade union bureaucrats fear these committees more than anything else, as they do not want direct organisation of the lower strata. To have to deal with organised factories and works is a much more difficult affair than to have to do with individual delegates. That is why the Right-wing of the Amsterdam International is so against factory and workshop committees, considering this a Communist slogan. The Scarborough Congress declared itself in favor of the organisation of factory and workshop committees. This means an enormous step forward on the road to the establishment of a truly revolutionary and strongly welded-together trade union movement. This decision caused consternation among the reactionary leaders. Factory and workshop committees are the things they want least of all. They know the revolutionary nature of factory and workshop committees and their role in times of acute social crisis. They will, of course, do their utmost to counteract the decision which was adopted and to bring it to naught if not throughout the country, at least in their own industries. Will the Right-wing succeed in sabotaging this decision? To judge by the mood of rank and file trade unionists, the Right leaders will meet with stubborn resistance from below. Did not the Congress compel Thomas not to speak against factory and workshop committees? Did he keep silent if he did not want to cut himself irremediably adrift from his own union?

A very significant fact was the hostile attitude of the Scarborough Congress to the Dawes Plan. It is well-known that the Dawes Plan is the child of MacDonald, the same MacDonald who came into power with the support of the British trade unions. Did not MacDonald work for the Dawes Plan under cover of the interests and behold the first congress after the introduction of this Plan takes up a decidedly negative attitude to this child of Labor treachery. This decision is of great political importance. First of all it throws a vivid light on the differences between the working class of Great Britain and the policy of the so-called Labor Government. A bigger smack in the face MacDonald could not have received. It is true MacDonald's name is not mentioned in

the resolution, but everyone knows very well what is the matter. It was certainly not mere chance that MacDonald did not meet at the congress with the reception which was always vouchsafed him on such occasions. Usually, when MacDonald put in an appearance at Trades Union Congresses, he was asked to speak. This time only one section of the congress met him with applause, the majority of the congress remained silent; he did not receive an invitation to speak and left disconcerted. The decision against the Dawes Plan must be looked upon as a serious rift in the Labor Party, which is built up on the trade unions.

We are witnessing an extremely curious phenomenon. The British Trade Union Movement is veering more and more to the Left whilst its ideology is lagging behind its practice. In practice, the British Trade Union Movement has already entered the class struggle—in theory this has not yet been sufficiently substantiated and crystallised in the resolutions and decisions of the congress. The clash of class interests is particularly visible now in Great Britain. The working class feels that bourgeois society, welded together and armed to the teeth, is against it. In view of restricted markets and the determination of the bourgeoisie to reduce the standard of living of the working class at all costs, the internal differences are becoming more acute and compel the disjointed British Trade Union Movement to weld itself together to offer resistance to the enemy's offensive. This necessity of collecting all the forces under one control is felt much more strongly below than above, for the upper stratum of the Trade Union Movement, especially as represented by the Right-wing, hopes to succeed in negotiations and persuasion the rank and file and the more sensitive leaders feel the coming of a social collision and are, therefore, endeavoring to establish as strong and united a front as possible.

The attempts of the miners to form a quadruple alliance of the miners to form a workers, railwaymen and miners, transport to any practical results in spite of the formal consent of the executives of all these organisations. The agreement exists only on paper, to Thomas and Co., who cannot imagine any possibility of action when interests are at stake which are not those of their union. Such an attitude is quite natural for people like Thomas, those sections of Labor are at stake, at the head of which they are; why then should they act in defence of the workers of other branches of industry?

The ratification of the Anglo-Soviet Unity Committee by the Scarborough Congress, the commencement of work of this committee front, the practical realisation of the united British and Soviet trade unions refutes everything the Second and Amsterdam Internationals have written and spoke concerning the united

front and unity. The United Front and unity have been realised—such is the conclusion that millions of workers will arrive at after Scarborough.

The Scarborough Congress did not go any further than what actually exists and it did not do so because many big trade unions were categorically against the adoption of new tactics called forth by the growing acuteness of the class struggle. They were particularly afraid to extend the powers of the General Council, for under existing conditions this would mean centralised leadership of the coming struggle. In the case of many trade unionists the interests of their union predominate over class interests; there is a lurking hope in their minds—"Perhaps the coming storm will not affect my union."

In spite of this the Scarborough Congress is

Morgan and His Critics

By G. Winter.

In "The Industrial Pioneer" of April, May, and June, 1925, appears a survey of Morgan's theories in the light of modern discovery, by Vern Smith.

This series of articles deals extensively with the writings to three anthropologists whom the writer calls "The American School." Their names are Franz Boas, Alexander Goldenweiser, and Robert Lowie, and they teach in American only in the sense that they are in American universities, but under the circumstances they cannot be charged with bias against Morgan because he was an American. The writer gives them great credit for their attainments, saying that they are "brilliant, tireless workers, and have studied both books and men."

"The new school," the "American school," is the "Columbia school" of the writer remarks, raises suspicions of "group patriotism."

"Their theory," Vern Smith goes on, "is largely that there is no theory, that generalisations are very dangerous in the science of anthropology, and that each separate case is to be considered by itself as different from all others. Resemblances they admit, with reservation, but they throw their emphasis on the differences." Further quotation is irresistible, for the letterman writer has stated the exact position in a few words and his statement would be very difficult to improve upon.

"Now, does not this theory of no theory sound familiar? Is it not the scientific offshoot of the pragmatic philosophy which erodes American intellectual thought? Doesn't it remind one of the present attitude of American bourgeois (and college) economists, who have decided that there is not a law of Value?"

"Protestantism or agnosticism in religion, liberalism in politics, philosophical anarchy in economics, and pragmatism in philosophy are the natural reactions of petty bourgeois, faced with the class struggle which they detect, with

an important landmark in the development of the British Labor Movement. In spite of the relics of the old, the progress noticeable within the masses of the British proletariat found an echo in it. It reflected the solemn dissatisfaction, the ferment and the indissection of the masses in search of new methods and forms of struggle. No matter how vague and indistinct some of the formulae may be—this determines the state of affairs. Life itself will introduce the necessary alteration into the vague formulae, practical struggle will do what has been left undone by the congress. To understand the trend of development of the British Labor Movement one must first of all turn to the real struggle of the British proletariat and then only after that to the resolutions of its congresses. The situation in Great Britain is perfectly clear; the veering to the Left is proceeding steadily.

the Marxian theory of value which they cannot refute and dare not accept, and with the dread of any kind of cold, hard logic, since their own position is illogical, and their own class is in danger of finding itself any day without a reason for existence."

After this brilliant exposure of the sociological basis of the case against Morgan, the writer needs to go further in order to make good his case against bourgeois anthropology. We feel that he is no longer on the defensive, for the honor of Morgan and the preservation of a weapon which was once good enough for Marx and Engels to use against the bourgeoisie. That weapon—an anthropological science—we are prepared to modify in accordance with all discovered facts, and still use against the capitalist controllers of society; and in using it we press home the point—that with all the facts at their disposal they could not forge a mathematic philosophy, have mournfully declared that anthropology—because it has no use to them—is not a science.

That is what the case of the American school against Morgan amounts to. It is not even a civil case—it is a petition in bankruptcy. With ample quotations in support of his conclusions, the position of the American School, sums up the positive and positive aspects respectively, in its negative and positive aspects respectively. Reducing these again to the briefest possible statement, we may say that the "new school" holds, negatively—that there is no universal and consistent line of progress, technical or sociological; and, positively, that there are specific geographical areas of culture, each with its own characteristic line of development.

Thus reduced to acceptable, and fully in accord, are perfectly acceptable, and fully in accord, with the Marxian concept of society, but once with the Marxian concept of society, it must be remembered that this reduction is in itself a generalisation, made, not by the "new

school" itself, but between two proletarian commentators. If the "new school" has really this much to offer us, at least it is more than mere quibbling about the differences which may be observed between modern tribes on about the same level of culture.

But the "new school" goes further, even so far as to allude to the school of Morgan as "evolutionist," and practically to dub itself anti-evolutionist. This can only arise from a prejudice against the universal concept of evolution which is as characteristically bourgeois as it is absurd. We know that the more conservative of the American bourgeoisie, in despair because the proletariat is beginning to think in terms of evolution, has even instituted an attack upon the teaching of Darwin's theories in the schools, and stops at nothing in trying to make evolution itself appear absurd. It is significant, therefore, that in America there should even spring up an anti-evolutionist school of anthropology.

"There is no universal and consistent line of progress," independent of geographical surroundings and racial contacts. Who ever said there was?

That does not alter the fact that there is a general line of progress, and that the progress of the human race may be traced through successive stages.

Any evolutionary theory may be made to look absurd through misstatement or caricature. Because the ancestry of man can be traced back to the fish, and further back still, that does not prove that the fishes of to-day are on their way to becoming men. Everyone who understands biological evolution knows that progress continued for ages, along lines that failed to adapt themselves to changing conditions, and that new, higher forms of life came into being from the development of forms which survived only because they were more primitive than those which became extinct.

So it is in society, and even in the historic period we have seen backward nations skip stages of development, and shoot ahead of those which had passed through these stages, but failed to adapt themselves to new circumstances. This does not in the least disturb the concept of social development through successive stages.

It appears to me that Vern Smith, in giving a quotation from Boas, overlooks a fundamental misconception of the materialist conception of history. The quotation reads:—"The evolutionary viewpoint, Morgans' system"—seems to involve a certain correlation between industrial development and social development, and therefore a definite sequence of inventions as well as of forms of organisation and belief."

The viewpoint of Morgan and Marx certainly implies a correlation, but one in which the industrial, or rather, technical, development, is essentially basic, springing as it does from the needs of man irrespective of his social organisation. Thus, in the general line of development (not necessarily in Fiji), the great advance which accompanied the discovery of pottery brought about a certain type of social or-

ganisation, under which further advances were made; but the domestication of the animals, which eventuated in the Old World, and the cultivation of food plants, which took place in America, were due, not to the social organisation itself, which was the same on both sides of the Atlantic, but to the capacity of man for supplying his needs according to the possibilities of the situation.

The "definite sequence of inventions" which some read into Morgan's theory is simply a product of the imagination. Perhaps no single race as ever followed that sequence, through its own inventive power, irrespective of outside influence. Certainly in thousands of cases, especially in modern times, separate races have suddenly been confronted with the discoveries of other races far in advance of them, and have either adapted themselves to the new situation or died out before the invaders.

From such interferences, as well as from geographical differences, spring the apparent exceptions and anomalies of which the destructive critics of Morgan make so much. They do not in the least invalidate the general conclusions as to the progress of humanity, laid down by the founder of the science. Unless we say that every tribe on the face of the earth is a law unto itself we must lay down general laws and proceed to the explanation of apparent exceptions. The stressing of differences without trying to account for them is the very reverse of scientific method.

Following the main objections which Smith quotes as having been raised against Morgan, we find such things as—

(1) The use of iron by negroes before they had discovered copper.

....(2) The practice of rock carving by African bushmen.

(3) The prevalence of slavery, and a ruling class among British Columbians and Polynesians.

The first is easily accounted for by the fact that Africa has been overrun time after time by various peoples in a higher stage of culture than its natives—a fact noted and stressed by Morgan himself.

The second is a type of frivolous objection, which stresses individual differences of very little real importance. Goldenweiser objects to Morgans' classification of the Australian aboriginals, simply because of their possession of the boomerang—an absurd exaggeration of the importance of a single weapon—if we can be called. Lowe, quite rightly, objects to Morgans' classification of the Polynesians, but the third objection strikes partly from Mor-

gan's error as regards the Polynesians, and partly from a misconception of their institutions. As regards the British Columbians, there is ample reason to believe what Vern Smith has absorbed into their population, and been affected by, thousands of Polynesian migrants. With the question of the Polynesians Vern Smith proceeds to deal, and his conclusions are much the same as my own. I have only to

add that the "ruling class" of Polynesia was only the "heaven-born" proto-aristocracy which develops among warlike barbarians wherever descent is in the male line and the unity of the tribe becomes a religion. On the one side as in New Zealand, it scarcely differs from the as in war-chieftainship of the Iroquois; on the other, as in Hawaii, it shows the beginnings of the man-worship and ancestor-worship of higher barbarism; but in every case it only renders more clear and distinct the reality of the kinship bond of which the chief is the representative.

In the second place, there is no analogy between the slavery of Polynesia and that of early civilisation. The Maori slave worked no harder than the free men and women of the tribe, and the only security against his running away was the fact that his own tribe would have treated him with contempt for ever after. The so-called slaves of Polynesia were after the manner of the tribe without simply men adopted into the tribe without privileges, and scorned by all because they preferred even such mild slavery to death in a battered state, have thought of the modern wage-slave?

The conclusion of the series of articles by Vern Smith is a summary embodying six statements, which are well worth quoting in full:—

"1. Morgans' conclusions are evidence of the accuracy of Marx's and Engels' Materialistic Conception of History, although the Materialistic Conception has plenty of other proof besides.

"2. Morgans' theories are challenged by a group who express the ideology of American petty bourgeois and professional classes, particularly the group of college professors and students, whose reaction to their environment causes them to adopt a theory that there is no theory.

"3. An inspection of the writings of this 'New School of Anthropology' shows that they have confined their criticism to that part of Morgan's evidence based on a study of living savages and barbarians, which might allow us to consider Morgan's theory proved by the evidence of European and Asiatic pre-history, merely declaring the cases given by the 'New School' of present-day savages and barbarians, to be exceptions.

"4. But a closer scrutiny shows that the criticism of the 'New School' even within the field to which they have confined themselves is faulty, and the exceptions to Morgans' theory are not so many as the 'New School' claims, the reason for which claims is again the psychological attitude of the members of the 'New School'.

"5. And a still closer scrutiny of the facts in the case shows that the most important of the exceptions which really do exist, is but an exception to Morgans' normal classification (which Morgans himself admitted was tentative) and is a justification of the principle on which his entire theory is based.

"6. There is a presumption that the other, and minor, actual exceptions are of the same nature."

The Imperialist Transformation of Democracy

Leon Trotsky.

It is not for nothing that the word "democracy" has a double meaning in the political vocabulary. On the one hand, it means a state system founded on universal suffrage and the other attributes of formal "popular government." On the other hand, by the word "democracy" is understood the mass of the people, itself, in so far as it leads a political existence. In the second sense, as in the first, the meaning of democracy rises above class distinctions. This peculiarity of terminology has its profound political significance. Democracy as a political system is the more perfect and unshakable the greater is the part played in the life of the country by the intermediate and less differentiated mass of the population—the lower middle class of the town and the country. Democracy achieved its highest expression in the nineteenth century in Switzerland and the United States of North America. On the other side of the ocean the democratic organisation of power in the federal republic was based on the agrarian democracy of the farmers. In the small Helvetic Republic, the lower middle classes of the towns and the rich peasantry constituted the basis of the conservative democracy of the united cantons.

