

# COMMUNIST REVIEW



Registered at G.P.O., Sydney, for transmission by Post as a Periodical.

No. 76.

DECEMBER, 1947

Price 6d.

## LIST OF CONTENTS

STEM THE ADVANCE OF REACTION	R. Dixon	747
THIRTY YEARS OF THE U.S.S.R.	J. D. Blake	749
THE MEANING OF DR. EVATT'S POLICY	L. L. Sharkey	752
DEMOCRACY OF A NEW TYPE	Prof. Eugene Varga	757
WOMEN DON'T WANT PREFERENCE	"Trade Unionist"	759
LENIN ON NATIONALISATION	E. W. Campbell	761
THE HOUSING SHORTAGE	J. O.	764
DENNIS CHALLENGES "UN-AMERICANS"		766
FROM SOCIALISM TO COMMUNISM	A. P. Lyapin	768
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS	L. H. Gould	771
BOOK REVIEW	J. P. Callaghan, M.Sc.	774
THE LANGUAGE OF BEES	Prof. J. B. S. Haldane, F.R.S.	775

ORGAN OF THEORY AND PRACTICE OF THE AUSTRALIAN  
COMMUNIST PARTY

Editor . . . . L. L. Sharkey

## STEM THE ADVANCE OF REACTION

R. DIXON

THE present session of Federal Parliament had barely commenced before the Opposition parties, aided and abetted by some Labor Party members, began a typically slanderous attack on the Communist Party, demanding the suppression of the Party or a Commission of Inquiry into its activities and connections.

They had in view much more than attacking the Communist Party. They wanted an inquiry to smear the trades union movement and Labor Party, as well as the Communist Party, and to attack the very basis of Australian democracy.

These people (Menzies, Fadden, Harrison, Abbott and others) who chant endlessly the absurd charge that the Communists get their orders from Moscow, avidly take their cue from the sayings and doings of the American monopolists who are now busily engaged in trying to smash the American labor movement and strangle democracy.

When the Liberals demanded a Commission of Inquiry into Communist activities they wanted something like the Committee of Un-American Activities. This Committee is an open forum for every limelighter, slanderer and reactionary in the United States to attack Communists, the labor movement and American democracy. Apart from its attacks on the labor movement this Committee is out to bring the liberal-democratic tradition of the Roosevelt regime into disrepute and to indict all those American liberals associated with the New Deal. In other words, the Un-American Activities Committee is waging a campaign of hate against everything progressive, democratic and decent in American life, and this is the kind of commission of inquiry the Liberal and Country Parties wanted the Government to establish here in Australia.

Throughout the capitalist world today a most determined attack is being made by reaction on democracy under the pretence of combating Communism. At the head of this offensive stand the powerful American monopolies. On the one hand the men who control the American trusts and monopolies are striving to crush the U.S. labor movement and to establish their undisputed dictatorship over the American people. On the other hand they aim to enslave the world, beginning with the capitalist world and ending, they hope, with Soviet Russia. Vyshinsky has drawn attention to the fact that the American Imperialists, in addition to spreading propaganda for war, are making the necessary military preparations for waging war to enslave the world.

Thus the American monopolists have world war and Fascism on their agenda. The approaching economic crisis, which threatens to engulf American capitalism, first of all, increases their aggressiveness.

American policy is a potential threat to Australian security and independence. The Morgans, Rockefellers, Duponts and Mellons, those sinister men who dominate the banking and industrial monopolies of America, aim to bring Australia under Yankee control. They are striving to sweep away Empire preference, to undermine Australia's trade with Britain and other countries, and to make us dependent on Dollar imperialism. This is why the policy of Dr. Evatt, which will bring Australia into a state of vassalage to America, if persisted in, must be fought by the labor movement. More than this. Dr. Evatt's policy, his consistent support of Dollar Imperialism in U.N.O. and of American foreign policy in general, serves to cover up and confuse the Australian people as to the real aims of the American monopolists and, therefore, disorganises the struggle for peace and democracy.

The European Communist Information Bureau, in dealing with the role of the right-wing labor leaders, points out that they "strive to conceal the predatory nature of imperialist policy beneath a mask of democracy and socialist phrases, whereas they are in fact only the loyal auxiliaries of the Imperialists in causing disintegration of the ranks and poisoning the mind of the working class."

The foreign policy of the Labor Government adds grist to the mill of the Liberal and Country Parties. These Parties have abandoned all pretence of defending Australia's independence from the American threat. They not only support the American war plans, but they join in the general offensive of the American monopolies against the democratic rights of the people and, first and foremost, in the attacks upon the labor movement.

The vicious attack upon the Communist Party and the demand for a Commission of Inquiry by the Liberal and Country Parties is closely connected with the speeding up of the war plans of Imperialism, the growth of Fascist trends in the capitalist countries, and fear of the approaching economic crisis and its consequences.

The Labor Government, it is true, rejected the demands for a public inquiry into the Communist Party, but they made no effort to expose the motives or the role of the Australian reaction. On the contrary, the reasons given by the Government for rejecting the Inquiry were: that such an inquiry would not reveal anything more about the Communists than the Commonwealth Investigation Branch already knew, and might result in the closing of sources of information.

That reply shows how completely the Labor Government capitulated to the Opposition in its attack directed not only at the Communist Party, but at the labor movement as a whole. It was not prepared to defend the working class or to

ALL CONTRIBUTIONS SHOULD BE SENT  
TO THE EDITOR,  
COMMUNIST REVIEW,  
695 GEORGE STREET, SYDNEY,  
AND SHOULD BE IN BY THE FIRST  
OF THE MONTH.

use the anti-democratic aims of the Opposition. Earlier, the Government candidly admitted that its policy of spying on the labor movement was going to be a full Labor Government sanction under the direction of Dr. Evatt's Department.

When we remember that spying and provocation against the labor movement, including the Labor Party, had been practised by the ruling classes ever since the first working class organisations were established in this country, and that labor organisations have always abhorred and condemned such practices, the admission of the Government is all the more alarming.

The danger to democracy and to Australia's independence and integrity comes from the enemies of the working class, from the men of the trusts and monopolies. These are the people whose activities need to be investigated and exposed. The working class movement, and in particular the Communist Party, are the most consistent and determined defenders of democracy and Australia's independence.

What other effect can the Labor Government's policy of spying on the labor movement have than to cause resentment, confusion and division in the ranks of the working class?

In other words, the Labor Government's stand weakens the labor movement and strengthens in any way the hand of reaction, of the men of trusts. It weakens the struggle to maintain democratic freedom and peace.

It is not only on these issues that we see this shameful failure of the Labor Party leaders to stand back against the reaction. Nationalisation of banks is another example. From the very beginning Mr. Chifley made his brief announcement of the Government's intention to nationalise the banking banks, the Labor Party stepped aside and the field of propaganda and agitation to the reaction, press and Opposition Parties.

When the Bank Nationalisation Bill came before Parliament the Labor Party, it is true, stood its case, which was a very effective one. Outside of Parliament, however, the Labor Party failed to campaign. The N.S.W. Labor Party committee blantly decided to hold no further meetings on nationalisation of the banks, and in the Victorian elections the Labor contestants tried to ignore the issue.

Outside of Parliament important events are taking place. The opponents of bank nationalisation, financed to the limit by the banks and big monopolists, not only have succeeded in creating confusion and doubt about nationalisation of the banks, they are threatening violence and calling for the establishment of organisations similar to

the Fascist New Guard in order to fight the labor movement. In other words, the bankers and their stooges are whipping up the hostility of sections of the people against the working class and are gathering together reactionary forces to attack the labor movement, the Constitution and the rights of the Australian people.

The Labor Party is fully aware of these developments but refuse to do anything to counter them. It is backing down at the very moment when it is essential to fight.

This attitude can only bring disaster for the labor movement. Australia is in danger of sliding to the Right because the Labor Party is not prepared to campaign against, and rally its supporters to fight against, the Liberal and Country Parties and the monopolists they speak for and represent.

The policy of the Labor Party, if persisted in, not only whittles away the electoral support of the Labor Party, it has grave dangers for the trade union movement. If the forces of the Right continue to grow in strength, the working class will suffer serious reverses, setbacks that it will take years to overcome. These are the issues the working class must face.

The swing to the Right must be checked if Australia is to continue along the path of democratic and progressive development.

The role of the working class is of supreme importance in this situation because it is the chief source of Australian democratic strength. Around a programme for the defence of Australian independence, democratic rights and further progress, the working class must strive to rally all democratic and patriotic forces of the people.

The labor movement must be fully conscious of the fact that the chief weakness of the working class today is the constant retreat of the Labor Party leaders and reformist officials before the attack of reaction. By this action they share the division in the labor movement, and confuse, disrupt and weaken the forces of the working class.

We must expect the attacks of the reaction on the labor movement to increase. It is of the utmost importance, therefore, that not only the Communist Party fights back, but the trade unions and Labor Party as well. The members of these organisations, the rank and file of the reformist trade unions and the Labor Party, must insist upon this.

This is the way to overcome the divisions in the labor movement, and to create working class unity. This is the way to stem the advance of the Right, to defeat the reaction. This is the way to ensure that the democratic and patriotic forces in our country, with the working class movement as the core, retains the initiative and leadership in the future development of Australia.

## THIRTY YEARS OF THE U.S.S.R.— SOCIALISM TRIUMPHANT

J. D. BLAKE

GREAT indeed have been the changes wrought in the lives of the Soviet people in the thirty years since the October Socialist Revolution in 1917. But this number of years gives a wrong impression of the time the Soviet people have been able to devote to the construction of Socialism.

During the first three years after 1917, the young Soviet Republic had to fight for its existence against armed intervention. The armed forces of England, America, France, Germany, Japan, Poland, Finland and other countries invaded the territory of the Soviet Union, adding to the devastation already caused by the first World War.

The period from the end of the civil war until 1927 was occupied in restoring the economic life of the country to its pre-war levels. From 1928 to 1941 was the actual period of socialist construction. After that came the second World War, lasting until 1945, and which again laid waste an area of Soviet territory larger than Victoria and New South Wales together; an area economically as important to the Soviet Union as those two States are to Australia.

From 1945 up to the present time, the Soviet people have been compelled to devote their great energies to again restoring the economic life of their country to its pre-war levels.

The fact which this brief history demonstrates is that in the thirty years' existence of the U.S.S.R., the Soviet people have actually been free to develop an expanding socialist economy and socialist society for less than half of that time.

Yet, by the end of 1937, Soviet industry was producing an output which was 428 per cent of the 1929 level. In other words, Soviet industrial production increased by more than four times over a period of eight years.

Nowadays, those record rates of development are being outstripped, as the growth of the Soviet State budget demonstrates. In 1940, the Soviet budget was 180,000 million rubles; in 1947, the budget reached the enormous level of 333,000 million rubles.

A fact of momentous importance about Soviet development is that after passing a certain stage, the rate of improvement in the living standards and the general well-being of the Soviet people begins to leap ahead at unprecedented speed.

That nodal point was reached just before the second World War, but the full fruition was stopped by the war. The Soviet people have again reached this point of development in 1947, and a few more years of peaceful development will reveal rates of growth astounding to the world.

The peaceful direction of Soviet policy is shown by this year's expenditure on health, which is 59

per cent higher than in 1940; while higher education is receiving seventeen and a half thousand million rubles more than in 1940. In secondary schools and universities, there are now 100,000 more students than before the war.

All the wild charges about "Soviet expansion" and "Soviet aggression" are completely exposed by the State budget figures. While, in 1940, 32 per cent of the budget went to military expenditure, this item is down to 17 per cent this year, and would be still lower but for the threatening policy of American imperialism. Estimated on the basis of the official exchange rate, the Soviet arms budget for 1946-47 is half the amount being spent on arms by the United States of America.

The U.S.S.R. does not need war and does not want war. To demonstrate the superiority of Socialism over capitalism, the U.S.S.R. needs peace above all else; that is the significance of Comrade Stalin's numerous statements on relations between the U.S.S.R. and capitalist countries in which he emphasises the possibility of peaceful competition between the two social systems.

With another decade of peace, the socialist achievements of the Soviet people would demonstrate beyond all doubt the superiority of socialist society for all the world to see.

In the capitalist countries, the reactionaries hysterically change the tune of their anti-Soviet propaganda from day to day. One day, they declare that a few years of capitalism, doctored by Marshall plans and Truman doctrines, will prove capitalism a better way of life than socialism, and that even the Soviet people will be won over to such a viewpoint. Next day, having no faith in their own nonsensical ravings, they scream for war against the U.S.S.R.—for atom bombs to be dropped on the Soviet people before it is too late—before they become too strong. On the following day, again the reactionaries play their tune of Soviet weakness to prove that a war against Russia would be a very easy proposition.

The campaign of hatred and abuse of the U.S.S.R., now at such fever heat in the capitalist newspapers, is not new. We can recall the wild stories about the "nationalisation of women," the "failure of the first five year plan," the supposedly "rotten Soviet system due to collapse at any moment," and the "tarnish Red Army, which was to be shattered in six weeks by Hitler's Nazi army."

A hardy propaganda stand-by of the anti-Soviet elements is the repeated declaration that criticism is not permitted in the U.S.S.R.; but in the autumn of 1946, there developed in the U.S.S.R. a widespread campaign of criticism of bad work

and incompetence on the part of a number of executive workers in industry and agriculture.

The capitalist press gleefully shouted that this revealed the failure of the new five year plan, and that Soviet foreign policy was designed to cover up internal difficulties. The collective farms were said to be in a state of chaos and revolt.

The present year has already supplied the true answer. The industrial plan was fulfilled 103 per cent in the first nine months of the year. The collective farms brought in a harvest 58 per cent greater than last year in spite of great difficulties resulting from war devastation.

There is not a government in the capitalist world which permits such free criticism of the weaknesses and defects in the State, party and economic apparatus as is the case in the Soviet Union. The fact is that this self-criticism is one of the most important weapons contributing to rapid socialist advance.

The reactionaries have no faith in their own stories about Soviet weakness. It is the growing might and power of the U.S.S.R. which sends them into such orgies of hysterical fury.

The champions of "private enterprise" and so-called individual liberty dread most of all the prospect that working people in their own country will really grasp the fact that on a vast territory of the earth ordinary working folk are demonstrating the splendours of achievement possible when monopoly bankers, exploiters and leeches of all kinds are thrown off their backs.

The shouts of the capitalists and their lackeys about freedom cannot hide the contrast between capitalist countries and the U.S.S.R. The cry "Freedom to own property" cannot conceal the fact that in Australia this freedom belongs to a wealthy clique which owns the wealth of the country. This freedom does not belong to working people — nor does it belong to farmers, whose lands are mortgaged to the banks.

Socialist industry and banks are the property of the Soviet people; the land is the collective farm property of the Soviet peasants.