Born of the struggle of the Third Estate against the powers of feudalism, the democratic State very soon becomes the weapon of defence against the class antagonisms generated within bourgeois society. Bourgeois society succeeds in this the more, the wider the class, the greater is the layer of the lower middle class, the greater the importance of the latter in the economic life of the country, and the less advanced, consequently, is the development of class antagonism. However, the intermediate classes become ever more and more helplessly behind historical development and, thereby, become ever more and more incapable of speaking in the name of the nation. True, the lower middle class doctrines (Bernstein and Company) used to demonstrate with satisfaction that the disappearance of the middle class was expected by the Marxian school. And, in reality, one might agree that, numerically, the middle class elements in the decline in importance of the country, still maintain an extremely prominent position. But the chief meaning of evolution has shown itself in the decline from the point on the part of the middle classes from the point of view of production, the amount of values

which this class brings to the general income of the nation has fallen incomparably more rapidly than the numerical strength of the middle classes. Correspondingly, falls their social, political, and cultural importance. Historical development has been relying more and more, not on these conservative elements inherited from the past, but on the polar classes of society—i.e., the capitalist bourgeoisie and the proletariat.

The more the middle classes lost their social importance, the less they proved capable of playing the part of an authoritative arbitral judge in the historical conflict between capital and labor. Yet the very considerable numerical proportion of the town middle classes, and still more of the peasantry, continues to find direct expression in the electoral statistics of parliamentarism. The formal equality of all citizens as electors thereby only gives more open indication of the incapacity of democratic parliamentarism to settle the root questions of historical evolution. An "equal" vote for the proletariat, the peasant, and the manager of a trust formally placed the peasant in the position of a mediator between the two antagonists; but, in reality, the peasantry, socially and culturally backward and politically helpless, has in all countries always provided support for the most reactionary, filibustering, and mercenary parties which, in the long run, always supported capital against labor.

Absolutely contrary to all the prophecies of Bernstein, Tugan-Baranovsky, and others, the continued existence of the middle classes has not softened, but has rendered to the last degree acute, the revolutionary crisis of bourgeois society. If the proletarianisation of the lower middle classes and the peasantry had been proceeding in a chemically purified form, the peaceful conquest of power by the proletariat through the democratic parliamentary apparatus would have been much more probable than we can imagine at present. Just the fact that was seized upon by the partisans of the fatal even for the external forms of political democracy, now that capitalism has undermined its essential foundations. Occupying in parliamentary politics a place which it has lost in production, the middle class has finally compromised parliamentarism, and has transformed legislative obstruction. From this fact alone, there grew up before the proletariat the problem of seizing the apparatus of state power as such, against it—not against its interests, but against its stupidity, and its policy, impossible to follow in its helpless contortions.

"Imperialism," wrote Marx of the Empire of Napoleon III, "is the most prostituted, and at the same time, perfected form of the state which the bourgeoisie, having attained its fullest development, transforms into a weapon for the enslavement of labor by capital." This definition has a wider significance than for the French Empire alone, and includes the latest

form of imperialism, born of the world conflict between the national capitalisms of the great powers. In the economic sphere, imperialism pre-supposed the final collapse of the rule of the middle class; in the political sphere, it signified the complete destruction of democracy by means of an internal molecular transformation, and a universal subordination of all democracy's resources to its own ends. Seizing upon all countries, independently of their previous political history, imperialism showed that all political prejudices were foreign to it, and that it was equally ready and capable of making use, after their transformation and subjection, of the monarchy of Nicholas Romanoff or Wilhelm Hohenzollern, of the presidential autocracy of the United States of North America, and of the tors in the French Parliament. The last great gesture world attempted to be re-baptised—presented to us a picture, unparalleled in history, of the mobilisation of all state forms, systems and schools of philosophy, in the service of imperialism. Even many of those pedants who insist development during the last decades, and towards ideas of democracy and universal suffrage, began to feel during the war that their some new meaning. Absolutism, parliamentary monarchy, democracy—in the presence of imperialism (and, consequently, in the presence of the revolution rising to take its place) all the slavish Tsarism to North American quasi-democratic federalism, have been given equal rights, merged one another in such combinations as to supplement each other in an indivisible whole. Impoverished succeeded by means of all the "democratic" means of all the "democratic" arithmetic of voting, to subordinate for its own purposes at the critical moment the lower middle classes of the towns and country and even the upper layers of the proletariat. The national idea, under the watchword of which the Third Estate rose to power, found in the national defence. With unexpected clearness, at the expense of class ideology, the last time of imperialism illusions, not only amongst the vanquished, but—after a certain delay—what was once national democracy, and, with it, the Babyness, rottenness, and helplessness of the middle classes and their parties everywhere became evident, with terrifying clearness. In State assumed first-class importance as a question of an open measuring of forces between the capitalist clique, openly or secretly supreme and disposing of hundreds of thousands of mobilised and hardened officers, devoid of all

scruple, and the revolting, revolutionary proletariat; while the intermediate classes were livid in a state of terror, confusion, and prostration. Under such conditions, what pitiful nonsense are speeches about the peaceful conquest of power by the proletariat by means of democratic parliamentarism!

The scheme of the political situation on a world scale is quite clear. The bourgeoisie, which has brought the nations, exhausted and bleeding to death, to the brink of destruction—particularly the victorious bourgeoisie—has displayed its complete inability to bring them out of their terrible situation, and, thereby, its incompatibility with the future development of humanity. All the intermediate and social-including here first and foremost the social-patriotic parties, are rotting away. The proletariat they have deceived is turning against them more and more every day, and is becoming strengthened in its revolutionary convictions as the only power that can save the peoples from savagery and destruction. However, history has not at all secured, just at this moment, a formal parliamentary majority on the side of the party of the social revolution. In other words, history has not transformed the nation into a debating society solemnly voting the transition to the social revolution by a majority of votes. On the contrary, the violent revolution has become a necessity precisely because the imminent requirements of history are helpless to find a road through the apparatus of parliamentary democracy. The capitalist bourgeois calculates: "while I have in my hands lands, factories, workshops, banks; while I possess newspapers, universities, schools; while—this most important of all—I retain control of the army; the apparatus of democracy, however you reconstruct it, will remain obedient to ever you subordinate to my interests spiritlessly will I subordinate to my interests spiritlessly the stupid, conservative, characteristically lower middle class, just as it is subjected to me materially. I oppress, and will oppress, the imagination by the gigantic scale of my build, my transactions, my plans, and my crimes. For moments when it is dissatisfied and murders, I have created scores of safety-valves and lightning-conductors. At the right moment I will bring into existence the opposition parties, which will disappear to-morrow, but which to-day accomplish their mission by affording the possibility of the lower middle class expressing their indignation without hurt therefrom to the capitalism. I shall hold the masses of the people, under cover of complete ignorance, giving them no opportunity of rising above the level which my experts in spiritual slavery terrorise which my experts in speech and print, consider the more privileged or the more backward of the proletariat itself. By means of these measures, I shall not allow the vanguard of the working class to gain the ear of the majority of the working class, while the necessary weapons of mastery and terrorism remain in my hands." To this the revolutionary proletarian replies: "Consequently, the first condition of salvation

is to tear the weapons of domination out of the hands of the bourgeoisie. It is hopeless to think of a peaceful arrival to power while the bourgeoisie retains in its hands all the apparatus of power. Three times over hopeless is the idea of coming to power by the path which the bourgeoisie itself indicates and, at the same time, barricades—the path of parliamentary democracy. There is only one way: to seize power, taking away from the bourgeoisie the material apparatus of government. Independently of the superficial balance of forces in parliament, I shall take over for social administration the chief forces and resources of production. I shall free the mind of the lower middle class from their capitalist hypnosis. I shall show them in practice what is the meaning of Socialist production. Then even the most backward, the most ignorant, or most terrorised sections of the nation will support me, and willingly and intelligently will join in the work of social construction."

When the Russian Soviet Government dissolved the Constituent Assembly, that fact seemed to the leading Social-Democrats of Western Europe, if not the beginning of the end of the world, at all events a rude and arbitrary break with all the previous developments of Socialism. In reality, it was only the inevitable outcome of the new position resulting from imperialism and the war. If Russian Communism was the first to enter the path of theoretical and practical accounts, casting up the same historical reasons, this was due to the same historical reasons which forced the Russian proletariat to be the first to enter the path of the struggle for power. All that has happened since then in Europe bears witness to the fact that we drew the right conclusion. To imagine that democracy can be restored in its general purity means that one is living in a pitiful, reactionary utopia.

The doctrine of formal democracy is not scientific Socialism, but the theory of so-called natural law. The essence of the latter consists in the recognition of eternal and unchanging standards of law, which among different peoples and at different periods find a different, more or less limited and distorted expression. The natural law of the latest history—i.e., as it emerged from the middle ages—included first of all a protest against class privileges, the other abuse of despotic legislation and the "artificial" products of feudal positive law. The theoreticians of the law, as yet, weak Third Estate expressed its class interests in a few ideal standards, which later on developed into the teaching of democracy, acquiring, at the same time absolute, all persons have the right of expression their thoughts in speech and print; every man must enjoy equal electoral rights. As a battle cry against feudalism, the demand for democracy had a progressive character. As time went on, however, the metaphysics of natural law (the theory of formal democracy) began to show its reactionary side—the estab-

The Static Revolutionaries

By I. X.

The concept of revolutionary action and activity existent before 1914 is necessarily, due to the immense political and social changes taking form since that period, subject to considerable modification not from the standpoint of principle but from that of tactical strategy in the waging of the class struggle.

With the exception of the Russian Social Democratic (Bolshevik section) the various Socialist Parties were concerned more with the academic expounding of Marxian economics than with an application of the Marxian revolutionary theories to the practice of revolutionary activity.

More confusion has been created by explainers of Marx, each explanation being colored by the personal opinions of the writer, than by all the attacks of bourgeois professors.

Considerable justification can be found for those Parties, usually situated outside of Europe, who refused to affiliate with the Second International because of the Reformist elements who found shelter therein, and because they feared that their small revolutionary parties would be submerged by, and subordinated to, the reformist policies of the majority of the International.

In considering revolutionary groups we must therefore take cognizance of those which, in 1914, refused to be led away by the patriotic appeals of the bourgeoisie, and enunciated instead their working class opposition to the capitalist war.

Among these may be found the Italian Socialist Party, the Socialist Party of Great Britain, the Russian Bolshevik Party, the Socialist Party of Canada and the Australian Socialist Party not to forget the Socialist Labor Party, which, whilst opposing the war, were not, in the U.S.A., prepared to oppose their government.

Of these the "Bolshevik" Party was the only one with a definite revolutionary policy regarding the war.

Such a policy could not be expected to exist in the British Dominions, in which the conditions could not be expected that the S.P.G. Party, owing to its expected that the S.P.G. Marxian theory, would be able to enunciate a policy for the British workers.

Unfortunately, the S.P.G.B. and S.P. of C. not to mention the others, were not in fact Parties, but simply Marxian academic sects.

Removed from, and refusing as organisations to take part in the every-day struggles of the working class, even though their members as individuals, were forced into the struggle to the industrial organisations of the workers, gradually developed.

Any move for the immediate relief of the workers, even though it involved struggle was classified as reformist.

Instead of attempting to organise the fighting spirit of the masses, nothing but the bald doctrines re historical development or, on the part of the S.L.P., the necessity for joining the W.I.I.U., were put forward. The phrase "Conditions will determine" was used so frequently that it became a cloak for those who, while professing revolutionary faith lacked revolutionary courage and developed a school of thought impregnated, not with historical materialism, but with historic fatalism.

An ideology which forms the basis for adaptation and opportunism.

1914 separated the social Patriots from the Socialist Parties. 1917 commenced the separating of the revolutionary Marxists from the academicians. With the formation of the Communist International and the issuance of the 21 points of affiliation thereto commenced the disintegration of the old Socialist Parties.

Whilst continually asserting both by pen and word of mouth, that the working class movement must of necessity be an International movement they set objected to surrendering their sectarian autonomy and becoming part of a centrally-organised world revolutionary movement.

In connection with this notice must be taken of the "Party" patriotism which developed among parties such as the S.P.G.B. and S.P. of C., due to their strict adherence to Marxian theory and dogma at a time when the other working class parties in the same countries were floundering in a morass of petty reformism.

Time brings changes! The position occupied by these parties in their respective countries because of their influence upon the Labor movement in Australia was severely challenged by the demand for an active aggressive policy in place of the academic policy previously pursued.

The policy of isolation could no longer be justified. If these parties were to be that which they claimed Revolutionary Internationalist, then reasons adduced prior to 1918 were valueless. There now existed three Internationals. The invalid Second, the betwixt 2nd and 3rd International, the Third (Communist) International.

Faced with the question of affiliation to the Third, they were placed in the position of either, revolutionaries, accepting the position of affiliation, or of being compelled to recede to the position of the Second International in order to justify their action in not affiliating.

Adherence to the Third carried with it the obligation to carry on an aggressive campaign

in the Trade Unions, workshops, and wherever the workers are massed together. Non-adherence allowed for the continuance of the old procedure. Academic teachings, the non-participation in the every-day struggles of the working class, refusal to take the risk of going to the mass of the workers, the unthinking elements. Incidentally such a position is coincident with a greater degree of safety."

Both Parties, as such, refused to affiliate, though, in the case of the S.P. of C., a large number of its members went over to the Communist movement.

It is in the manifesto of these Parties, published since the war, that we observe the fall from the Marxian position.

In the case of the S.P.C., the only change we find is a statement in the foreword to the fifth edition of the manifesto concerning the lessons of the war with respect to the possibilities of an easy solution to working-class problems.

In the case of the S.P.G.B., their manifesto, published in 1920, is indicative of their revolutionary bankruptcy.

Not one word had altered the map of Europe which was as to the social and political changes which led to the workers of Britain to prepare them for the changed conditions confronting them. No hint of an upheaval in Eastern Europe of world significance. Nothing but a belaboring of other Socialist Parties and Labor Party members for their co-operation with the ruling class.

Correct in so far as it went, but what was the attitude of the S.P.G.B.

Then as before and during the war. An air of Olympian wisdom, of benevolent tolerance towards a working class that acted blindly but should not. A criticism of mistakes after the action had been taken. But never once a descending into the arena or the giving of a direction to the actual struggle.

Blinded to everything except the mistakes of others they were static in a world of change.

The influence of their thought is noticeable in this country, particularly amongst those who read Marx without attempting to apply Marxism to current happenings in the class struggle.

Thus we find the Communist Party criticised because it prefers that the workers of this country should obtain objective experience of

the futility of Labor Governments, operating the Capitalist State, being used for the abolition of Capitalism, by supporting the return of the Labor Party to the seat of Government. Apart from the objective lessons to be drawn from their activities whilst in office (the use of State police to arrest striking seamen is one example) it is obvious that under a Government depending for its support upon the Trade Unions, the conditions are more favorable to the development of the working class movement, than can be the case under a Government mandated to crush the militant workers.

The adopting of an apparently extreme revolutionary position, in effect a negation of revolutionary activity, which prevents the possessors from taking part in mass movements of the more backward sections of the workers for fear of besmirching the "purity" of their position; the failure to recognise that an industrial disturbance quickly develops a political aspect necessitating the broadening of the struggle so as to bring within its scope as many of the working class as possible; these things and much else demonstrate the static character of such people's Marxian knowledge. Before setting up oneself as a judge of what is revolutionary it is well to be able to demonstrate one's own revolutionary activity. Revolutionary phrases do not necessarily imply revolutionary activity or a knowledge of Marxist theory.

In these days of capitalist oppression on a world scale with the drawing of the class lines tighter and more distinct, no one claiming to be a revolutionary stays outside of the Communist International. In the struggle of the classes there is no neutral territory. Either with the Communist International for the world's workers, or with the Second International and the support of capitalism. There is no middle course, the logic of events drives the opponent of the Third into the ranks of the Second. In the days of the workers' struggle for Power the "Static" will be found upon the mountain tops crying out that "The time is not ripe."