The cry "Freedom of the press" cannot hide the fact that publication of daily papers like the Sydney Telegraph or the Melbourne Herald can only be undertaken in Australia by millionaire monopolies, while in the Soviet Union the press is published by the organisations of the people.

Freedom in capitalist countries means freedom for monopolies and trusts to exploit the people. The Soviet concept of freedom is based on the principle of freedom from exploitation; freedom from the forms of religious and racial oppression. It is the freedom of all useful people to join their forces and abilities in mutual collaboration to overcome the forces of nature for the betterment of mankind.

The freedom of the individual person is found in the freeing of society from the tyranny of class exploitation and oppression. The betterment of the individual person flows from the betterment of

society as a whole. True personal freedom and the blossoming of individual personality can be secured in no other way.

Socialism rouses the latent forces of the people and sets free their genuine creativeness. In a socialist society, it is ability and talent, not wealth or influence, which are the qualities upon which young people can rise to the highest peaks of human endeavour.

It has become commonplace for the capitalist press to use the term "totalitarian" when speaking of the U.S.S.R. The difference between the U.S.S.R. and capitalist countries is supposed to be that the former is totalitarian, while the latter are democratic.

What does totalitarian mean? The meaning of this term is quite well known; it means the concentration of all the power in the State (or freedom within the State) in the hands of a final capitalist oligarchy. It means the glorification of the State as a separate, permanent and mystical entity standing above the people, who, in turn, are made into slaves.

This was quite well described by the late unalented Mussolini when he said: "Everything is in the State, and nothing human or spiritual exists or has any work outside the State."

In other words, totalitarianism is the very essence of fascism, and fascism is the product of monopoly capitalism. That is why fascist tendencies are so manifest today in the United States of America, the home of the most powerful capitalist monopolies in the world.

The entire development of the U.S.S.R. is in the opposite direction — putting an end to totalitarianism. The first essential feature of the Soviet State is that it came into existence after depriving the financial oligarchy of power, and the vesting of all power in the hands of the people who used this power to complete the elimination of the financial capitalist oligarchy, and for ending the exploitation of man by man.

The historical growth of the Soviet State has been a chronicle of expanding democracy in which ever increasing millions of people participate. This political growth coincides with the building of a classless socialist society and was codified in the new Stalin constitution of 1936.

The building of a classless society and the widening democracy of the Soviet State laid the foundations for the withering away of the State as such. The Soviet Union provides a classic demonstration of the validity of the Marxist teachings on the State. The Marxists know that the State had a beginning and will have an end; moreover, the Marxists lead society to the stage where the State, as such, can die away.

The Soviet Marxists, headed by Comrade Stalin, are brilliantly developing and implementing this profoundly democratic teaching, and are bringing into the field of reality the words of Frederick

Engels about: "humanity's leap from the realm of necessity into the realm of freedom."

Thus it can be seen that the Soviet Union, far from being totalitarian, far from glorifying the State, teaches all mankind by its example how to use the State to overcome fascist totalitarianism, and to prepare the way for the dying out of the State itself.

The great socialist victories of the Soviet people were possible because they were led by such a great party as the Soviet Communist Party. This party is a true party of the masses, based on the solid foundation of Marxist-Leninist theory.

Under the leadership of the Communist Party, headed by Comrade Stalin, the Soviet people have overcome internal and external enemies in their struggle to build a socialist society. Under the brilliant leadership of this great party, they are now advancing to the transition to full Communism and the realisation of the Communist aim — "From each according to his ability — to each according to his needs."

Looking back on the history of the U.S.S.R., it may seem to many that at each of the great turning points in Soviet development, it was quite easy and simple to make correct decisions; but at the time these great decisions were made by the Party under the leadership of Comrade Stalin, the correct decision was not so easy to see as it is now in retrospect.

Experience has demonstrated that the decision to launch the first five year plan to industrialise the country was of decisive importance for the whole development and the very existence of the U.S.S.R. But at the time the decision was taken on the initiative of Comrade Stalin, there were many like Bukharin, Zinoviev and Kamenev who declared it to be madness and ruthlessly fought against it.

The same thing applies to the historic Party decision on the development of collective farming, agriculture, and the elimination of the Kulak class. If that decision had not been carried out, what a sorry position would have arisen when Hitler's hordes advanced into Soviet territory. Yet that decision also was adopted and carried out in the teeth of fierce opposition from hostile enemy elements and classes.

This leadership called for a party with a mastery of the advanced theory of the working class movement — the theory of Marxism-Leninism. It called for a revolutionary party, free from all opportunism and unswerving in its struggle against compromisers, waverers and capitulators.

The Communist Party of the Soviet Union, headed by Stalin, is precisely such a party of a

new type; a party which daily strengthens the firm connections which bind it to the masses of the people; a party whose main line of policy is not merely the policy of party members, but the policy adopted and carried out by the whole people.

A year ago, after the enormous loss of life among Communist Party members in the second World War, the Soviet Communist Party had six million members, and two-thirds of its members were under the age of thirty-five years.

Every member of the Soviet Communist Party is an active leader of the people — there are no mere holders of a party card in the Bolshevik party.

The official organ of the Party, Pravda, is the greatest organising force in the world today. When a decision of the Central Committee, a speech of Stalin or other Soviet leaders, appears in Pravda, the Communists in the remotest corners of the vast Soviet territory will be found sedulously studying the paper as soon as it appears, and immediately deciding how to put the decisions into effect.

Editorials of Pravda on the spring sowing or the harvest, on a particular industry or factory — are carefully studied and discussed immediately by the party members directly concerned, and steps are taken without delay to correct defects revealed in their work.

All this is possible because of the close ties between leadership, party and masses, and because a thorough knowledge of Communist theory and policy is the hallmark of a member of the Soviet Communist Party.

Led by such a Party, the Soviet people have won world-shaking victories in the past thirty years. Led by such a Party, the Soviet people in the next few years will reach such pinnacles of economic, social and cultural development as will transform the outlook of hundreds of millions of people throughout the world.

A new economic crisis is now besetting the capitalist world. At the time of the last economic crisis in the early thirties, the contrast between the U.S.S.R. and capitalist lands stood out clear and sharp for all to see, but at that time the Soviet Union was only beginning Socialist construction from a very low level.

Today, at the beginning of a new capitalist economic crisis, the Soviet Union is already a powerful, highly industrialised socialist State, with a rate of development in human achievement which will give unprecedented impetus to the Socialist advance of the masses of mankind now laboring under the increasing decay and chaos of capitalism.

## THE MEANING OF DR. EVATT'S POLICY

L. L. SHARKEY

THE Labor Party Governments of Britain, Australia and New Zealand still maintain their alliance, in the sphere of foreign affairs, with the American Big Business Government.

During the recent Federal Parliamentary debate on foreign policy, Prime Minister Chifley adopted the contradictory position of rebuking Menzies, Fadden and Co. for their warmongering, but then said that Vyshinsky's attack on the equally vicious and far more dangerous, because so much more powerful, Yankee warmongers, was "hard to swallow." In effect, Mr. Chifley believes that Menzies and Co. held beliefs inimical to peaceful co-operation among the nations, but will not see that there are powerful warmongers in Britain and the United States: Churchill and the gentry indicted by Vyshinsky.

Certainly, the English-speaking peoples desire no new wars, but that is not true of many of the powerful monopolists and imperialist politicians. It is not the "duty" of the labor movement to "defend" warmongers because they are British, as McNeil did at U.N.O. in the case of Churchill, spicing his "defence" with some nasty anti-Soviet slanders, but to expose and fight warmongers wherever they are to be found. Our duty, in particular, is to fight "our own" warmongers.

The Australian Labor Government's policy is "close co-operation" with America, allegedly to make Australia secure from aggression. It is apparently of no concern to the Labor Government who rules in America, whether it is a fascist, Tory, or Liberal Government of the Roosevelt type, nor of any consequence what kind of policy that Government pursues. To the Labor leaders, it seems America is powerful enough to "protect" Australia and that is all they ask.

That is the line persistently pursued since the end of the war. It is a fundamentally false policy, and one fraught with the gravest dangers for the Australian people.

The American Government is a government of Big Business, of the representatives of the most colossal monopolies and trusts on record. It serves entirely the interests of U.S. Big Business. It oppresses the American people. The Taft-Hartley anti-Trade Union legislation is described as "the Slave Bill" by the American trade union movement. More striking still, the leaders of the two American trade union Federations, Presidents Murray and Green, who are as far from being Communists as Mr. Chifley himself, have described the Taft-Hartley Bill in an official joint statement as a "long step towards fascism."

Millions of American civil servants are being Third Degree'd as to their politics by Edgar Hoover's strong-arm F.B.I. men. What is the difference between this and the infamous laws against "dangerous

thoughts" imposed on the Japanese by their fascist and warmongering rulers?

Henry Wallace, to the applause of millions of Britons and Americans, brands the Truman policy, backed by the big capitalists, as a warmongering policy. Vyshinsky is by no means alone when he points to warmongers and fascists in the U.S.A., he has the complete support of all the democratic forces of America, from the Rooseveltian Liberals to the trade unions, the growing American Labor Party, and the Communists.

The demagoguery of Dr. Evatt at U.N.O. cannot conceal the fact that the foreign policy of the Australian Labor Government is completely out of step with the views of the American democrats of all schools of thought; that it gives aid and comfort to their worst enemy, which shackles them with a "Slave Bill" and robs them of their last dollar through uncontrolled high prices, profiteering and backmarkting.

The American progressives, Vyshinsky and the democrats of all lands are right in their estimate of U.S. policy and Evatt is wrong in his defence of the American imperialists; the policy which Mr. Chifley uneasily defended in the Federal Parliamentary debate. Not only is it wrong, but it is an insult and a blow to the American democrats, who are fighting strenuously the war and fascist policies of American reaction, the American Menzies, Fadden and Churchills.

The American people, at last, are proceeding to build a Third Party in order to wage the struggle against their oppressor, Big Business and its Government.

The "co-operation" between the A.L.P. leaders and the American monopolists, warmongers labor-haters, fascists and would-be world rulers, defended by Chifley and Evatt on the ground it is "necessary" for Australia's "defence," raises the question: Defence against whom? Dr. Evatt or the Prime Minister tell us who is preparing to invade Australia? Is it India, Indonesia, China? Or France or Italy? Everyone knows it is absurd to talk about invasion from any of these countries in any discernible future. Germany and Japan are occupied by Allied armies. Who then? The "expansionism" of the Soviet Union, the reactionaries will shout in chorus.

The notion of a Soviet invasion of Australia or America, or Britain, is a fantastic invention of warmongering propaganda. It is physically impossible, even if the Soviet Union were a warmongering, imperialist State, puffed up with dreams like the Wall Street tycoons, of world domination instead of being a Socialist, peace-loving State. It is the imperialist warmongers of the United States who dream of war, talk war and prepare war.

If such a war did come, it would not take the form of a Soviet aggression, nor an invasion of the English-speaking countries. Quite the contrary. The Americans are obviously preparing for an attack on the frontiers of the Soviet Union. That is why they are preparing military bases across the world, thousands of miles from the shores of the United States.

Such a war would be fought in Europe and Asia, not in the Americas and Australia, or even in Britain. It is the Americans who are building military railways in Turkey, running right up to the Soviet frontier, not the Soviets who are building bases in Mexico; it is the U.S.A. that is building war bases in the Middle East to attack the Baku oilfields, not the Soviets building war bases in Canada to attack the U.S.A. and so on.

It is the imperialists, not the Soviets, who are preparing for an aggressive, unjust war. Joseph Stalin recently pointed out that the monopolies had found war a "profitable business" for them. The American bosses about doubled their capital and are still making super-profits as a result of the war. Peace threatens this exploiters' paradise. A terrible depression casts its shadow over the U.S.A. and other capitalist countries. So war seems more profitable to them than peace and "depression"—and mass revolt against the ensuing poverty.

War is inherent in monopoly capital, which is not to say that war is inevitable. The warmongers can be straitjacketed by the struggle of the masses.

It is clear, then, that the "co-operation" of the Labor Government with America is not concerned simply with Australian defence, but will inevitably lead to the transformation of Australia into a satellite, after the fashion of Hungary, Bulgaria, Finland, etc., in Hitler's war, in the offensive of the American trusts against the Soviet Union and the people's movements the world over.

The role of Dr. Evatt is shown up very clearly in connection with the struggle around the veto, ideologically posing as the super-defender of "democratic majority decisions" and the "rights of smaller powers," Evatt has consistently assailed the veto power.

The "Big Three" agreed to the veto because the principle of unanimity of the decisive powers is vital; moreover, in any action against a possible aggressor the major states would have to shoulder the main burden, therefore, protection of their interests was considered necessary.

The "Big Three," further, is composed of two imperialist and one Socialist country, which, while it does not preclude co-operation for peace and international trade, nevertheless complicates matters, as they naturally approach problems from different, i.e., socialist and capitalist, standpoints.

These are the circumstances in which the veto, or principle of unanimity, was born.

At the end of the war, on the basis of the discovery of the atom bomb, the American and British imperialists went over to the "get tough with Russia" policy, to "atom bomb blackmail."

Anglo-American imperialism set out to dominate the world, with the more powerful American imperialism in the leading role.

A swarm of small capitalist states and some larger ones (France, China, Italy) hope to live on American dollars and to buttress their reactionary ruling-classes against the popular movement with American imperialist power. Therefore, they are subservient to the will of the Wall Street paymasters, and have lost, or are losing, the power to take an independent political line. Some of them, like Argentina and Greece, are fascist.

Dr. Evatt's "democratic majority" is composed, then, of delegations dependent on Wall Street. In reality, therefore, Evatt's "democratic majority" is the instrument of dollar imperialism.

Democracy is freely translated to mean the "rule of the people." What has this "majority" of satellites in U.N.O. to do with the "will of the people?" The answer is, nothing.

The Wall Street trusts are out to capture the market and financially control the economy of the other capitalist states. The American imperialists want to achieve Hitler's aim, i.e., world domination. The less powerful capitalist states thus lose their independence.

The Wall Street trusts found war a most profitable business for them, unlike the peoples of Europe, who wander hungry amid the ruins of their cities, factories and farms.

The Wall Street monopolists and those of London cherish a bitter class hatred for the Soviet Union and the popular governments and movements of Europe. Hence, they bang the war-drums and drive towards a Third World War as their unstable, monopoly-capitalist economy totters on the brink of a new crisis.

The Soviet delegation has used the veto to prevent Wall Street imperialism having its way in the Balkans, Spain, in the Middle East, and to block its encroachment on the independence of small countries and its plan to turn Europe into an American backyard.