So be it. For us the flexibility of Marxism-Leninism makes it adaptable to the ever-changing needs of the struggle. Making mistakes and benefitting by our admission thereof, fighting and perhaps losing, but in every instance the foremost in attack the rearguard in retreat."

Fragments of Australian History

By C.J.S.

America had for years been used as part of the social drainage system by the British ruling class. Africa had been tried, but the results had appalled even the casual lazy minded British politicians, and had raised an outcry from such men as Burke, so that the experiment had not

The colonisation of Australia is one of the direct consequences of the victory of the American colonists. In 1776 the British Government found itself deprived of a convenient dumping ground for those elements of the community labelled undesirable and dangerous.

been repeated. Consequently convicted criminals had been handed over to contractors who were paid so much and obtained so very much more for them by selling them to American exploiters in human flesh.

The American War put an end to this convenient arrangement. Consequently the industrial chaos in England during the latter half of the 18th century, the number of prisoners in gaols increased by hundreds. The solution of all industrial problems which appealed to British politicians was to fill the gaols with all those who were idle out of work, starving, or who had enough spirit to steal a few pence worth of food. Many were sentenced to long terms of imprisonment for poaching. That is, they had been accustomed to some sort of open air, active life. When thrown into an evil, insanitary, unless, slimy cell, chained to a wall, with not even straw on which to lie, and kept there for months on end, the filth became indescribable, and disease broke out killing them by hundreds. Their very presence became a menace to the health of the people who had thrown them there in order that they might preserve their rabbits and birds for their amusement and prevent starving men catching them for food.

Sir Joseph Banks had made a pleasure trip with Captain Cook on one of his early voyages of exploration in the South Seas, and although on his return he had said that Botany Bay was the barrenest spot on the earth, still when the question of the disposal of criminals became urgent, he suggested that Botany Bay would be just the place to send them. No action was taken for some time, until in 1783, a long carefully worked-out proposal was sent to the British Government from James Mario Matra. Matra was an American who had been a midshipman in Cook's ship in 1770 and according to Cook's Diary had been chiefly notorious for various mischievous pranks which stood him in bad stead for his future under His Majesty's Government. However, for the next 20 years he plays a worthy part as an American Loyalist, and was rewarded by the British Government for his faithful service by various badly-paid consulates and became a very disillusioned man. In 1783 he was very much worried not only about his own future, realising that he was not going to be rewarded for his years of loyalty as he had deserved, but also for the future of his fellow loyalists who had served England so faithfully in the war. He evidently had heard something of Sir Joseph Banks' suggestions to Lord Sydney, and his own proposal shows clearly the underlying forces at work.

He lays particular stress on the loss of the American colonies, and the part played by the Loyalists. He claims that a home must be found for them. "New South Wales may afford asylum to American loyalists whom Great Britain is bound by every tie of honor and gratitude to protect and support; where they may regain their broken fortunes and again enjoy their former domestic felicity."

He then points out the possibility of wealth

to Great Britain in the way of trade through Australia, China, Korea, and Japan could all be exploited for increased wealth. He also suggests that Australia would serve as a naval station against Dutch and Spanish colonies, and the colony might even serve as a basis for an invasion of South America.

These two suggestions are evidently thrown out as a sop, to make attractive the real motive that is in his mind—an asylum for his fellow countrymen.

Matra also quotes Banks in a suggestion that Chinese settlers could be got, on account of their industry and docility.

He tries to appeal to Lord Sydney's difficulties by quoting a conversation between himself and Sydney to the effect that "New South Wales would be a very proper region for the reception of criminals condemned to transportation." A few acres of land might be handed over and some tools and, "as they cannot fly, they must either work or starve." In this connection Matra refers to the transportation to Africa where he states that, during the year 1775-6, 746 criminals had been sent, of whom 334 had died, 271 deserted, and of the remainder no account could be given. This he attributes to the barrenness of the country and the unhealthy climate.

No further reference is found to the fate of Matra's proposal. It evidently found its way to the file of correspondence devoted to troublesome problems.

Two years later, Sir George Young, a naval officer, submitted a plan to the Attorney General to forward to Lord Sydney. This plan was substantially the same as Matra's. He sketches the geography of Australia. He sketches trade with America, China, the East Indies, the fact, he lays stress on the urgent necessity for some place where convicted criminals can be sent. It is apparent that the question can be coming more urgent, and that the expense of exercising the minds of English statesmen and now politicians.

In 1776 at last the experiment was taken in hand. The opinion was gaining ground that such men as felons must not be kept at the country's expense, but must be exploited for their country's wealth if possible, and at any rate disposed of for their country's good, and at any conclusion is obviously what one would expect wasters refused to work and preferred death by disease or starvation, then at least they should be removed to such a place where their death agonies would not be a nuisance to their neighboring neighbors! They must be removed out of sight, hearing, and smell, as soon as possible!

Pitt and Sydney at last decided that something must be done. The expense of the upkeep of such numbers of prisoners was worrying Pitt, but Sydney was only concerned with getting

them disposed of, and out of the country, somehow, and anyhow.

This we find to be the strain of Sydney's communication to the Lords of the Treasury in 1786. He leaves the larger questions of an American colony, of trade, of war, alone, and confines his attention to the immediate disposal of human waste. He states that His Majesty was pleased to consent to the transportation of criminals as the gaols in England are overcrowded, that escapes are feared and even rebellion. Therefore, 750 convicted felons were to be transported to Botany Bay and 200 women would be obtained from the islands of the South Seas, whose place could be taken later by women convicts. This plan of obtaining women from the islands does not appear to have been carried out, as women convicts were sent from the beginning.

The Order of Transportation was dated December 1787, and states that: "When any person is convicted for fraud or petty larceny or any other offence for which liability is to transpire, it shall be lawful for a Court before which he is convicted, to order such person to be transported beyond the seas for a term not exceeding the term liable for transportation."

Captain Phillip was appointed Governor. Sir John Phillip was appointed Governor. Sir John Phillip was appointed Governor. Sir John Phillip was appointed Governor. Sir John Phillip was appointed Governor.

Phillip was granted military powers, and the colony was to take its start as a military colony.

From this time on the historical records show a perpetual struggle between Phillip and the British Government.

Phillip's views on the treatment of the convicts can be briefly summarised. He worked on a supposition that no convict was to be trusted, and that the natural consequence of the expedition would be sickness and disease. He believed that the women convicts were dishonest, and that the women convicts were dishonest. He regarded himself being Governor of a military or navy as personally responsible for the life or death, reward or punishment of those under his rule. He stated that two crimes alone merited death—murder and adultery. For either of these crimes I would wish to confine the criminal as a prisoner to the natives of New Zealand and let them eat him.

But along with this disciplinary attitude of mind, we find a genuine care for the health and lives of the hapless men and women of whom he had charge. His correspondence shows a perpetual fight and struggle, not only with the Lords of the Treasury and the Ministers of the Crown, but also with the criminal and the lives of these carelessness and disregard for the lives of these undesirables which they showed. He did not accept the view that these ships loads of human beings were to be sent off with a display of charity and benevolence, while the only hon-

est feeling was one of relief at their departure, and an utter throwing off of responsibility as to their future. He put up a fight for their lives, and without that fight, very few of these first inhabitants of New South Wales would ever have reached these shores.

The accounts of the hideous misery on the hulks filled with these men, convicted for mostly petty offences; the wretchedness on the ships owing to the heavy, almost insupportable irons with which they were loaded; the unsuitability of the food and the shortage of it; the lack of clothing—these accounts, coupled with the later history of the cruelty, and almost unparalleled brutality with which these men and women were treated after landing by subsequent governors, give a picture which damns the colonisation of Australia in British history. Smug hypocrisy at home, the out of sight out of mind attitude, so easy to acquire for the British race, gave a license for the practice of unchecked cruelty and the indulgence of human passions of vindictiveness and greed in this remote land. Australia is splashed red on the map, stained with the blood and ringing with the groans of the working class.

In March, 1787, before the fleet had sailed, Phillip complains about the weight of the irons on the prisoners. He says that if he goes to sea with men loaded with such manacles, the ships would sink with the weight of the irons alone. He also complains that the whole expedition is fitted up with food as if it was merely a six-weeks' passage to America, not a six-months' voyage to an unknown and uninvited land, remote from any supplies, and for many months incapable of providing supplies. No flour was furnished, very little seed for sowing. Rations were regarded as consisting of salt meat, and little of that, scurvy or no scurvy. Phillip makes serious allegations of overcrowding, and states that the ships were in an appalling state of dirt. The women he complains, were not properly clothed; they were dirty, diseased, and many of them pregnant.

In April, 1787, Phillip writes to Nepean, the under-secretary, and asks him to make some representation to Lord Sydney and children were some mistake, 100 women and children were put on board the Lady Penrhyn, although that ship was only intended to carry 102, and that propriety, should not have been taken more than two-thirds of that number.

The expedition, obviously, was sent with little care, whether the convicts ever lived to see their ill-fated home. Reports are made in Phillip's despatches that no rations at all had been included for children, although a number of children had been embarked; that no medical supplies or hospital arrangements had been made; that insufficient clothing and food had been sent, and that the women and children were in a very serious neglect on the part of the British Government. Nevertheless, despite this criminal neglect, the fleet got under weigh and sailed on 15th April.

with 253 marines and 729 convicts. The fleet consisted of the Sirius, Alexander, Charlotte, Scarborough, Friendship Prince of Wales, Lady Penrhyn.

Two incidents alone mark the sailing of the Fleet as evidence that the spirit of the workers, and even those sailing as convicts was still surviving. On several ships the seamen struck and

refused to go to sea until they had been paid their wages, and allowed to go ashore before sailing. And on May 20, it is reported that the convicts on the Scarborough had formed a scheme for taking possession of the ship.

On January 26th, 1788, all the transports moored in Sydney Cove.

A Red Election.

FOR the last month or more a spectre has been haunting N.S.W., the spectre of Communism. As in the British elections, this and nothing else has been the main issue of the electoral campaign in this State. From the Premier's policy speech in the beginning to the A.L.P. "Victory Demonstration" at the end, it has held the centre of the stage. What was the opening theme of the Premier's policy speech? That the A.L.P. was Communist-ridden. What aroused so much interest in the A.L.P. "Victory Demonstration"? The question whether Communists would march in the procession and whether the Union Jack would be burned in the Domain. The platforms of all parties resounded with references to Communism and the Communist Party; from the "Herald" to the "Labor Daily" the entire daily press filled its columns with matters of revolution, Russia, Bolsheviki, Soviets, socialisation, etc.; cartoons and even photographs of our Political Secretary appeared day after day; election leaflets gave us regular mention; even the wireless told the world that Communists did march in the A.L.P. procession. In the full glare of the political limelight our Party has gone about its business of putting its message

The Communist

Monthly Journal of the Communist
Party of Australia

(Section of the Communist International)

Editor - - - - J. Kavanagh
Business Manager - - A. Baker

Postal Subscription Rates: Yearly 4/6,
Half-yearly 2/6.

Make all Money Orders and Postal Notes payable: Haymarket Post Office, Sydney. Address all Literary Matter to the Editor, and all Business Communications to the Business Manager, at 395 Sussex Street, Sydney.

A Red Mark across this space means that your subscription expires this issue.

over to the workers. Is it any wonder that we are having fine meetings, that our literature sales are increasing, that new members are joining our Party, that we are all feeling rather pleased? It has been a red election.

THE IMPERIALIST TRANSFORMATION OF DEMOCRACY

(Continued from page 11.)

ishment of an ideal standard to control the real demands of the laboring masses and the revolutionary parties.

If we look back to the historical sequence of world concepts, the theory of natural law will prove to be a paraphrase of Christian spiritualism freed from its crude mysticism. The Gospels proclaimed to the slave that he had just the same soul as the slave-owner, and in this way established the equality of all men before the heavenly tribunal. In reality, the slave remained a slave, and obedience became for him a religious duty. In the teaching of Christianity, the slave found an expression for his own ignorant protest against his degraded condition. Side by side with the protest was also the consolation. Christianity told him:—"You have an immortal soul, although you resemble a pack-horse." Here sounded the note of indignation. But the same Christianity said:—"Immortal soul has in store for it an eternal reward." Here is the voice of consolation. These two notes were found in historical Christianity in different proportions at different periods and amongst different classes. But as a whole, Christianity, like all other religions, became a method of deadening the consciousness of the oppressed masses.

Natural law, which developed into the theory of democracy, said to the worker: "all men their origin, their property, and their position, every man has an equal right in determining the fate of the people." This ideal masses in so far as it was a condemnation of the absolutism, aristocratic privilege, and the petty qualification. But the longer it went on, the more it sent the consciousness to sleep, legalising poverty, slavery and degradation; for every man has an equal right in determining the fate of the nation?

THE COMMUNIST

A JOURNAL FOR THE THEORY AND PRACTICE OF MARXISM

No. 12

MARCH 1926

3d.

"The weapon of criticism cannot, to be sure, replace the criticism of weapons, material force must be overthrown by material force; theory, however, also becomes a material force, so soon as it grips the masses."—Karl Marx.

CONTENTS

NOTES OF THE MONTH
THE CRIMES BILL
CLASS JUSTICE

---By R.P.D.

EGYPT AT THE CROSS ROADS

---By J. Crossley

EVOLUTIONARY SOCIOLOGY

MARX & MORGAN

---By G. Winter

HANDS OFF CHINA

"Our theory is not a dogma, but a guide to action." F. Engels.

"Without a revolutionary theory, a revolutionary movement is impossible. . . . A party can play the role of a vanguard, only if it is guided by a vanguard theory."—V. I. Lenin.

Notes of the Month

The Crimes Bill.

Labor Leader's Hypocrisy—Imperialism—The Danger to the Opportunists—The Need for Organisation—Constitutional Methods and the Paris Commune—The Vengeance of Private Property—Organise in Defence of Working-class Interests—The Disarmament Conference—Anti-Russian Propaganda—Fake Disarmament.

The discussion upon the Crimes Bill now before the Federal House shows up in full relief the peculiar character of Australian political life. Peculiar in the sense that it provides more outstanding examples of traitorous action on the part of Labor opportunists than probably any other country in the world.

Traitors who have left the Labor Movement to appear openly as capitalist imperialists, and traitors who are still in the Labor Movement under the guise of representatives of Labor.

A condition, the existence of which betokens an apathy and indifference on the part of the Australian working-class.

The only opposition put forward to the enactment of this measure intended to crush the workers is apparently based upon a trade union viewpoint. But only apparently. The attack upon the Crimes Bill is so weak, its absence of a real working-class opposition so marked, that the Bruce Government is being practically assured in advance that, providing the Act does not interfere with peaceful unions which adhere rigidly to industrial court rulings, no attempt is to be made to oppose the law in practice.

The leaders of all parties are quite in accord on the matter of suppressing the Communist Party together with all other militants.

Mr. Charlton desires to know why such power as is now possessed by the Federal authorities has not been utilised for that purpose prior to this.

Mr. Charlton is Parliamentary Leader of a party having as its objective the socialisation of industry. That does not prevent him from desiring to deport, jail, or otherwise suppress any organisation opposed to our Empire. In this he is supported by a considerable number of his colleagues.

As an indication of stupidity or chicanery, or both, it is difficult to excel.