The Soviet use of the veto at U.N.O. therefore, served the interests of the democratic and peace-loving peoples everywhere, whereas Evatt's demagogic anti-veto campaign is of the greatest service to the war-making and world domination plans of Churchill and the men of Wall Street.

The "crisis" in U.N.O. today is caused by the ruthless efforts of the Yankee imperialists to reduce U.N.O. to the status of the unlamented League of Nations, which degenerated into the servile instrument of the policy of one or two powerful countries, that is, to make U.N.O. the tool of the Yankee pretenders to world "leadership."

Evatt's struggle "against the veto" is in reality a struggle to ensure the dominance of American foreign policy—the policy of the super-millionaires—over U.N.O. and the world.

That is why Moscow radio said Evatt was not "pro-British or even pro-Australian, but pro-American" and the "errand boy of the dollar."

Evatt's "foreign policy" of subservience to American imperialism over the veto issue has nothing in common with the democratic tradition of the Australian labor movement, but is its antithesis.

Evatt's campaign on the veto, if successful, would destroy U.N.O., as neither the Soviet Union nor any other really democratic country is prepared to accept American overlordship.

So, as an effective organization for peaceful cooperation among the Nations, U.N.O. would cease to exist and instead would become the plaything of Churchill and Wall Street. The world would thus be brought that much closer to war.

Such is the real content of Evatt's anti-veto demagoguery which, in their own interest, the Australian people should repudiate because, in the last analysis, Evatt's attack on the veto would, if successful, remove a powerful bulwark from the warmongers' path.

The obscene fascist dictatorship of Franco still rules Spain with the firing squad and the gallows.

When the Soviet and Polish delegates about a year ago raised the question of Franco before U.N.O. and demanded serious action to remove this legacy of Hitlerism, Evatt played his usual sidetracking role, claiming that U.N.O. action would "strengthen" Franco, an obvious falsity, and proposing a "fact-finding" committee to find out, it would seem, if Franco is "really" a fascist!

Evatt, together with the Yankee imperialists, carried out this farce, which has prevented real aid being extended to the Spanish people.

The Evatt-imperialist line on Spain has resulted in Franco being left undisturbed to slaughter the cream of the Spanish nation while the New York and London monopolies pour in capital to plunder the unfortunate Spanish masses kept on a starvation wage by the Franco dictatorship. And in the most recent U.N.O. debate on Spain, Evatt was in the minority, opposing a motion aiming at action against the Franco dictatorship!!

Evatt bears a heavy responsibility for the betrayal of the Spanish people by the Yankee-controlled U.N.O. majority who prefer Franco's dictatorship to a democratic regime in Spain.

The result of Evatt's activity around Spain is a real test of his sincerity—a practical test—and the result has proved that Evatt and his Wall Street patrons endeavor to sidetrack "interference" by U.N.O. with the loathsome Spanish fascist regime.

In every issue where Evatt has pulled faces and made loud demagogic noises in opposition to real demands for U.N.O. action, the result has been the same—a setback for the democratic, peace-loving forces, and a victory for Churchill, Wall Street, and international reaction.

Evatt has consistently backed intervention in Greece, where the democratic forces and heroic fighters against the Nazi and Italian invaders are being executed by scores, while other thousands are sent to island concentration camps by the savage Royalist-fascist dictatorship.

When, at the recent U.N.O. session, the crude American attempt to "declare" Yugoslavia, Albania and Bulgaria "guilty" of aiding the guerrillas proved too much for other delegations, and an amendment was moved deleting the "guilty" clause, Evatt influenced also perhaps because the Yugoslavs have wounded his vanity by criticising him (and he is wounded a type whose politics can depend very often really a type whose politics can depend very often on his emotional reactions, which handicaps him for the post he holds) stood out, alone almost, for the continuation of this provocation, which could easily have led to a war in the Balkans, and which was aiming at giving the American imperialists an opportunity to intervene against the people's governments.

In "reply" to Vyshinsky's demand for the removal of foreign troops from Greece, Evatt defended intervention against the Greek people and told the world that Soviet troops were occupying Yugoslavia.

There have been no Soviet troops in Yugoslavia since the Nazis were driven out. No doubt there are still some Soviet troops guarding communications through Poland to the Soviet occupation forces in Germany, but they are not carrying on a reactionary war against the people and democracy as is the case in Greece. Soviet troops in Europe are there with the consent of the Allies, just as are the British and U.S. troops. And Evatt was one of a small minority at U.N.O. who wanted to turn over South-west Africa to South Africa, whose race phobia and ill-treatment of Negroes and Indians is notorious!

Evatt was almost frantic in his efforts to defend his patrons against Vyshinsky's charge of warmongering. Evatt's "amendment," in the name of Australia, to Vyshinsky's motion to outlaw war propaganda was an insult to the name of Australia. In effect, Evatt claimed "free speech" and "democratic rights" for warmongers!

What a prostitution of the glorious concept of freedom of speech and democracy! Free speech for the Hitlerians so that the crematoriums can be stoked again and the rivers run red with blood from the battlefields.

Evatt talked about press campaigns against the warmongers, knowing full well that most of the propagandists of an anti-Soviet war, who censor peace arguments from its columns. Evatt wants to suppress, not the warmongers, but those who expose the warmongers. Evatt said that the Soviet press and radio campaign "against America" is a cause for war! It is well-known that the Hearst and the rest of the Yankee press daily pollute the atmosphere with streams of the foulest lies about the Soviet Union, but Evatt could not be expected to regard that as a "cause of war."

A country that regards press criticism as a cause for war must be on the verge of insanity, and Evatt thus unwittingly exposed his friends.

He endeavored to protect Byrnes against Vyshinsky's description of his book as "warmongering." The depths to which Dr. Evatt has fallen can be judged by comparing the London Times review of Byrnes' book, which described it as "a recipe for war."

To indicate fully the role of Evatt, the "great Liberal-Labor democrat" from democratic Australia, as a chief apologist for the U.S. imperialists and a "democratic screen" for war-preparation, let me quote at length the exposure of Evatt's "defence of the free Press" made by Vyshinsky at U.N.O., more particularly as it disposes of the lies told about the Soviet Press and the humbug that the press of Hearst and Beaverbrook, Murdoch and Fairfax is a "free press."

Vyshinsky will have the support of every Australian worker who knows only too well the vicious character of "our" millionaires' press. Vyshinsky said:

"Dr. Evatt protested against censorship, but the entire Australian press is strictly censored by the monopolists. There is no Government censorship in Australia, which means no censorship under public control; but there exists a very rigorous private censorship extending to everything printed in the newspapers, from articles down to the smallest notes and advertisements. It deals with the least significant questions, as well as with subjects of first-rate state significance.

... In his statement made here, Dr. Evatt accused the Soviet press of failure to report the friendly acts of other countries in regard to the U.S.S.R., and he did so very emphatically and making use of unfair expressions. What is the meaning of this accusation advanced by Dr. Evatt here, especially in connection with the subject we are now discussing—measures against instigators of war and against propaganda of a new war?

"This accusation means neither more nor less than that the Soviet press—and since according to Evatt's conception the Soviet press is controlled by the Soviet Government—that the Soviet Government deceives its own people by refraining from reporting to our Soviet people friendly acts coming from various states. If this is true, it is a grave crime.

"What did Dr. Evatt cite as an example? In support of his contention he cited the fact that not a single Soviet newspaper published Gromyko's statement made in the Security Council on February 26, 1947, concerning the decisive part which the armed forces of the U.S.A. played in the victory over Japan, and concerning the fact that the United States sustained greater losses in the war with Japan than any other country. Did not Dr. Evatt plainly say that this statement was not reported to the Soviet people?

"But here I will pass to the Chairman this copy of the newspaper Pravda of February 27, 1947. This is the organ of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. I shall pass this

copy of Pravda to the Chairman and request him to certify that on page 6 there is a despatch entitled "In the Security Council," which reproduces exactly, word for word, what Dr. Evatt quoted here yesterday, accusing us of concealing this statement from the Soviet people.

"Thus, Dr. Evatt, it is one of two things: either you were misled by your dishonest or ignorant advisers, who palm off on you all kinds of criba, the products of their ignorance and illiteracy, for the sole purpose of heating up your temper, hot as it is; or else you did it deliberately and in this case dishonestly.

"In the light of facts of this kind I shall ask you whether the assertion that the Soviet Government and the Soviet press concealed friendly acts of other states is not the very same malicious slander which is covered by the second paragraph of the resolution moved by Dr. Evatt? The great Russian writer Gogol describes the widow of a corporal who flogged herself. I believe that in this instance Dr. Evatt also flogged himself, but I expect him to offer an explanation on this point.

"While dealing with this question, I should like to note in passing one interesting feature: on February 27, when the U.S.A. moved in the Security Council the establishment of trusteeship over Japan's former mandated islands, the Australian representative Mr. Hasluck requested that the discussion be adjourned. It was then that Mr. Gromyko came out to say that the question was perfectly clear and that there was no reason for adjourning it. Thus the Australians wanted to secure an adjournment and perhaps even frustrate a decision altogether. The Soviet Union came out against this, and now this is being presented here in a distorted way in an effort to push through an inconsistent and false contention.

"This is how matters stand with regard to the basic contention that the press is free in some countries, such as, for instance, Australia, and that in other countries, such as, for instance, the Soviet Union, a Government-controlled press deceives its people.

"Dr. Evatt waxed indignant in connection with a cartoon of Eisenhower published in the Literaturnaya Gazeta. Yet, were Dr. Evatt to turn his attention to what is going on, let us say, in New York as regards cartoons of the leaders of the Soviet Government, he could paste all these walls with such cartoons instead of wall paper. Not only the New York American Journal or the New York World Telegram, but even the New York Times and the Baltimore Sun, Times, Herald and a number of other newspapers permit themselves insolent attacks on the leaders of the Soviet Government and Soviet people. I see them every day and examine with utter abhorrence these cartoons presented by the American press. I have a great many of them, and some time we shall issue an album in order to convict false witnesses.

"Dr. Evatt forgets one important circumstance, namely, that the Soviet press began attacking the

December, 1947

press of other countries only in reply to attacks on leaders of the Soviet State which had been launched continuously long before the Soviet press proceeded to attack. It has become an everyday occurrence, especially in America, to picture Russia as a kind of horrible polar bear mauling the rest of the world, and to act with the insolence of hooligans in misrepresenting our leaders. This has become so common that it seems to cause no surprise to anyone here.

Our people, however, are highly indignant and we shall reply to such cartoons by our own cartoons, by a dozen cartoons to one, by a hundred to a dozen, by twice as much rudeness to rudeness, without considering rank and distinction without considering past services, as it should be in a true democracy. We shall call war instigators, such as Churchill, by their real name of war instigators, and not only call them so but prove it, even though they may have rendered great services in the past struggle against our common enemy.

Dr. Evatt should understand this and not feel offended when the Soviet press pays back in kind. He should not feel offended by cartoons. In this connection, I should like to cite a Russian proverb: "No use complaining about the mirror when your face is crooked." A cartoon, like a mirror, shows what actually exists.

I have seen no adequate reply by Evatt, for the very good reason that there is no convincing reply, nor so far as I know, has he expressed any repentance for his falsities regarding the Soviet press.

Evatt's well-known change of front in regard to policy on Japan indicates his growing subservience to American imperialism. There is no need for me to emphasise the danger to Australia implied in a revival of Japanese imperialism. Earlier, the Federal Government seemed to be alive to this potential menace, and Evatt appeared to be opposing the policy of MacArthur.

MacArthur's policy is to maintain the Japanese Emperor, the feudal aristocracy and the big monopoly concerns, the heart and mainspring of Japanese fascism and aggression. MacArthur, in line with imperialist policy in Western Germany, wants to restore the enemy to strength in order that he might be used for a new world war as an American ally and to use his industry as a source of profit for Wall Street. No genuine type of democracy is to be permitted in Japan and the Trade Unions, and the Communists are to be rigorously excluded from any voice in Japan's future.

It is well known that this self-same policy in regard to Germany after the First World War led to disaster—to the rise of fascism and the outbreak of the Second World War. An imperialist, fascist Frankenstein was created in Germany, as part of an anti-Soviet policy, which could not be controlled.

Australia's national interest demands that this "mistake" be not repeated in regard to Japanese imperialism, as our nation may not be fortunate

enough to escape destruction in a second conflict with the Japanese warlords.

Evatt suddenly changed his policy and accepted the reconstruction of a reactionary Japan under all that means. Without a doubt, this acceptance of the MacArthur dictatorship in regard to Japan's future is much more of the Soviet Union, which trails a safety than that of the Soviet Union, which is altogether too powerful for Japan to tackle. The war proved that point.

That Evatt is aping, or taking orders from, the American reactionary government is indicated by certain activities here in Australia.

Evatt boasts of his "co-ordination" of the "Intelligence Services" (in other lands, these are known as "espionage") and the greatly increased budget for these "services." As far as can be gathered the main function of this "Service" is espionage on Australian citizens, militant workers and intellectuals, suspected of "dangerous thoughts," a lack of belief in the "morals" of the capitalist system.

Evatt seized the opportunity, when a few trade unionists mistakenly talked of a boycott of the rocket range, to improve on the infamous Crimes Act of the Bruce Government, by a piece of repressive legislation that is a menace to Australian liberty.

While we Communists do not oppose Australia experimenting with the latest military technique, there can be no doubt that the rocket range, in present international conditions, is part of the preparation for an imperialist, anti-Soviet war. The Australian people must realise that it is part and parcel of a reactionary world policy and not necessarily for Australia's protection against aggression.

Such are some of the attacks on Australian democracy sponsored by Attorney-General Evatt. A new inner crisis develops in the Federal Labor Party over policy, most political students feel that Evatt is the likely one to follow in the footsteps of Hughes and Lyons, who split the Labor Government and installed reaction back in office. This suspicion and latent distrust is widespread in labor movement.

The path along which Evatt has been directing Australian foreign policy is brought into sharp relief by Molotov's announcement of Soviet possession of the atom bomb secret.

Evatt strongly defended the American "monopoly" of the atom bomb and stoutly resisted the Soviet proposal that atomic weapons be outlawed, in the fond belief that Soviet science would not master the technique of the atom bomb for 10 or 15 years. In the meantime, Evatt and his patrons would play the game of atom bomb diplomacy, i.e., threatening to shower atom bombs on the Soviet people, just as the Yanks unnecessarily dropped them on Japanese cities at a time when the outcome of the Pacific war had already been decided.

It is along this path to war that Evatt's subservience to American atom bomb diplomacy is attempting to lead Australia.

December, 1947

COMMUNIST REVIEW

757

That such a war is against the interests of the labor movement and the Australian nation needs no demonstration.

It is because the Communist Party leads the struggle for peace and opposes war with the Soviet Union and the new European democracies that we are slandered by the warmongers as "Fifth Columnists."