Imperialism and empires are based upon the subjugation and exploitation of the masses of the peoples—including the members of the working class belonging to the dominating nations. Rendered possible in its inception by the surplus values wrung from its native working class, the empire, as such, ultimately rests upon the continued exploitation and oppression of the workers in the various colonies and spheres of influence.

Out of the wealth accruing from the exploited of the empire the central State power is maintained, strengthened, and increased.

To speak of the socialisation of industry, with its consequent elimination of the source of imperialist State power, whilst concurring and supporting the continued existence of such a power, is to betray a sycophant attitude towards the ruling class, and a lip service to the needs of the workers only to be found in a Labor opportunist.

It is not, however, because the Communists and other militants are a possible immediate source of danger to "our Empire" that Messrs. Charlton, McCormack, Theodore and Lang, not to mention the lesser lights of the same kidney, are so desirous of having them crushed.

It is because the trade unions of this and other countries only really function in proportion to the number of militant workers in the unions.

So long as the unions are content to be led by the nose to the industrial courts for an adjudication as to the conditions under which they must live and work—so long as they are content to wait from one election period to another, and depend upon Parliament for redress in economic and political affairs.

So long as this ideology is prevalent amongst the workers the parliamentary opportunist, the arbitration court frequenter, the constitutional labor official—all are assured a continuance of a meal ticket at the expense of the Labor Movement.

When, however, as a result of the activities of the militant elements of the Labor Movement a demand arises for organisational resistance to the encroachments of the employers and their henchmen, the position of these half and half leaders of the working class becomes exceedingly insecure.

Appropos of the condition in Australia, Mr. John Turner, one of the British Trade Union delegation to Soviet Russia, said, in answer to a query, that one class did not necessarily dominate the parliamentary machinery, as he knew of several Labor Governments who governed in the interests of capitalism just as well as any party of the capitalist class.

The Australian Labor Party through its representatives is pursuing the same policy of

class collaboration, is giving the lead for an attack upon the militant workers of this country, in exactly the same manner that Ramsay try, in exactly the same manner that Ramsay MacDonald and the Labor imperialists of Great Britain gave the lead to the Baldwin Government for the suppression of the British Communist Party.

Despite the assurances of the Bruce Government that the Bill is not aimed at the unions it implies in effect, only such unions that have become completely emasculated and no longer attempt to function as part of the working-class movement.

Another step is to be taken to more completely identify Australia with the servile State. Procrastination, under certain conditions, becomes more than the thief of time. It becomes a weakening factor in the workers' resistance to oppression.

It is futile and dangerous to rely upon Parliament or Parliamentary representatives staging any struggle against the forces about to be launched against the working class.

From out of the unions must come the demand, the will, and the energy to weld together an organisation for the protection of the workers against the forces of reaction.

In view of all the belaboring of the constitution, constitutional methods, and the desisting of any attempt to organise the workers crying of any attempt to recall that on a class basis, it is opportune to recall that the 18th day of this month marks the 55th anniversary of that glorious episode in the history of the workers of Paris—the inception of the Paris Commune.

The lessons drawn from which experience was utilised to the full by the Bolshevik Party of Russia between March and November, 1917.

It is well that the workers of Australia should be afflicted with an instrument of class oppression more far-reaching than any yet experienced, should also draw some lessons from the Paris Commune.

Arising out of a nationalist spirit in the first instance, developing—with the traitorous and oppressive manoeuvres of the bourgeoisie—into a proletarian movement, the Commune of Paris marked the first serious attempt of the modern working class to seize power.

Contrary to the bloodthirsty and mendacious reports appearing in the press of that period, the workers of Paris took possession of the city in order to prevent the Government of France from surrendering Paris to the German Army then on the outskirts of the city.

It was not an act of betrayal, but on the contrary the deposition of the traitors to France.

For over two months, the working class of Paris conducted the affairs of the city. Robberies were unknown, prostitutes had vanished—they and their madmen together with the other degenerates of Paris having gone to Versailles with their masters.

Everything was done in a thorough democratic manner, a manner suitable to even Ramsay MacDonald or Mr. Charlton.

The same lying, scurrilous and venomous campaign was carried on against the workers of Paris, as has since 1917 been carried on against the workers of Russia.

The workers of Paris were not Communists. They did not seize the gold in the banks. They refrained so far as possible from destroying the capitalist institutions that existed, but born out of the very life of the struggle itself emerged the embryo of the Workers' State. The right of private property was challenged, and within three months from the inception of the Commune 30,000 of the working class of Paris were butchered, in order that the venom of the bourgeoisie of France, whose great God Property had been insulted, might be appeased.

The threat to the continued supremacy of capitalist property whether attempted constitutionally or otherwise, meets with the same resistance.

In fact the worker only acts in an unconstitutional manner when he has found out by long and painful experience that his efforts in that direction are abortive.

In view of the reports re Bolshevik gold coming to this country, and the hypocritical indignation of the middle-class morons, it is well to remember, as an act of international unity of the capitalist class, that Bismark released 87,000 French soldiers, prisoners of war, in order that they might be used to massacre the working class of Paris in the interest of the capitalist masters.

No one in the Communist Party is desirous of taking any action bringing in its train chaos and disorder. No one in the Party desires to plunge the country into civil war. We would so order things, if possible, that no one hair of a worker's head should be harmed. The others can look after themselves.

But things are not as we would wish.

On the contrary we are faced with prospects of reaction blacker than any yet experienced. If the workers are not prepared to allow themselves to be beaten into a docile, hopeless mass, it is necessary that the necessary organisational steps be taken to bring into being a militant movement of the working class, with correct leadership, could be made into a movement capable of resisting both the "constitutional" reaction of Mr. Bruce, or the thug reaction of Mr. McCormack. A movement that, drawing the correct lessons from the struggles of the past, would be capable of carrying out its historic mission, the emancipation of society from capitalism in any manner that the conditions of the period predicated.

Mr. Austen Chamberlain, the Deus Machina of the Locarno Pact is now accusing Soviet Russia of spoiling the fake disarmament conference at Geneva. His remarks are echoed and elaborated upon by the press agents of imperialism in this country.

Russia is accused of being the marplot—the evil genius who is compelling all these peace-

loving freebooters to maintain their present show of armaments.

The officials of the Soviet Government very correctly refuse to take part in any conference held in Switzerland, despite the guarantees of protection offered by the Swiss Government. The last time a representative of Soviet Russia was in that country he was foully murdered by a degenerate White Guardist. The Swiss Government allowed the murderer to escape on his grandstand plea of patriotic fervor.

This talk of disarmament is nothing but a cloak under cover of which the relative strength of opposing forces is carefully felt out. To disarm means to remove the basic power of every State. The embodiment of the State is the soldier-armed force.

The function of the capitalist State is to preserve and further the common interests of the

capitalist class. This consists in the protection of the rights of private property, whether it be from outside forces or from its wage-slaves at home.

So long as capitalism remains the expenses of armaments will increase, despite the protest of Quaker exploiters as to the horrors of war, or the moans of the parasites of the earth over the size of their tax accounts.

Only after the formation of a world federation of Soviet Republics will it be possible to dispense with the instruments of coercion—instruments which came into being together with human slavery—which have expanded and improved with the development of slavery, and which will be cast upon the scrapheap following the abolition of capitalism, the last of the slave systems.

CLASS JUSTICE.

Historic Trials—Awakening to the Fight—The Old Drugs—The Class Issue—Challenging the Rules—A Specimen Discussion—The Maiden Aunts—The "Permanent Government" in Capitalist Democracy—Capitalism—"A Fair Trial"—With Exceptions—Class Laws—An Act of Class Struggle—Suppressing Strikes—"Rioting"—Humbug of Capitalist "Free Speech"—Liberal Lamentations—Mr. MacDonald's Role—Workers and Free Speech.

The British bourgeoisie is teaching the Class War to the British working class. The historic trials at the Old Bailey and in South Wales, the declaration of the Communist Party as illegal, the open organisation of strike-breaking by the Government, the ugly signs of the preparation of violence against the working class, the obvious complicity of Fascism, the police and the whole State apparatus, the incitement by repeated acquittals to extended hoodliganism against the whole working class movement, all these are teaching more rapidly and universally than any agitators could do the reality of the Class State and the Class Struggle. They are opening the eyes of thousands of sincere workers, and demonstrating the truth of what the revolutionaries have always said, that once the struggle reaches a certain point and scale, once the working class achieves a measure of advance, then without hesitation the ruling class will throw off the pretence of reason and democracy, and demonstrate with cynical clearness that Force, Force, Force is their real answer to the aspirations of the working class. The rags of British Democracy are being rent in the storm of the approaching struggle, and the nakedness of Class Violence and Class Exploitation is showing more and more clearly through. When this stage has been reached even in

Britain, the home of democratic hypocrisy, then it is becoming clear to all that a whole historical epoch is finally ended—the epoch of Liberal Capitalism, and the last stage is coming close at hand.

Like a man who has been blindfolded and gagged by tricksters, like a man who has been dragged by sharpers and at the last instant awakens and battles to consciousness to face his assailant, so to-day at the eleventh hour the British working class is awakening to the fight in front. All the lies that have been instilled, Liberal progress, and dreams of easy victories and stark realities of class suppression and a struggle to be faced are standing out. Yesterday it was the illusion of gradual progress and improvement of conditions under Capitalism that was shattered by the blows of free speech and democracy that is being shattered. The indignation at the facts of political persecution and class justice has been intense, though the blows of anger have still fallen but feebly on the antiquity of a Home Secretary or the nakedness of the Class State itself. The response of the whole working class movement to the Government's attack has been deep widespread and

sincere. The atmosphere of Liverpool has vanished. The working class movement has shown the will to drop the illusions of the past and face the realities of the present.

But the sharpers are still busy. They are still offering the same drug, offering a touch more of the same drug as a cure for the effects of the last. For the guns and the goals of the Government, they offer—a Parliamentary debate. "To-day," declares the "Daily Herald" editorial proudly, "their trickery will be exposed, and a fresh stone set on the road of Free Speech, a stone which history will certainly not forget." The stone has been set: Is anyone the better for it? Is an atom of the situation changed? The Twelve remain in prison. Fascism and the Government preparations go on. The sharpers declare that British Liberty, that spotless virgin, has once again been violated. No doubt: what then do they propose to do about it? They will cast imprecations on the villain of the piece; they will declare that an insignificant half-wit who happens to occupy the puppet position of Home Secretary is the guilty man, who has betrayed the traditions of British liberty and justice. They will arraign the political partiality of the judge. They will attack the mustiness of the legal blunderbuss that has been put in operation. They will accuse the Government of allowing "political prejudice" to stand in the way of "real regard for the impartial administration of justice." Nay, they will even admit that their faith in capitalist justice and democracy is sadly shaken. "Sometimes," declares Mr. MacDonald, "one is almost tempted to go over the borderline because of the unequal administration of justice." "There is one law for the rich and another for the poor," affirms Mr. Clynes. "Political Democracy is a farce" alleges the I.L.P., "unless the rights of freedom of speech, meeting and association are maintained. And what then? These protests do not ring clear, because they, any facing of the alternative, any recognition that what has taken place is not an accident of personalities, but the necessary working of capitalist justice and capitalist democracy, and that the only answer and defence lies, not in appeals to the hoary crises of "British Liberty" but in the strength and action of the working class.

It is necessary to take a little more seriously the issue raised by the Government's attack. In every collapse of capitalist democracy, as the sharpening of the class struggle inevitably leads to open class dictatorship, the democrats always find excuse and refuge, in some accident, in some person, in some theories and the disappearance of democratic "liberty." But a more serious political view will recognise that these incidents are of very secondary importance, and that the real issue is the class issue itself. It is not a question of an ancient law, a partial judge or a peculiar Home Secretary.

If there had been no Act of 1797, the trial would still have taken place (as the Attorney-General was able to point out, the charge of "incitement to mutiny" does, in fact, fall under the Common Law). If there had been no Mr. Justice Swift, another judge would have done the job. If there were no Joynson-Hicks or even no Tory Government—if necessary, a Labor another Government—would have carried out the Government—would have carried out the prosecution. Capitalist Class Justice consists, not in the maladministration of the law, but in the Law itself. The real basis of Capitalist Democracy consists in capitalist class rule and coercion. If that coercion is accepted, then "freedom to discuss," provided that coercion is not challenged, is permitted. The crime of the Communist Party consists in having challenged the basis.

In a game of chess two men are playing. One has all the pieces in full. The other has only a pawn to defend his king. In all other respects the conditions are strictly equal. Elapsed regulations are framed to safeguard the equal rights of each. Expensive timepieces are set to secure that each shall have his exact three minutes a move. Attendants are present to see that there shall be no foul play. It is a contest of pure reason, of brain power. If the man with the pawn can play skilfully enough to win, he is informed; his opponent assures him will be awarded him; the full prize of victory will be awarded him; in his word of honor as a gentleman of this on his word of honor as a gentleman. Some few malignants suggest that the prize will not be awarded him if he should win; but the man with the pawn rightly discounts these crudely suspicious notions. Patiently and wearily the man with the pawn plays on and on; he is defeated again and again. At length he starts up in indignation: "I challenge the rules," he declares, "let us first make our pieces equal, and then we can talk about an equal game and the combat of reason." For answer his gentleman opponent smiles contemptuously and—produces a revolver.

Let us continue the parable. The man turns round in surprise: the attendants have also covered him with revolvers. "So?" says he. "I thought this was a contest of pure reason?" "Certainly," says his opponent, "but the rules of the game must be my own cause, but for the revolver, not in my own cause." "Why, then, defence and honor of a revolver for the defence supposing I draw a revolver for the defence and honor of my new game, seeing you have drawn yours for your old one?" "I will have You will be performing a selfish interest to get anti-social act: first, because you will be acting lawlessly in your own selfish interest to get more pieces, and not as I do, lawfully in defence of the game; and second, because you will be abandoning the basis of reason of our game and appealing to violence, which is beastly, inhuman, futile, condemned by all rightly thinking men, whatever our opinions, and a reversion to the morality of the Stone Age. Besides, I have seen to it that you have no

revolver." "Then, you common fraud," shouts the man, rising up in rage (for he has now lost all faith in the gentlemanliness of his opponent). "I shall appeal to the attendants to be men and turn against you, and stand by me and honesty." "In that case, you dog," whips out his opponent, showing the first sign of rage and fear, "I will shoot you at sight for endeavoring to corrupt the attendants from their duty." "But," pleads the man, in one last desperate attempt at argument before the fight begins, "supposing I want to change the rules of the game peacefully, what can I do?" "Certainly you can," returns the other with a smile of relief at the reversion to reason; "but you must do it in an orderly manner; you have only to win one game, and then you can establish what rules you like." "But if I cannot win under the present rules, and wish to change the rules, what then? What is the rational answer to that?" "The answer?" returns the other quietly, "the answer is a revolver."

And this is the precise point in the dialectic of democracy that the Labor Movement is reaching. The Labor Movement is discovering the revolver in the background.