Soviet possession of the atom bomb destroys the illusion of the imperialists that they were in a position to inflict a quick defeat on the Soviet Union with a shower of atom bombs while escaping retaliation themselves.

Molotov's announcement should cause them to revise their policies, give up their crazy plans for world domination and co-operate with the Soviet Union along the lines agreed to at the Potsdam Conference of the Big Three and embodied in the Charter of the United Nations.

## DEMOCRACY OF A NEW TYPE

PROFESSOR EUGENE VARGA, Moscow

(Continued from last issue)

ALTHOUGH the same social order exists in all the countries of democracy of a new type, there are differences of no little importance, conditioned historically in both economy and policy.

This applies particularly to the national policy of the States under review. It might seem that in this sphere a sharp contradiction exists between the policy of Yugoslavia, on the one hand, and that of Czechoslovakia and Poland on the other (Bulgaria is almost united as regards its national composition). Czechoslovakia and Poland expelled to Germany almost all the Germans who previously lived on the present territory of their countries. In Yugoslavia all nations have equal rights and it is a federation of various nationalities. This contradiction, however, is only a seeming contradiction. In Yugoslavia a question of nations which (born from the common Slav nationality) were oppressed by the Germans and fought against the invaders. During the war they belonged to one camp.

At the same time the Germans in the Sudeten region and Poland were a tool of Hitler fascism even before the war. They openly betrayed the country of which they were citizens. During the world war they fought on the side of Hitler against their motherland. It is comprehensible that, with this motherland, the Czechoslovak and Polish experience in mind, the Czechoslovak and Polish peoples have no desire to expose themselves to a possible danger by keeping these treacherous elements in their countries. The complete equality of rights of Slovaks and Czechs in Czechoslovakia clearly demonstrates the nature of its national policy, based on historical experience.

On the completion of the expulsion of Germans and the voluntary migration of Ukrainians from Poland to the Soviet Union and Poles from the

The Australian labor movement must reject the policy pursued by Evatt as dangerous to peace and placing Australia in the position of a U.S. satellite imperilling its power to make its own independent decisions.

The labor movement, rejecting Evatt's foreign policy, should demand:

Rejection of the idea that U.S. imperialism is Australia's only protection.

The outlawing of atomic weapons.

Universal disarmament.

Banning of war-inciting statements.

Liquidation of the fascist groups.

Carrying out the U.N.O. programme of international co-operation for peace.

Such a programme alone guarantees Australia's peace and independence.

Soviet Union to Poland) the national composition of the States of the new democracy will be as follows: Bulgaria and Poland will be almost completely homogenous as regards national composition, Czechoslovakia will consist of two nations with equal rights (probably with a Hungarian minority, which the population unwillingly accepts). Yugoslavia, on the other hand, is a federation of equal nations. This national policy of the new Yugoslavia is particularly important for the prosperity of the country and friendship among the peoples living on its territory, because its pre-war regime left behind an extremely unfavourable heritage in this respect. Although the country was called Yugoslavia, i.e., the land of southern Slavs, it was the Serbian bourgeoisie which exercised actual domination and oppressed the other peoples. Precisely for this reason everything which in the slightest degree could be interpreted to mean a continuation of the pre-war Serbian policy of oppression was deleted from the Constitution and practice of the new Yugoslavia.

There remains in Yugoslavia a small German (and Magyar) minority. Since Yugoslavia, however, has no common frontier with Germany, and its regime is politically extremely stable, it can, unlike Czechoslovakia and Poland, safely leave this minority in its country.

All the states of democracy of a new type are People's Republics: the working people determine the policy of the government. The form which the political rule of the workers takes is not, however, the same in each case. Czechoslovakia, Poland and Bulgaria are parliamentary republics with universal, equal and secret electoral rights. The

governments in these countries are made up of coalition parties forming a majority and are responsible to parliament. Their electoral rights differ from the suffrage in the old bourgeois democracies, in that fascist parties are not allowed to operate and fascist traitors have no electoral rights. At the same time Yugoslavia is a federative republic, its Constitution being similar in many ways to that of the Soviet Union.

In this connection an important theoretical question arises: the idea was widely held in the Communist parties that the political domination of the working people, as is the case in the Soviet Union, could only be realised in the form of Soviet power. This is not correct, nor is it an expression of Lenin's opinion.

In my book on the Hungarian Soviet Republic, *Economic-political Problems of Proletarian Dictatorship*, published in 1920, I wrote the following phrase:

"The hostility of the prosperous peasants and all strata of the ruling classes toward the proletarian state does not depend on the form the latter takes: whether this system is Soviet, a government of trade unions or a parliament with a Labor majority—this is all the same to the ruling classes. They will offer equally strong resistance to whatever form is assumed, once serious steps are taken to build up socialist economy."

This phrase which allows of the possibility of other forms of political rule by the working people was regarded by a number of comrades as incorrect. Lenin, however, who made sharp notes of criticism in the margins of some pages of my book, made no remarks at all concerning the phrase quoted above, but merely underlined part of it (see *Lenin Symposium*, Vol. 7, p. 371, Russ. Ed.).

The rise of states of new democracy shows clearly that it is possible to have political rule by the working people even while the outward forms of parliamentary democracy are still maintained.

The foreign policy of the States of new democracy is determined by the transitional character of their social order. It is owing to their social order that the capitalist States, primarily the United States of America and Britain, do everything in their power not only to hinder the progressive social development of these countries but to throw them back and once more convert them into ordinary capitalist States. This effort becomes all the stronger on account of the fact that the present State system of these countries excludes the possibility of their once more becoming economically dependent countries as they were before the war in relation to Germany. It is this which explains facts in the daily press which are all too well-known to the reader: the repeated attempts at interference in the internal affairs of these countries, the hulla-balloo about the absence of democracy because

reactionary plotting is severely dealt with, attempts to discredit the elections, support of every display of opposition, i.e., of all reactionary (in the present historical situation) and objectively counter-revolutionary parties and politicians, etc. The revolutionary parties at interference differs in intensity of these attempts at the different countries. It is relatively weak in relation to Czechoslovakia, because the bourgeoisie there are so discredited that they collaborate with the German fascists that they can, at least for the present, act openly as a political not, at least for the present, act openly as a political force and foreign reaction is deprived, therefore, of internal support. The democratic character of Czechoslovakia, therefore, cannot be disputed. In Poland, where Mikołajczyk's Peasant Party serves as the chief legal centre of reactionary forces inside the country and a bulwark for foreign reaction, attempts at interference assume the most intense character. One of the chief tasks of the foreign policy of these countries, therefore, is to protect their political conquests at home and their social system from all these attacks.

It can be understood from these circumstances why the States mentioned maintain the closest friendly relations among themselves and render each other economic and political aid. Of the States mentioned, Yugoslavia and Bulgaria, on the one hand, and Czechoslovakia and Poland on the other, have common frontiers which facilitate their economic ties. (There are two countries—Hungary and Rumania—between these two groups of states, which, although at the present time not belonging to the countries of democracy of a new type, are clearly developing in this direction.)

It is equally understandable that these countries maintain close, friendly relations with the Soviet Union. This is so not only because it was precisely the victorious troops of the Soviet Union that liberated their countries (Yugoslavia being, in part, an exception) from German occupation, and not only because they are all Slav states, but primarily because the present social order brings them close to the Soviet Union, because of all the great powers the Soviet Union alone is interested in the maintenance and further progressive development of the social order and political regime existing in these countries and can afford them diplomatic support against the reactionary offensive from outside.