One last touch remains to add to the picture. The man has a number of maiden aunts, who have always fussed round him a good deal and urged him on to this game of chess as the sure path to fame and fortune. These are thrown into great perturbation by the production of the revolver and the ugly scenes which are beginning to threaten. With a great flapping and fluttering they declare that all the decency and nobility of the grand old game of chess is being ruined. They plead with their nephew not to be so provocative, but to abide by the rules like a gentleman; if he fails to do so, and continues on his present path, they will have to disown him. Then on behalf of their nephew, while making clear that they do not in any way agree with him, they deliver a heavy broadside of words against his opponent as the really guilty person for having precipitated the crisis. They do not protest against the revolver; they make that quite clear; they recognize that a revolver is the necessary basis of a game of chess. But it should not be shown so openly—that is the point—not at least until the situation is really grave; not until the nephew has made some effort at action, such as will have to be quelled by the revolver; so far their poor nephew has only talked; they point out, and the revolver should not yet be prematurely brandished, as that only destroys his faith in the game. Finally, they urge their nephew to meet the revolver in the only dignified, humane and effective way—namely, with his pawn.

"The Government of this country," declared the Judge in his summing up, "is not Conservative or Labor; it is not Mr. Ramsay MacDonald or Mr. Baldwin of whom we are thinking when we speak of the Government of this country. We speak of government by 'the King in Par-

liament' that permanent Government which is going on the whole time. Governments fall frequently, but when we talk of the overthrow of the Government, what is meant is a complete change of the Constitution, the abolition of the King and of the House of Commons, and the substitution of some form of government by a committee of the workers. The jury must bear that in mind when studying the documents, and when making up their minds whether or not they do in fact tend to the overthrow of the Government." The Judge could not have put the point more precisely. The real Government in Capitalist Democracy is not Mr. Baldwin or Mr. MacDonald—that is a matter of complete indifference, and none would turn a hair at their overthrow; the real Government is "that permanent Government which is going on the whole time"; and the crime of sedition, at which all the boasted "free speech," reasonable argument, discussion and the rest of it comes to an end and is suddenly replaced by the gaoler's turnkey and the end of a gun, is the crime of daring to question that "permanent government" of daring to look past the puppet Prime Ministers on whose alternative virtues all orthodox, dutiful, permitted "free" political agitation should be centred, and instead fixing on and challenging that "permanent Government" which is the real government in Capitalist Democracy which maintains itself by force of arms and no more allows its right to be questioned than any other autocracy. And what is that mysterious "permanent Government"? The judge in tones of high mystery endeavored to explain it in the impressive and adoring phrase "what we speak of as Government by 'the King in Parliament,'" much as if he was saying, "Government by the Blessed Virgin" or "Government by the Holy Trinity." But the reality is not so mysterious or ineffable, if we choose to examine it. The "permanent government" in Capitalist Democracy is not difficult to discover, if its actual plain working in the whole social and political system, in every corner of the land, bureaucratic and military machine, is examined. The "permanent government" which is going on all the time" in Capitalist Democracy is—Capitalism.

Capitalism is the framework of Capitalist Democracy, and the offence against Capitalist Democracy is the offence against Capitalism. Every thing will be permitted, except to attack that framework. Every dream of the most impossible and beautiful future society is permitted, so long as for the present in fact the actual State, i.e., Capitalism, is accepted. To accept Capitalist Democracy means in the legends upon which aspiring workers are brought up, to accept the reign of peace and freedom and equality and the people's rule, to put all trust in the golden voice of reason and to build upon the solid rock of conviction. But to accept Capitalist Democracy means in fact, as every Labor Minister has soon dis-

covered, to accept and become the instrument of Capitalism and all its daily violence and tyranny; to be ruled, not by a very precise "voice of the people," but by a very precise and explicit system of laws, rules, codes, practice and routine, all of which are nothing but the voice of Capitalism writ large in a mist of fine language and archaic ritual. The fight against Capitalism inevitably becomes a fight against Capitalist Democracy. The working class struggle against Capitalism invariably comes again and again into conflict with the legality of Capitalist Democracy, because the whole legal system of Capitalist Democracy is the expression of Capitalist Class rule. The Communists are in prison, not because they have "theories of violence," but because they have proclaimed Socialism against Capitalism, and have dared to challenge the system of Capitalist Class coercion and dictatorship which is the reality of Capitalist Democracy.

* * *

"It was a fair trial." At least so says the capitalist press, which is a good judge of fairness. And so it was a fair trial—according to capitalist notions. For since the Law is Capitalist and Capitalism is the Law, then it is possible to exercise the most scrupulous and tedious process of fairness to the working class victims caught in it, and still amazingly find them in the wrong every time: it is possible to evict workers, to drive their families into the street, to ruin them and rob them, to club them when they plead their case, to order them to shoot one another, and if there is the slightest opposition to any of these acts and orders, in then it is crime, felony, treason, illegality, in then it is crime, and lawless violence on the part of the workers.

It is not surprising, therefore, that the capitalist press should comment with pride on the conspicuous fairness and impartiality of capitalist justice, as compared with the vulgar bias and partisanship of the Soviet rule; where the workers are the judges and the exploiting minority get the bad time, where actual rich men are frequently sent to prison for the crime of robbing the workers, instead of poor men for the crime of stealing a loaf for their families, and where the workers have a right to shelter and livelihood instead of being sentenced for the crime of lacking them. It is not surprising that the capitalist press should call attention to the enjoyable position of the English workers, who, instead of being tried by their fellow workers of the factory, comrades in plain language or plain issues of comradeship, have the privilege of being tried by members of the governing class in archaic language and incomprehensible ritual. It is not surprising, finally, that the capitalist press should call attention to the remarkable and notorious leniency of capitalist rule (so frequently exemplified in India, Iraq and Ireland under the Black and Tans), which has actually so far refrained from sentencing these audacious young men to death, despite the years of civil war that have been raging in this country.

"It was a fair trial." It is true the judge happened to be an ex-Tory Member of Parliament, who had been unseated by a Labor representative; but this was an accident, and made no difference to his complete freedom from class outlook. It is true the Conservative Party openly dictated the sentence before the Home Secretary predicted the sentence beforehand; but these were, as "The Times" correctly pointed out, "indiscretions," and should not be allowed to create a wrong impression. It is true the jury did not apparently contain a single Labor representative, despite Labor now constituting a third of the electorate; but this was mere chance of the ballot and should only be treated as such. "The jury," declared "The Times" with regard to them, "may be taken to represent the statistically correct representation of the 'normal citizens of this country.' It is true that a statistically correct representation of the 'normal citizens of this country' should, as a mere matter of arithmetic, contain at least nine or ten laborers and operatives out of the twelve; but this is a sordid and scientific view, which actually treats common people as existing, and forgets that for 'The Times' all right thinking people the 'normal citizens of this country' consist of one-tenth of the population." Finally, the defendants were actually allowed to speak for a number of hours before their sentence without being clubbed on the head for it. It is true that every time they wished to make a single reference to any really important facts, such as the politics of the case, the role of the Conservative Party, the secret police, the Fascist outrages, and the illegal arming and utterances of their prosecutors, they were rapidly stopped by the judge with the comment that such matters were "irrelevant"; but this was not any exhibition of class bias, but purely fidelity to the Law.

* * *

It is the Law itself that is the expression of Class Justice under Capitalist Democracy. All the class-bias of the agents is incidental, though inevitable. The upper class training of the judges and lawyers, the power of gold and the powerlessness of poverty, the private bourgeois influences on trials and sentences, the commercialisation of the whole procedure, the recurrent scandals which arouse opinion from time to time at some ugly case of leniency to the rich and severity to the poor, and actual stretching of the law, all these are but inevitable outgrowths and symptoms of the whole system. Were the agents as new-born babes, and as free from bias as the same. For the essential results would be the same. For the agents are not free agents; they are agents of the Law, and the Law in a Class State is the Law, and the Law is the Law in capitalism. The codification of capitalist society is the codification of the necessary rights of property and of the necessary oppression of the working class. This is the reality of Capitalist Justice because all the smug assumptions of fairness and equality. Capitalist Justice differs from Proletarian Justice in its transition Proletarian State above all in its hypocrisy, that it denies its class character and

loving freebooters to maintain their present show of armaments.

The officials of the Soviet Government very correctly refuse to take part in any conference held in Switzerland, despite the guarantees of protection offered by the Swiss Government. The last time a representative of Soviet Russia was in that country he was foully murdered by a degenerate White Guardist. The Swiss Government allowed the murderer to escape on his grandstand plea of patriotic fervor.

This talk of disarmament is nothing but a cloak under cover of which the relative strength of opposing forces is carefully felt out. To disarm means to remove the basic power of every State. The embodiment of the State is the soldier-armed force.

The function of the capitalist State is to preserve and further the common interests of the

capitalist class. This consists in the protection of the rights of private property, whether it be from outside forces or from its wage-slaves at home.

So long as capitalism remains the expenses of armaments will increase, despite the protest of Quaker exploiters as to the horrors of war, or the moans of the parasites of the earth over the size of their tax accounts.

Only after the formation of a world federation of Soviet Republics will it be possible to dispense with the instruments of coercion—instruments which came into being together with human slavery—which have expanded and improved with the development of slavery, and which will be cast upon the scrapheap following the abolition of capitalism, the last of the slave systems.

CLASS JUSTICE.

Historic Trials—Awakening to the Fight—The Old Drugs—The Class Issue—Challenging the Rules—A Specimen Discussion—The Maiden Aunts—The "Permanent Government" in Capitalist Democracy—Capitalism—"A Fair Trial"—With Exceptions—Class Laws—An Act of Class Struggle—Suppressing Strikes—"Rioting"—Humbug of Capitalist "Free Speech"—Liberal Lamentations—Mr. MacDonald's Role—Workers and Free Speech.

The British bourgeoisie is teaching the Class War to the British working class. The historic trials at the Old Bailey and in South Wales, the declaration of the Communist Party as illegal, the open organisation of strike-breaking by the Government, the ugly signs of the preparation of violence against the working class, the obvious complicity of Fascism, the police and the whole State apparatus, the incitement by repeated acquittals to extended hoodliganism against the whole working class movement, all these are teaching more rapidly and universally than any agitators could do the reality of the Class State and the Class Struggle. They are opening the eyes of thousands of sincere workers, and demonstrating the truth of what the revolutionaries have always said, that once the struggle reaches a certain point and scale, once the working class achieves a measure of advance, then without hesitation the ruling class will throw off the pretence of reason and democracy, and demonstrate with cynical clearness that Force, Force, Force is their real answer to the aspirations of the working class. The rags of British Democracy are being rent in the storm of the approaching struggle, and the nakedness of Class Violence and Class Exploitation is showing more and more clearly through. When this stage has been reached even in

Britain, the home of democratic hypocrisy, then it is becoming clear to all that a whole historical epoch is finally ended—the epoch of Liberal Capitalism, and the last stage is coming close at hand.

Like a man who has been blindfolded and gagged by tricksters, like a man who has been dragged by sharpers and at the last instant awakens and battles to consciousness to face his assailant, so to-day at the eleventh hour the British working class is awakening to the fight in front. All the lies that have been instilled, Liberal progress, and dreams of easy victories and stark realities of class suppression and a struggle to be faced are standing out. Yesterday it was the illusion of gradual progress and improvement of conditions under Capitalism that was shattered by the blows of free speech and democracy that is being shattered. The indignation at the facts of political persecution and class justice has been intense, though the blows of anger have still fallen but feebly on the antiquity of a Home Secretary or the nakedness of the Class State itself. The response of the whole working class movement to the Government's attack has been deep widespread and

sincere. The atmosphere of Liverpool has vanished. The working class movement has shown the will to drop the illusions of the past and face the realities of the present.

But the sharpers are still busy. They are still offering the same drug, offering a touch more of the same drug as a cure for the effects of the last. For the guns and the goals of the Government, they offer—a Parliamentary debate. "To-day," declares the "Daily Herald" editorial proudly, "their trickery will be exposed, and a fresh stone set on the road of Free Speech, a stone which history will certainly not forget." The stone has been set: Is anyone the better for it? Is an atom of the situation changed? The Twelve remain in prison. Fascism and the Government preparations go on. The sharpers declare that British Liberty, that spotless virgin, has once again been violated. No doubt; what then do they propose to do about it? They will cast imprecations on the villain of the piece; they will declare that an insignificant half-wit who happens to occupy the puppet position of Home Secretary is the guilty man, who has betrayed the traditions of British liberty and justice. They will arraign the political partiality of the judge. They will attack the mustiness of the legal blunderbuss that has been put in operation. They will accuse the Government of allowing "political prejudice" to stand in the way of "real regard for the impartial administration of justice." Nay, they will even admit that their faith in capitalist justice and democracy is sadly shaken. "Sometimes," declares Mr. MacDonald, "one is almost tempted to go over the borderline because of the unequal administration of justice." "There is one law for the rich and another for the poor," affirms Mr. Clynes. "Political Democracy is a farce" alleges the I.L.P., "unless the rights of freedom of speech, meeting and association are maintained. And what then? These protests do not ring clear, because they, any facing of the alternative, any recognition that what has taken place is not an accident of personalities, but the necessary working of capitalist justice and capitalist democracy, and that the only answer and defence lies, not in appeals to the hoary crises of "British Liberty" but in the strength and action of the working class.

It is necessary to take a little more seriously the issue raised by the Government's attack. In every collapse of capitalist democracy, as the sharpening of the class struggle inevitably leads to open class dictatorship, the democrats always find excuse and refuge, in some accident, in some person, in some theories and the disappearance of democratic "liberty." But a more serious political view will recognise that all these incidents are of very secondary importance, and that the real issue is the class issue itself. It is not a question of an ancient law, a partial judge or a peculiar Home Secretary.

If there had been no Act of 1797, the trial would still have taken place (as the Attorney-General was able to point out, the charge of "incitement to mutiny" does, in fact, fall under the Common Law). If there had been no Mr. Justice Swift, another judge would have done the job. If there were no Joynson-Hicks or even no Tory Government—if necessary, a Labor another Government—would have carried out the Government—would have carried out the prosecution. Capitalist Class Justice consists, not in the maladministration of the law, but in the Law itself. The real basis of Capitalist Democracy consists in capitalist class rule and coercion. If that coercion is accepted, then "freedom to discuss," provided that coercion is not challenged, is permitted. The crime of the Communist Party consists in having challenged the basis.

In a game of chess two men are playing. One has all the pieces in full. The other has only a pawn to defend his king. In all other respects the conditions are strictly equal. Elapsed regulations are framed to safeguard the equal rights of each. Expensive timepieces are set to secure that each shall have his exact three minutes a move. Attendants are present to see that there shall be no foul play. It is a contest of pure reason, of brain power. If the man with the pawn can play skilfully enough to win, he is informed; his opponent assures him will be awarded him; the full prize of victory will be awarded him; in his word of honor as a gentleman of this on his word of honor as a gentleman. Some few malignants suggest that the prize will not be awarded him if he should win; but the man with the pawn rightly discounts these crudely suspicious notions. Patiently and wearily the man with the pawn plays on and on; he is defeated again and again. At length he starts up in indignation: "I challenge the rules," he declares, "let us first make our pieces equal, and then we can talk about an equal game and the combat of reason." For answer his gentleman opponent smiles contemptuously and—produces a revolver.

Let us continue the parable. The man turns round in surprise: the attendants have also covered him with revolvers. "So?" says he. "I thought this was a contest of pure reason?" "Certainly," says his opponent, "but the rules of the game must be my own cause, but for the revolver, not in my own cause." "Why, then, defence and honor of a revolver for the defence supposing I draw a revolver for the defence and honor of my new game, seeing you have drawn yours for your old one?" "I will have you arrested at once for a selfish, violent and anti-social act: first, because you will be acting lawlessly in your own selfish interest to get pieces, and not as I do, lawfully in defence of the game; and second, because you will be abandoning the basis of reason of our game and appealing to violence, which is beastly, inhuman, futile, condemned by all rightly thinking men, whatever our opinions, and a reversion to the morality of the Stone Age. Besides, I have seen to it that you have no

revolver." "Then, you common fraud," shouts the man, rising up in rage (for he has now lost all faith in the gentlemanliness of his opponent). "I shall appeal to the attendants to be men and turn against you, and stand by me and honesty." "In that case, you dog," whips out his opponent, showing the first sign of rage and fear, "I will shoot you at sight for endeavoring to corrupt the attendants from their duty." "But," pleads the man, in one last desperate attempt at argument before the fight begins, "supposing I want to change the rules of the game peacefully, what can I do?" "Certainly you can," returns the other with a smile of relief at the reversion to reason; "but you must do it in an orderly manner; you have only to win one game, and then you can establish what rules you like." "But if I cannot win under the present rules, and wish to change the rules, what then? What is the rational answer to that?" "The answer?" returns the other quietly, "the answer is a revolver."

And this is the precise point in the dialectic of democracy that the Labor Movement is reaching. The Labor Movement is discovering the revolver in the background.

One last touch remains to add to the picture. The man has a number of maiden aunts, who have always fussed round him a good deal and urged him on to this game of chess as the sure path to fame and fortune. These are thrown into great perturbation by the production of the revolver and the ugly scenes which are beginning to threaten. With a great flapping and fluttering they declare that all the decency and nobility of the grand old game of chess is being ruined. They plead with their nephew not to be so provocative, but to abide by the rules like a gentleman; if he fails to do so, and continues on his present path, they will have to disown him. Then on behalf of their nephew, while making clear that they do not in any way agree with him, they deliver a heavy broadside of words against his opponent as the really guilty person for having precipitated the crisis. They do not protest against the revolver; they make that quite clear; they recognise that a revolver is the necessary basis of a game of chess. But it should not be shown so openly—that is the point—not at least until the situation is really grave; not until the nephew has made some effort at action, such as will have to be quelled by the revolver; so far their poor nephew has only talked; they point out, and the revolver should not yet be prematurely brandished, as that only destroys his faith in the game. Finally, they urge their nephew to meet the revolver in the only dignified, humane and effective way—namely, with his pawn.

"The Government of this country," declared the Judge in his summing up, "is not Conservative or Labor; it is not Mr. Ramsay MacDonald or Mr. Baldwin of whom we are thinking when we speak of the Government of this country. We speak of government by 'the King in Par-

liament' that permanent Government which is going on the whole time. Governments fall frequently, but when we talk of the overthrow of the Government, what is meant is a complete change of the Constitution, the abolition of the King and of the House of Commons, and the substitution of some form of government by a committee of the workers. The jury must bear that in mind when studying the documents, and when making up their minds whether or not they do in fact tend to the overthrow of the Government." The Judge could not have put the point more precisely. The real Government in Capitalist Democracy is not Mr. Baldwin or Mr. MacDonald—that is a matter of complete indifference, and none would turn a hair at their overthrow; the real Government is "that permanent Government which is going on the whole time"; and the crime of sedition, at which all the boasted "free speech," reasonable argument, discussion and the rest of it comes to an end and is suddenly replaced by the gaoler's turnkey and the end of a gun, is the crime of daring to question that "permanent government" of daring to look past the puppet Prime Ministers on whose alternative virtues all orthodox, dutiful, permitted "free" political agitation should be centred, and instead fixing on and challenging that "permanent Government" which is the real government in Capitalist Democracy, which maintains itself by force of arms and no more allows its right to be questioned than any other autocracy. And what is that mysterious "permanent Government"? The judge in tones of high mystery endeavored to explain it in the impressive and adoring phrase "what we speak of as Government by 'the King in Parliament,'" much as if he was saying, "Government by the Blessed Virgin" or "Government by the Holy Trinity." But the reality is not so mysterious or ineffable, if we choose to examine it. The "permanent government" in Capitalist Democracy is not difficult to discover, if its actual plain working in the whole social and political system, in every corner of the land, bureaucratic and military machine, is examined. The "permanent government which is going on all the time" in Capitalist Democracy is—Capitalism.

Capitalism is the framework of Capitalist Democracy, and the offence against Capitalist Democracy is the offence against Capitalism. Every thing will be permitted, except to attack that framework. Every dream of the most impossible and beautiful future society is permitted, so long as for the present in fact the actual State, i.e., Capitalism, is accepted. To accept Capitalist Democracy means, in the legends upon which aspiring workers are brought up, to accept the reign of peace and freedom and equality and the people's rule, to put all trust in the golden voice of reason and to build upon the solid rock of conviction. But to accept Capitalist Democracy means in fact, as every Labor Minister has soon dis-

covered, to accept and become the instrument of Capitalism and all its daily violence and tyranny; to be ruled, not by a very precise "voice of the people," but by a very precise and explicit system of laws, rules, codes, practice and routine, all of which are nothing but the voice of Capitalism writ large in a mist of fine language and archaic ritual. The fight against Capitalism inevitably becomes a fight against Capitalist Democracy. The working class struggle against Capitalism invariably comes again and again into conflict with the legality of Capitalist Democracy, because the whole legal system of Capitalist Democracy is the expression of Capitalist Class rule. The Communists are in prison, not because they have "theories of violence," but because they have proclaimed Socialism against Capitalism, and have dared to challenge the system of Capitalist Class coercion and dictatorship which is the reality of Capitalist Democracy.

At least so says the capitalist press, which is a good judge of fairness. And so it was a fair trial—according to capitalist notions. For since the Law is Capitalist and Capitalism is the Law, then it is possible to exercise the most scrupulous and tedious process of fairness to the working class victims caught in it, and still amazingly find them in the wrong every time: it is possible to evict workers, to drive them to the club street, to ruin them and rob them, to club them when they plead their case, to order them to shoot one another, and if there is the slightest opposition to any crime, felony, treason, illegality, then it is crime, felony, treason, illegality, in then it is crime, felony, treason, illegality, therefore, the workers. It is not surprising, therefore, that the capitalist press should comment with pride on the conspicuous fairness and impartiality of capitalist justice, as compared with the vulgar bias and partisanship of the Soviet rule; where the workers are the judges and the exploiting minority get the bad time, where actual rich men are frequently sent to prison for the crime of robbing the workers, instead of their families, and where the workers have a right to shelter and livelihood instead of being sentenced for the crime of stealing a loaf for their families, and where the capitalist press should not be surprised that the enjoyable position of the call attention to the enjoyable position of the English workers, who, instead of being tried by their fellow workers of the factory, comrades in plain language or plain issues of comradeship, have the privilege of being tried by members of the governing class in archaic language and incomprehensible ritual. It is not surprising, finally, that the capitalist press should call attention to the remarkable and notorious leniency of capitalist rule (so frequently exemplified in India, Iraq and Ireland under the Black and Tans), which has actually so far refrained from sentencing these audacious young men to death, despite the years of civil war that have been raging in this country.

"It was a fair trial." It is true the judge happened to be an ex-Tory Member of Parliament, who had been unseated by a Labor representative; but this was an accident, and made no difference to his complete freedom of class outlook. It is true the Conservative Party openly dictated the sentence before the Home Secretary predicted the sentence beforehand; but these were, as "The Times" correctly pointed out, "indiscretions," and should not be allowed to create a wrong impression. It is true the jury did not apparently contain a single Labor representative, despite Labor now constituting a third of the electorate; but this was mere chance of the ballot and should only be treated as such. "The jury," declared "The Times" with regard to them, "may be taken to represent the statistically correct representation of the 'normal citizens of this country.' It is true that a statistically correct representation of the 'normal citizens of this country' should, as a mere matter of arithmetic, contain at least nine or ten laborers and operatives out of the twelve; but this is a sordid and scientific view, which actually treats common people as existing, and forgets that for 'The Times' all right thinking people the 'normal citizens of this country' consist of one-tenth of the population." Finally, the defendants were actually allowed to speak for a number of hours before their sentence without being clubbed on the head for it. It is true that every time they wished to make a single reference to any really important facts, such as the politics of the case, the role of the Conservative Party, the secret police, the Fascist outrages, and the illegal arm and utterances of their prosecutors, they were rapidly stopped by the judge with the comment that such matters were "irrelevant"; but this was not any exhibition of class bias, but purely fidelity to the Law.

It is the Law itself that is the expression of Class Justice under Capitalist Democracy. All the class-bias of the agents is incidental, though inevitable. The upper class training of the judges and lawyers, the power of gold and the powerlessness of poverty, the private bourgeois influences on trials and sentences, the commercialisation of the whole procedure, the recurrent scandals which arouse opinion from time to time at some ugly case of leniency to the rich and severity to the poor, and actual stretching of the law, all these are but inevitable outgrowths and symptoms of the whole system. Were the agents as new-born babes, and as free from bias as the same. For the essential results would be the same. For the agents are not free agents; they are agents of the Law, and the Law in a Class State is the Law, and the Law is the Law in capitalism. The codification of capitalist society is the codification of the necessary rights of property and of the necessary oppression of the working class. This is the reality of Capitalist Justice because all the smug assumptions of fairness and equality. Capitalist Justice differs from Proletarian Justice in its transition Proletarian State above all in its hypocrisy, that it denies its class character and

March, 1926.

professes to be in the interests of "all," and further that the class whose interests it represents is the small minority, whereas Proletarian Justice openly acts in the interests of the majority. It is this reality of the class character of the Law, which is the basis of Capitalist Justice, that enables its agents to assume pontifical expressions of neutrality and freedom from class bias and of fidelity to the Law because they know that under that form of fidelity to the Law they can give expression to all the class bias and hatred in their hearts, and exercise a machine of class terror no less than if they called it a dictatorship. And for this reason the trial at the Old Bailey was as pure an incident of class struggle, of confrontation of classes, of capitalist versus working class, as any other incident in the whole regime of capitalist class oppression and working class struggle.

How completely the issue of the trial was purely and simply the issue of the Class Struggle, of Capitalism versus Socialism, of the bourgeois ruling class and the subject workers, was let slip again and again in one utterance after another of the Prosecutor, the Attorney-General, the Home Secretary and the Judge. Before the case had been completely dressed up in more suitable garb, the Crown Prosecutor said quite bluntly that the crime of sedition consisted in the propaganda of the class war, or "creating antagonism between different classes of His Majesty's subjects." This is the most open expression of the whole purpose of the Class Justice. This clumsy expression of the capitalist motive of the whole trial was discreetly dropped by the Attorney-General, who himself, however, fell into equal slips when he declared that the function of the military was to "suppress strikes," and had subsequently to correct this as an "error" in the shorthand report. The blazing indiscretions of the Home Secretary, when he menaced his working class opponents at a political meeting during the progress of the trial with the club that was prepared for them in the shape of the sentence class fight behind the trial than his announcement of discipline to Mussolini, and praise of Mussolini's violence as having "made them work" revealed clearly the slave-master's aim behind the whole array of Capitalist Justice. Finally, lest there be any doubt that the whole Labor Movement was being attacked, Mr. Churchill announced, immediately after the verdict, that no distinction could be drawn between the Socialists and the Communists, and the trial took up at once the campaign for the extension of the legal campaign to a wider sphere, depends, as the Home Secretary's evasive replies to questions have made clear, solely on the question of power and the reaction of the working class.

Even more significant for bringing out the whole Class Struggle purpose of the new Capi-

talist judicial offensive is the relation of the Old Bailey trial to the South Wales trial. When the Attorney-General declared that the function of the military was to "suppress strikes," he endeavored to defend himself later by saying that he had intended to say "suppress riots." The Judge endeavored to support this by the following statement:—

No one would suggest that the military would be used to suppress struggles merely because they were refusing to work, but it was the duty of the Crown to stop rioting, to prevent disturbances and disorder.

Here a most reassuring distinction is drawn. Strikers will not be suppressed as strikers; they will only be suppressed as "rioters." In the innocent workers' mind is raised a picture of violent carnage and bloodshed—"disturbances and disorder"—which alone will lead to the kindly intervention of the forces of the Crown to restore "order." How unjustified is this Communist propaganda, thinks he, which declares that the soldiers and police will be used as instruments of Capitalist violence against strikers whenever the situation is serious. But then comes a shock. For there follows immediately the Ammanford trial.

What was the essence of this trial? The police attacked a crowd of strikers. Numbers of strikers—quiet, hardworking, respectable men, according to the police evidence—are sent to gaol in batches for "rioting." What then? Had they been guilty of violence? Not at all. Against this crowd of starving men, under every provocation from the authorities, not one act of violence could be proved. Where then was the "rioting"? Where was the justification for the intervention of the forces of the Crown? Lord Halsbury, the Crown lawyer sent down for the purpose of the trial, was not discomfited. He declared:

"It was idle to say it was not rioting because nobody was hurt." So here the circle is complete.

(1) Strikers will not be suppressed by the forces of the Crown unless they are guilty of "rioting" (Mr. Justice Swift).

(2) But the strikers can be guilty of "rioting" although there is admittedly no violence on their part (Lord Halsbury).

(3) Therefore strikers can be suppressed by the forces of the Crown although there is not violence on their part.

The worker will conclude that the Communist argument was not so wrong after all. The forces of the Crown are the instruments of Capitalism against the working class, for whose pared. And if that is correct, then how completely justified is the Communist plea for working class propaganda to the military forces—dictum against them, and which is in fact no more than a proclamation of the most necessary task of the whole working class movement meet Capitalist violence.

March, 1926.

It is therefore essential that the whole working class movement should meet the capitalist attack revealed in the Communist trial as an act of the class struggle and in the spirit of the class struggle. Appeals to the bourgeoisie on behalf of free speech will not at the present stage carry far, for the bourgeoisie is moving in a different direction. The bourgeois tradition of "Free Speech" is only a tradition of deceiving and doping the workers: "Free Speech" is allowed in plenty, so long as the bourgeoisie is allowed in plenty, and the workers are sufficiently callous to accept and respect the cant that is belogged to them, as in the halcyon days of Gladstone and Bright. But so soon as the Gladstone change, so soon as the workers' conditions change, so soon as the workers' own consciousness and their own expression to consciousness and Communist proposition, so soon as Socialist and Communist proposition begins to gain a real hold, so soon as the aganda struggle grows more serious, then the tune class struggle throws "Free Speech" changes, the bourgeoisie turns to direct aside as an outworn tool, and turns to direct repression; and a small dwindling band of the Liberals is left lamenting the progress of the Class Struggle which they have spent their lives trying to conceal. But these Liberals are only lamenting the decay of the appearances which used to bring comfort to their souls in the midst of the horrors of actual class oppression, and the vulgar openness of the Class Struggle that has now succeeded; in practice they show their solidarity in all essentials with the bourgeoisie.

In this way the "Manchester Guardian" laments the role of the Home Secretary as nowments the role of the Home Secretary "not because days the Secretary for Class War" not because he conducts the class war (his actual preparation, etc., they recognise as necessary), but because he ceases to make any pretence about it and openly proclaims his role in the class war.

"By acting in this spirit he has already gone far to compromise in a really terrible way the character and efficiency of the arrangements which every British Government will now have to make for the maintenance of vital services during any industrial struggle on a great scale with which the perversity of employers or workmen may plague the country. Obviously, the one thing supremely needful was to keep any such provisions from having a party or class color, or being mistaken for some sort of strike breakers or anti-capitalist."

Sir William Joynson Hicks made the fatal mistake of launching his scheme as a response to the appeal of a private committee of persons whom every Trade Union official would inevitably regard as an upper class and anti-Labor Committee of Public Safety. In fact, he treated the Class War (just as the Marxists do) not as a struggle which could be averted but as a struggle already existing and chiefly needing to be waged aggressively."

Here speaks the authentic voice of Liberalism. It is not the Class Struggle that is the evil, but the recognition of the Class Struggle. It is not

even the class preparations of Joynson-Hicks that are ("arrangements which every British Government will now have to make"), but his failure to conceal their class character ("obviously the one thing needful was to keep any such provisions from having a party or class color") and the consequent danger of arousing the suspicions of Communist propaganda that is suppression of the danger of giving it an ad-vice instrument of working class subjection; in fact, "freedom" so-called is believed in, only because the conditions of capitalism make it false. And therefore in the end there is practical unity with the Conservatives.

In the same way Mr. MacDonald, even when on behalf of the working class movement he has to appear in the role of advocate for the Communists against the Government prosecution makes clear in his speech his practical unity with the bourgeoisie. Does he declare in his speech the right of Communist, as of all working class, propaganda, despite bourgeois suppression? Not at all. How could he, after Liverpool? He declares, not only his "active opposition to Communism," but that the real issue is:—

"Whether the prosecution of leading members of the Communist Party as it is in the country at the present time is a service or dis-service to the State."

This is a very significant sentence. The point of view from which Mr. MacDonald approaches the question of the prosecution of the Communists is not the point of view of "the State," i.e., class, but the point of view of the working class, the Capitalist State. Further he recognises that the question is not whether the Communists should be prosecuted, but when ("whether... at the present time"), implying that at a later stage the fight of Capitalism and the Capitalist State against Communism and the working class will have to take place, but that as a wise strategist he should like to postpone the prosecution to a more favorable point when it is absolutely necessary. This is the speech of one bourgeois statesman to another on the best method of combatting Communism. It is not a speech in defence of the rights of working class speech in defence of the Campbell case or the Transport Strike is bound to recur, and cannot repeatedly be evaded.

Working class agitation for freedom of speech will follow a very different line. The workers know very well that they have only won in the past and can only hold to-day so much right of freedom of speech for themselves as they have been able to extort by their own strength from

the capitalist class. Freedom of speech is itself an issue of the Class Struggle. There can never be real freedom of speech for the workers in capitalist society, as long as the capitalist class or 1 per cent. maintains a 99 per cent. monopoly of the press, and the production and distribution of news and views, leaving the feeble poverty-stricken workers' press to struggle along, and the Capitalist State maintains through its laws and courts an effective control of what may and what may not be printed. The workers will then only begin to win real freedom of speech when they have smashed the capitalist monopoly of the press by the working class dictatorship and won the press for the working class or immense majority. The limited right of freedom of speech which the workers have so far won for themselves within Capitalism they can only hold against repeated at-

tacks of the capitalist class by the strongest assertion of their combined strength. To-day the bourgeoisie has delivered a direct assault on the fundamental rights of working class agitation and propaganda, that is, on the basis of the working class movement. It is for the whole working class movement to defeat this assault. The future of open revolutionary working class propaganda (and all working class propaganda in the future will inevitably have to be more and more clearly revolutionary) is at stake. There can be no rest in agitation and yet stronger agitation, in assertion and repeated re-assertion all over the country of the right of revolutionary working class propaganda in the face of every menace until this fundamental right of all working class propaganda is won anew and held by the power and will of the working class.—R.P.D., in the "Labor Monthly."

Egypt at the Cross Roads.

By J. Crossley

An extraordinary situation prevails at the moment in Egypt, and there is every evidence that the country is faced with a political crisis of such a magnitude as will have far-reaching consequences throughout Egypt and the whole of the Near East. The position is one which is also causing a great deal of embarrassment to the British Residency and will raise many knotty problems for the newly-appointed British Resident Governor, Sir George Lloyd. In his efforts to steer a middle course between the reactionary unconstitutional policy of the British bayonet-supported Cabinet of Zivar Pasha, and the rising tide of Nationalism, which is once again throwing into high relief the strange dominant personality of Saad Zagloul Pasha, Sir George Lloyd will find himself in a more difficult position than that which at any time confronted his predecessor, Lord Allenby, during his term of office. The anomaly with which he is faced is that the Residency has undoubtedly connived behind the scenes at the wrecking of the Constitution which was wrung from the British Government in 1922, and has openly identified itself with the Zivar Ministry which was appointed by the Zivar Ministry during the events of last year arising out of the assassination of Sir Lee Stack, the Sirdar of Egypt and Governor of the Sudan.

In order better to understand what is taking place in Egypt to-day it is necessary to review briefly the circumstances which have led up to the present political crisis.

It was in 1922 that, after a long series of negotiations and much haggling, following on the report of the Milner Commission of Enquiry, which was sent out by the British Government to Egypt for the purpose of pre-

paring the ground for the granting of the long-promised independence and constitution, and after the famous visit of Zagloul Pasha to Britain and France at the head of the delegation of the Waft, that the then Coalition Government decided there was no other way out of their difficulties save by the restoration of independence to Egypt and the granting of a constitution to the country.

Accordingly this was nominally done, but the promise of sovereignty was belied by the provision for the maintenance of British armed forces in Egypt, while several other important questions were left in abeyance for future settlement. The main questions so left were—

- (1) The future control of the Suez Canal.
- (2) The question of the future control of the Sudan, which at that time was under a joint Anglo-Egyptian control (Egypt finding-maintaining the money for development and Britain doing most of the Sudan, and mainly in the interests of the "controlling," Syndicates).

(3) The question of the future status of British officials and functionaries resident in Egypt and the Sudan, who monopolised practically the whole of the important posts in the various departments.

These questions were left to be settled in future negotiations, but it can safely be said that Britain never entertained the slightest idea of relinquishing her right to her hold on the Suez Canal, the extension of her influence in the Sudan, or the exaction of the maximum amount of compensation for displaced British officials.

In the elections which took place immediately following the granting of the Constitution, Zagloul Pasha was returned at the head of the Government with an overwhelming majority of votes, and was appointed Premier. His term of office was characterised by a vacillating policy on the question of negotiations with Britain on the outstanding questions to be settled. Also he pursued a policy, evidently with an eye to currying favor with Britain, of persecution of the workers' movement. His savage repression of the Alexandria strikes and his prosecution and imprisonment of the leaders, including many members of the Communist Party of Egypt, a number of whom are still lying in Egyptian gaols; his forcible breaking up of the splendid Confederation of Labor, the up of the splendid Confederation of Labor, the up of the splendid Confederation of Labor as a wing of the "Confederation of Labor as a wing of the State funds Waft with a criminal embezzler of State funds at its head, as Secretary, who was brought out of prison for this purpose; these acts mark Zagloul as a retrograde of the worst type and aroused deep resentment amongst the town workers.

At the height of his popularity, disintegration began to take place in the Waft amongst the followers of Zagloul. Under the leadership of Hafiz Bey Ramadan a section of the extreme Nationalists who were disgusted with Zagloul's temporising policy with Britain, and who maintained an attitude of no compromise, split away and formed the Hisb-el-Watani Party. In the opposite direction those sections of the rising bourgeoisie who found that their interests were bound up with foreign capital, and who were terrified at the thought of the Nationalist movement swinging more and more to the left, broke away and formed the Liberal Constitutionalist and Unionist parties.

Round the outstanding questions a storm of controversy arose, and Cairo, Alexandria and the other main towns of Egypt were a seething mass of political excitement. The immense student population at the secondary schools and colleges of Cairo were in a constant state of excitement, and school strikes and demonstrations were of almost daily recurrence.

During this time Britain was demonstrating her intention not to allow the control of the Suez Canal to go out of her grasp, and it was during the period of Zagloul's Ministry that the great Air Base was constructed at Ismailia on the Suez. Great excitement prevailed all over the Sudan and culminated in a rebellion of the Egyptian forces, which was suppressed with utmost rigor by the British army, augmented by hastily summoned troops from India.

The climax was reached by the assassination of Sir Lee Stack in the streets of Cairo in November, 1924. Seizing with avidity on an unfortunate incident, Lord Allenby immediately presented the Egyptian Government with an infamous ultimatum which demanded an official apology from the Government, an indemnity of £500,000, prohibition of all political demonstrations, speedy arrest and punishment of the

criminals, increase of the Sudanese Government of powers of irrigation beyond the area of 300,000 feddans previously agreed upon, withdrawal of all Egyptian troops from the Sudan, and unconditional withdrawal of opposition to the claims of British officials, residents and functionaries.

To the first four points, namely—the Apology, Indemnity, Prohibition of Political Demonstrations, Arrest and Punishment of the Criminals, Zagloul and his Government agreed under protest. On the remaining points of the Ultimatum, namely—the extension of the area of irrigation in the Sudan, the withdrawal of Egyptian troops, and the withdrawal of opposition to the claims of British residents, Zagloul refused to accept the terms of the Ultimatum, and gave a blank refusal.

On this intimation being conveyed to Lord Allenby, he immediately ordered the seizure of the Customs at Alexandria and Port Said, and forcibly disbanded the Egyptian Army in the Sudan, and placed the whole of Egypt under martial law. Thus, at one stroke, Britain, through the agency of its devoted henchman, was able to annex the coveted prize of the Sudan in the interests of the cotton-growing associations which have been steadily building up their prestige, and feverishly commenced the scheme of gigantic barrages on the upper reaches of the Nile in the Sudan, which when ultimately completed will give the control of this mighty river, the life blood of Egypt's teeming population, into the hands of the Sudanese Government and place the whole of Egypt at the mercy and caprice of Great Britain as the dominating power.

Zagloul and his Ministry immediately resigned, and under pressure on the Court by the ed, and King Fuad selected a reactionary Residency, King Fuad selected a reactionary Ministry with Zivar Pasha, leader of the Ittihadists, or Unionist Party, at its head.

Under this most reactionary Ministry, with its slavish subservience to the Court and to the British occupation, every vestige of liberty and every remaining scrap of the constitution was ruthlessly destroyed. Workers' organisations were terrorised into impotence, and by an extensive and elaborate system of spying all known workers of radical tendencies were persecuted. On June 5 of this year the Government suppressed the only workers' paper, "Al-Hisab," and its editor, Mr. Jabouh, along with twelve others was arrested on the charge of being engaged in Communist activities. Amongst those arrested was Miss Charlotte Rosenthal, daughter of Mr. Rosenthal, the jeweller of Alexandria, who was deported during Zagloul's administration, but was afterwards repatriated, mainly thanks to the efforts of prominent members of the British Labor movement and of the "Daily Herald." All these comrades are still in prison without trial.

During this period the power and popularity of Zagloul grew tremendously, and at last so great became the demand for a restoration of Parliament that the Ministry was obliged to yield. In the elections to the Parliament which ultimately took place in April of this year,

every artifice of coercion was used by the Ministry in its efforts to secure the defeat of Zagloul. All but official or Ministerial supporters were refused the right of meetings, and elector-delegates known to belong to the Wafd were, in scores of cases, confined to their houses for weeks under penalty of imprisonment. In spite of everything, however, the Wafd secured a majority of votes over all the other combined parties. The Hisb-el-Watani (Extreme Nationalists), in their hatred of Zagloul, sided with the Ministerialists, and in the process were hopelessly snowed under, and succeeded in returning only six members. When the Parliament assembled the Chamber voted Zagloul as President and another member of the Wafd as Vice-President. Ziwar Pasha, the Premier, immediately left the Chamber, sought an audience with King Fuad, who only four hours earlier had officially opened the Parliament, laid his resignation before him, which the king refused to accept, and returned to the chamber with the king's authority to dissolve it. Thus, after only 12 hours' duration, Egypt was once more without a parliament, and once more unbridled reaction was placed in the saddle. It seems pretty clear what the role of the Court was during this period. Under the guidance of his clever adviser, Nashaat Pasha, King Fuad has evidently been playing to bring the Constitution into ridicule and impotence so that the excuse may be afforded ultimately for the destruction of the Constitution and the establishment of an absolute monarchy on the old Eastern pattern. Having temporarily triumphed over the Nationalist forces of the Wafd by the dissolution of the Parliament, Ziwar and his Ministry found that all was not smooth sailing, for a struggle developed between the Ministry and the Court. This came to a head during Ziwar's visit to London in September and October, when, during his absence, a ministerial crisis was caused by the resignation of Sidky Pasha and others of the Ministry. A hasty reshuffling of the Ministry took place, and Ziwar cabled instructions to the effect that the portfolio for the Ministry of the Interior be left open for himself.

The news of the split was the signal for wild jubilation amongst the Nationalist and other enemies of Ziwar, and all the old elements of popular political enthusiasm were revived, street demonstrations, by students and others, school strikes, and great agitation in the Press. One significant feature of this revival is the reunion which has taken place between the forces of the Wafd and of the Hisb-el-Watani.

It is here very important to note that the great revival of Nationalism is assuming a very much deeper and wider significance than has characterised the Nationalist movement in the past. Throughout the Arabic Press of Cairo and Alexandria there has been for the last nine months or so a tremendous interest taken in the Nationalist struggles of Abdel Krim in Morocco, and much of the money needed by Abdel Krim to conduct his heroic campaign against predatory French imperialism has un-

doubtedly been raised by appeals throughout Egypt and the other Near Eastern countries. The Arab demonstrations against the Balfour declaration establishing Palestine as a Jewish National Home, the struggles of the Arabs in Hedjaz, Iraq, and now the revolt against French imperialism in Syria by the Druses and other sections of the Arab communities, all these things are having their repercussions in Egypt, and are symptomatic of the revival of a great Pan-Islamic movement which, however vague at the present moment, will undoubtedly take shape and direction during the coming months.

It is with such a background therefore that the aged Zagloul Pasha once more steps on the stage. After being refused the demand for the re-assembly of the old Parliament in the House of Representatives, a meeting of Members of Parliament was called to take place at the Continental Savoy Hotel, Cairo. In spite of the fact that the Ministry of the Interior prohibited the meeting, and deployed forces of soldiers round the building, the assembly was held and attended by upwards of 130 deputies. A resolution was formulated for presentation to the king demanding the restoration of the Constitution, and this was carried with wild enthusiasm. The newspaper, "El-Ahram," in the course of an article entitled "Let us all Unite for Independence," states:

"We must not forget that we have always been working for independence and that the Constitution will never be well safeguarded as long as England rules in Egypt. Egypt has been deprived of enjoying the Constitutional regime by the English; the first Egyptian Parliament of 1881 could not live under pressure, and the new Parliament was dissolved twice under the effect of British policy. Let the new agreement of parties be the first step towards a better understanding. Let us all make efforts, with good faith, for the attainment of a genuine independence which should have no relation whatever with the Milner independence or the independence of 1922. We must know how to call things by their right names."

Zagloul Pasha is also reported to have stated that the present situation will lead to revolution unless the Ministry permits the restoration of the Constitution. In any fresh election it returned at the head of a government by an overwhelming majority. Now, therefore, Egypt stands once again at the cross-roads, and the path she takes will have an enormous influence on the whole of the Near Eastern situation. The question is being asked by all thoughtful working-class students of Eastern problems: will Zagloul in his coming hour of triumph use the golden opportunity thus placed in his hands to atone for his unenviable reputation as an autocrat by restoring to the workers the right of full liberty of speech and press and the right of Trade Union and working-class political combination? Will he lift Nationalist politics out of the morass of personal intrigue and egotism

and, together with the best elements of the radical nationalist movements, adopt a policy of abolition of all the terrible crying evils of poverty and sweating under which the whole of the great masses of Egyptian workmen and fellahs are staggering? Or, on the other hand, will he once more resume his previous policy of repression of all those elements which dare to overstep the extremely narrow bounds of the

limited nationalism which has previously characterised the Wafd? Egypt is entering upon troubled seas. A great Nationalist Party with a great Nationalist leader is her need at the moment. The slogan of this party should be "All power to the federated free Arab republics of the Near East." Will Saad Zagloul Pasha fill this role? We hope but doubt.

Evolutionary Sociology.

MARX & MORGAN.

By G. Winter

The importance of Morgan's theories to a proper understanding of social evolution was immediately recognised by Marx and Engels who practically incorporated Morgan's conception in the "Scientific Socialism" which they founded. Since their time, the proletarian school of thought has been chiefly concerned with the developments of the capitalist system, and with the beginnings of the proletarian revolution.

The importance of present-day events, and the struggle against opportunism in all its forms, has brought into existence a type of being which is known, even among the militant proletariat, as the "cast-iron Marxian." On investigation it will always be found that the cast-iron Marxian has a very limited, crude, and narrow conception of Marxism; that he thinks in terms which are absolute, and is a metaphysician rather than a dialectician. Of course, not every Marxian is a cast-iron one, and there are many who try to excuse their own looseness of thought by accusing all Marxians of narrowness and dogmatism. Any such charges, whether made against the whole school of Marxism, or against certain types of individuals calling themselves Marxians, ought to be made clear and substantiated.

It cannot be denied that there are individuals, who calling themselves Marxists or Marxians, who seem to imagine the human race only about six thousand years old; who think all persons are influenced mainly by fear and hunger; that no man does anything except to further his own material interests; and that the course of history has been laid down in a mould, the true shape of which is definitely known to them. This particular type, may possibly extend its studies as far as to consider all prehistoric periods, following each other in every detail to sequence, and corresponding in every detail the social conditions discovered within recent times among the more backward races of the world. Of the actual conditions of these races the source from which Morgan's theories were derived—they know little; they imagine them to be practically identical among all races of the same "status" of savagery or barbarism, as the case may be.

Just as the "cast-iron Marxian" discredits Marx, so the "cast-iron Morganian," so to speak, discredits Morgan; and for the same reason, namely, that he does not understand what he is talking about.

On the other hand, those who sneer at the Morganite may be simply trying to excuse their own ignorance—like the man who "doesn't claim to be a Marxian"—by making out the subject to be of little importance.

Such sneers may take either of two forms—that of the man who at least admits frankly that he knows nothing about the subject, and that of the one who dogmatically asserts that Morgan is out of date and discredited. Exactly the same mental reactions may be observed in the same mental reactions of Darwin. There are some who deny their importance, and others who claim that Darwin is out of date and discredited. Both expressions are mere cloaks of ignorance.

If Darwinism is discredited, what has taken its place? The evolution of life-forms is better understood to-day than before, but all that has been discovered since Darwin's time has gone to build up the structure of evolutionary biology of which Darwin laid the foundation. Marx, likewise, laid the foundation of evolutionary sociology, in the materialist conception of history. Subsequently, Morgan made use of the same foundation, and may be said to have laid it down independently made such a study of social development that it may now be said to have any other basis?

But to go further, Morgan laid down the general line of technological and social development in prehistoric times. If his theories are ment in prehistoric times. If his theories are discredited, by whom have they been placed? ed, and what theories have taken their place? I venture to say that the modern criticism of them credited, that the modern criticism of them springs entirely from bourgeois mentality; and that, had the development of social science been unhampered by class bias, Morgan would to-day be recognised as the founder of evolutionary sociology, in so far as it relates to the origin of civilisation.

In the same hypothetical circumstances, Marx would be recognised as the founder of evolu-

tionary sociology, insofar as it deals with the period of civilisation, and as Marx realised, the lines of social evolution prior to civilisation must be studied in order to understand social evolution as a whole.

When we recognise the essential interconnection between the doctrines of Darwin, Morgan, and Marx; when we see that Marx—though he began his work before he met with the work of either of the others—realised the importance, of this interconnection; Marx must appear as the great co-ordinator in the whole field of the science of living things. Marx himself was an independent investigator in the field of ethnology, as Engels shows in his "Origin of the Family," and of course, where credit is given to Marx, almost equal credit is given to Engels by implication. Nevertheless, the special field of investigation upon which Marx concentrated his efforts, was that of social evolution during the period of civilisation. Insofar as he laid down the laws of this particular stage of social development, and stressed the essential differences between the historic period and the prehistoric, Marx must appear, not merely as a critical investigator of the capitalist system, but as a critical investigator of civilisation itself.

Understand the term "civilisation" is used here, not in the popular sense of progress, but in the definite, scientific sense of a particular stage of progress. If we are to divide human progress into stages, we must recognise that each successive stage must have a beginning and an end. The opponents of proletarian science, in opposing the revolutionary proletarian movement, accuse us of wishing to destroy civilisation—meaning thereby those social and political institutions within which human progress has been made during the historical period. That is exactly what we aim at, because we realise that these institutions have served their purpose and are now only a hindrance to further progress. But they are uttering deliberate falsehood when they say we wish to return to barbarism; we wish to usher in a new period of human progress, as high above civilisation as we have known it as that of Greece was above that of the surrounding barbarians.

There is therefore no justification for confining our attention to the economic struggle of to-day—though circumstances compel us to give that our most immediate attention—or narrowing down Marxian doctrine to a mere criticism of capitalism as such.

There are tendencies in modern capitalism which seem to point to developments which we might describe as a return to feudalism, or to chattel slavery. The characteristics of the former may be seen in the practices of Leverhulme and Ford; those of the latter in the Fascist movement. But the revolutionary proletarian is not content with destroying those social evils that are peculiar to capitalism as such, and sees nothing desirable in rebuilding the tyrannies of the past. We find no analogy between the social system we hope to establish, and the various systems of oppression and exploitation which have existed during the period

of civilisation. In order to find analogies we must throw our minds back to the liberty, fraternity, and equality of the ancient gentile system, which Morgan found in actual existence among the Iroquois. The whole period of civilisation is one of oppression and exploitation, of class wars and violent revolutions. Savagery and barbarism were, comparatively speaking, periods of social solidarity, equality, and gradual, peaceful social changes.

This generalisation holds good, notwithstanding the fact that in barbarism are found the beginnings of exploitation and oppression. This is only to be expected, on the evolutionary hypothesis, for such things do not drop from the skies; but there is an essential difference in the gentile organisation of the barbarian and the State organisation of civilisation. The former is essentially based upon kinship and fraternity; the latter is based upon aggression and expropriation. And it is just this State (Latin, civitas) organisation which gives civilisation its name.

All of this holds good, notwithstanding any criticism of Morgan which has ever been put forward; and it is of far more importance than the extent of group marriage in prehistoric Europe, the existence of slavery among African savages, or the smelting of iron in some parts of the world prior to that of copper.

My survey of the Oceanic area has shown, I claim, in support of Morgan:—

1. That there has been a gradual improvement in the methods of production, which in every case has been the basis of a progression of forms of social organisation. The importance of particular items in the technical advance depends, to an extent unrecognised by Morgan, upon the natural surroundings of any particular race.

2. The social organisation of the aboriginals of Australia is, generally speaking, a division of society into marriage groups, within which we find the embryo of the maternal gens.

3. In Melanesia we find the class system breaking up, and several other types of social organisation emerging, among which are the maternal and paternal gens, and tribal organisation without gentes; also, for the first time, the individual pairing unaccompanied by class licence and class restrictions.

4. In Polynesia we find a gentile system, originating in, but not identical with, punaluan marriage; the difference between this system and that of America can be traced to a difference in the method of subsistence, that of Polynesia being exceptional, and that of America typical of the great mass of humanity.

5. Whatever the specific differences, perhaps nowhere greater than in America and Polynesia, we find everywhere an organisation based upon devoid of class struggles, and carrying out the principle of the greatest good to the greatest number, in accordance with the necessities of the time and place.

To All Friends of China; to All Organisations Sympathetic to the Chinese People.

At the present time, when the people of the entire world are striving to maintain peace, and Japan with the greatest brutality, and without the slightest regard for the most elementary principles of right and justice, is occupying Mukden. At the same time, the imperialist press reports that the representatives of the great powers in China have given Japan a mandate over Manchuria. This clearly indicates that the occupation of Mukden by Japan is not done in order to protect its colonists, but is an event of far greater political importance.

We therefore feel obliged to place this matter before the entire world and to explain the far-reaching importance, and the results of this event.

The significance of the Mukden occupation is three-fold:

1. The Japanese Imperialists have used various methods in the exploitation of China, of which the most characteristic is the method of "Unequal treaties." They have also systematically nourished and encouraged Chinese militarism and have used the South Manchurian Railway as a base of operations for the exploitation of North China, in the same manner that England used the East India Company for the exploitation of India.

As early as 1915, Japan endeavored to make the traitor Yuan Chi Jui emperor of China and force upon China the "21 points." In 1916 it succeeded in making the Anfu Party of which Yuan Chi Jui was the leader, its instrument. Thru Yuan Chi Jui Japan succeeded in obtaining secret treaties for War Loans and the operation of the Shantung Railway. In return Japan gave arms and money for the suppression of the young liberation movement. Thru all the Chinese Civil Wars in the last few years, we can trace the manipulations of Japan—whether can trace the manipulations of Japan—whether the war between Wu Pei Fu (representing the Chihli Party) and Chang Tso Lin. During the events of 1924, Chang Tso Lin, acting on the orders of Japan, suppressed with the greatest brutality the workers, peasants and students who were endeavoring to free the Chinese people, slaughtered great numbers of them, and dissolved their organisations.

The more the terror of the Japanese agents was felt in China, the more did the Chinese people become conscious of the necessity for taking up the struggle for freedom. "Down with gans "China for the Chinese" and "Down with Japanese Imperialism" quickly spread to all corners of China. Every day that the Japanese remain in Mukden means an intensification in the struggle for the liberation of the Chinese people. It is quite evident that such a state of

affairs is not profitable for the international imperialists who wish to exploit China quietly. The result of this can only be a crisis arising out of the effort of the international imperialists to suppress the Chinese National Revolutionists and to divide China among themselves. Such a division, however, cannot take place without a struggle amongst the great powers, themselves.

2. The occupation of Mukden serves to intensify the differences between the various imperialist powers. Since 1842, the year in which the Nankin Treaty, the result of the defeat of China in the opium war, was signed, each of the great powers has had its "sphere of influence" which it sought to extend. In order to accomplish this, the powers made extensive use of the corruption of the Governors of the various Chinese provinces, who thus became their tools. Thanks to the differences between the powers themselves, however, the complete division of China could not take place. Thus, in 1895, for example, Japan was prevented from occupying the peninsula of Liau Tung because of the opposition of Germany, Russia and France. In 1905, Japan's victory over Russia enabled it to take over the South Manchurian Railway, but the interference of the United States prevented Japan from using the Railway for military purposes.

The imperialist differences also show themselves in the failure to come to an agreement on the question of banks and telegraph.

The Japanese occupation of Mukden brings with it the assurance that England will not stand passively by, but will endeavor to grab another piece of China. That is why she is at present supporting the counter-revolutionary general Chen Jui Ming, who has been instructed to make war upon the peoples' government of Canton. The occupation of Mukden, which was a relatively easy matter for the Japanese, due to the favorable conditions in Mukden itself, will, however, arouse the envy of the other imperialist powers, will sharpen the contradictions between them, and will lead to a new World War.

3. The World War did not change the nature of world capitalism. On the contrary, the exploitation of the suppressed classes and people has become fiercer and more intense, and in spite of the contradictions between the various powers, they help each other in the suppression and exploitation of the masses of the people. Thus England helped France invade Germany, and both are co-operating in their attempts to isolate Russia through the Locarno Treaty. France carries on a brutal

campaign against the natives in Morocco, co-operating with Spain in this work, and supports the British seizure of the Mosul oil fields. The occupation of Mukden is also a direct result of the Treaty of Locarno and is directed against Russia, which is very sympathetic with the Chinese people in their struggle for freedom.

Friends of China—

The occupation of Mukden concerns not only China, but is of international significance, since it contains the germ for a new world war. All friends of peace and progress must therefore be on the watch and not permit themselves to become accomplices in a new world war.

The Chinese people, under the leadership of the Kuo Mintang Party, are ready to sacrifice their lives in the struggle against imperialism, and call upon the oppressed people and classes of the entire world to unite in the struggle against the imperialists of their own country, and against international imperialism. The Chinese people demand the fulfillment of the slogan:

"CHINA FOR THE CHINESE!"

Do not hesitate—The time for action has come.
—Association of Chinese Students in Germany.

QUERIES AND ANSWERS

"Distributor," writing from North Sydney, queries as to whether the continuous agitation against taxes is of importance to the worker. Also as to whether our poverty is due to the greed and rapacity of the food-purveyors, etc.

His question amounts to the old one of robbery at the point of consumption.

It is necessary that all questions of economics take into consideration the basis upon which modern production rests.

That basis is wage-labor, which elaborated means a condition wherein labor power, the mental and muscular energy of the worker, is bought for wages, a price covering, on the average, the cost of those things necessary for the maintenance of life.

It is thus essential to bear in mind that the worker, before he buys must sell, and consequently the labor power which he sells passes under the control of the employer, who consumes it in the process of production.

If the consumer was robbed it would therefore follow that the workers, the great mass, who are continually selling labor power to the employers, a relatively small class, would be robbing the employers and getting increasingly wealthy at the expense of those who consumed their energy. Everyone is aware that such is not the case.

On the contrary the employing class grows in wealth and power because in the consumption of labor power greater values are produced than is necessary for the repurchase of a similar quantity of labor power.

It is therefore apparent that wealth is produced and values created, not in the purchase and sale of food, clothing, etc., but in the sphere of production wherein the consumption of labor power takes place.

Values are created in industry and realised in the market. It is in the place wherein values are created that the robbery takes place.

We regret having to announce the death of Comrade George Winter, a valued contributor to the "Communist," and a keen student of Sociology. The Australian Labor Movement loses a diligent, if quiet, worker.

Our "Workers' Press Bond"

HELP US GET A PRESS.

£500 URGENTLY NEEDED.

As announced some time ago, the Party has decided to make a definite attempt to procure a printing press.

One method towards this end being the sale of "Workers' Press Bonds."

Bonds are issued at 2/, 5/, 10/, £1 and £5.

Send all subscriptions to W. Stone, Press Fund Organiser.

The Communist

Monthly Journal of the Communist
Party of Australia

(Section of the Communist International)

Editor - - - - - J. Kavanagh

Business Manager - - A. Baker

Postal Subscription Rates: Yearly 4/-
Half-yearly 2/-.

Make all Money Orders and Postal Notes payable: Haymarket Post Office, Sydney. Address all Literary Matter to the Editor, and all Business Communications to the Business Manager, at 395 Sussex Street, Sydney.

A Red Mark across this space means that your subscription expires this issue.