The Soviet Union is at the same time interested in the maintenance by these countries of the existing regime and their further development in a progressive direction. The present regime in these countries provides the guarantee that they will not, in the future, again voluntarily serve as a place d'armes for any power which tries to attack the Soviet Union. For this reason the Soviet Union is interested in these States being as strong as possible in the economic, political and military sense, in order that they may defend themselves against foreign attack at least until such time as the Soviet

armies can come to their aid and so avert their forcible conversion into a military place d'armes against the Soviet Union, as happened during the Second World War.

This situation signifies that the States of democracy of the new type are the junction of the post-war struggle of two systems. It was not for nothing that during the war Churchill frequently called for the opening of a Second Front in the Balkans

instead of a genuine Second Front in the West, in order that, by the end of the war, British armed forces would be on the spot to safeguard the old order. But these proposals were rejected by Roosevelt and Stalin as being incorrect from the military viewpoint.

All this points to the extremely close interweaving of home and foreign policy at the present stage of the general crisis of capitalism.

## WOMEN DON'T WANT PREFERENCE

### "TRADE UNIONIST"

PREFERENCE in employment when accorded to women means but one thing—the nation is facing a crisis. Preference in employment is accorded women not by legislation, as in the case of returned soldiers, but by the economics of capitalism. This preference reaches a peak in times of depression, or in times of acute manpower shortage due to war.

Today capitalism throughout the world faces an impending economic crisis. In planning our activities in this period we must give attention to consolidating wartime gains in wages and to further lifting the Australian standard of living.

In this situation specific consideration must be given to the question of women wage earners, not because they are women—but because they are an important part of our nation. Capitalism views womanpower as its "one in the bag" to be produced as and when required. Gone are the pious cries of "breaking up the family," "losing femininity" and so on—cheap labor is needed. Women constitute a huge reservoir of cheap labor and particularly in times of depression provide the means of carrying on what little production may be required at the lowest possible cost.

So preference to women during economic crises means "out with the menfolk, in with our cheap labor." Figures culled from the reports of the Commonwealth Government Statistician and the Bureau of Census and Economics bring these facts forcibly to notice. Tracing the history of the last depression we find—

- In 1927 of the total number of factory employees 25.5% were females; in 1932 it had risen to 29.2%.
- In 1927 unemployment was 7.0%; in 1932 29%.
- In 1927 masculinity (the number of males employed per 100 females) was 294; in 1932 it had dropped to 241.

Whilst unemployment soared the number of males employed to females decreased considerably. Even at the height of the war, 1944, with thousands of men in the Armed Forces, with unemployment at its lowest ebb, with higher rates for women offering more inducement to enter industry the figures barely surpass the depression years—women in factory employment constituted

29.6% of total factory employees; masculinity was 237.

This is what preference in employment meant during the depression. Preference to work at a cheaper rate in an endeavour to provide for the family, whilst the male wage earner was idle. Preference to rear your family on 54% of the male rate!

In addition to clearly illustrating how this cheap labor reservoir is used, the figures also show quite plainly that women in industry are a numerically large part of our society—they comprise approximately one-third of the total labor force of the Commonwealth. There are people who would ignore this fact and still follow the concepts of the late unlamented Adolf Hitler, who said "... man's world is the State, his struggle ... woman's world is a smaller one—her world is her husband, her family, her children and her home. The woman of the future shall be at home in her kingdom and will not torment herself with fruitless worry about equality."

The military defeat of fascism brings with it also the need to eradicate traces of its ideology. The fight for equality of status for women will assist in this struggle. The United States Manpower Commission, during the war, stated: "No society can boast of democratic ideals if it utilises its woman power in a crisis and neglects it in peace." The United Nations Charter includes "equal rights for men and women and no discrimination on account of sex."

No doubt the A.C.T.U. Congress had this in mind when discussing the question of women in industry. The resolutions of Congress give a basis around which campaigns can be waged for equality in industry.

Included in the A.C.T.U. decisions are—

1. Removal from State Arbitration Acts of clauses prescribing first a "minimum male living wage" and a percentage of that rate to women, ranging from 54% to 60%.

This is an important decision. State awards are based firstly on this percentage calculated "female basic wage" with margins for skill, etc., added to it.

No female basic wage exists in the Commonwealth sphere—the Court assesses the female rate



but follows the practice of accorded a lower rate than the male rate. Congress affirmed the 1945 decision on the basic wage, calling for a complete investigation into the basis of assessment of the wage. The position of women must not be lost sight of in any such enquiry—the rate set must be a 'minimum adult living wage' irrespective of sex.

2. That all Unions in seeking awards apply for the rate for the job, such rate to apply to male and female alike.

As the decisions of Congress are now binding in all affiliated Unions it will need vigilance to see that this policy is carried out.

3. Decision to seek amendment of the new Commonwealth Arbitration Act is linked with other matters dealt with by Congress calling for the complete abolition of the Wage Pegging Regulations.

Deletion is sought of the existing prohibition whereby Conciliation Commissioners cannot set the minimum rate of remuneration for adult females, which is reserved for the Court to decide, and repeal of Wage Pegging Regulations which provide the Court may award only up to 75% of the minimum male rate for females.

Amendment to the Wage Pegging Regulations this year created this 75% maximum and later the regulations were amended to provide that the judge could award rates if he found it desirable in the "national interest." To date no union has tested whether the "national interest" is sufficiently elastic to overcome the existing 75% restriction.

4. Pending the complete abolition of Wage Pegging Regulations the Government to continue the rates set by the Women's Employment Board and the Female (Minimum Rates) Regulations.

At the same time Congress requested that the 75% be not related to the minimum male rate but 75% of the corresponding male rate, or 75% of the minimum adult male rate plus full male margins, whichever is most suited to the industry.

5. As a means of lifting the general wage rates for women, Unions operating under the Female (Minimum Rates) Regulations to seek immediately to have those rates incorporated in their awards.

This in order that when the Regulations expire there will not be a return to the old 54% with meagre margins.

6. State and Commonwealth Governments are to be approached to introduce equal pay for their own employees. Equal pay is the policy of the Labor Party, the Liberal Party, the Communist Party and the Trade Union Movement and there is no reason why the various Governments cannot introduce it at least for their own employees.

7. Elimination of policy and legislation which has a discriminatory affect on women's employment, more particularly in the public service. Here attention was directed to obsolete re-

strictive provisions; Government policy which debars women from sitting for examinations to qualify for higher paid positions, and policy which, despite any educational or practical qualifications held by women, debars them from certain positions.

8. Executive and State Labor Councils are to arrange deputations to the various Governments to place the views of the Trade Union Movement before them.

Thus the A.C.T.U. Congress decisions represent a comprehensive policy for the trade union struggle for equality for women.

This is not sufficient.

The mere carrying of good resolutions and placing such views before parliamentarians never won victory in any campaign. What is needed is action in the unions and on the job.

Here the task comes back to the Party.

It is not strange to note that the Unions who have made the greatest gains for the womenfolk are, in the main, Unions in which our Party exercises some considerable influence. But much more remains to be done.

Too many of our Party members are prone to leave the question of women's wages over, to regard this question as something we will give attention to later, or something which is the responsibility of women. In the recent successful disputes in the metal industries insufficient attention was paid to bringing women into active participation in these struggles—not only the industrial woman but the housewife. Reasons may be found for this omission but it is not good enough.

In all our campaigns for increased wages we must give attention to the woman in industry, and this assumes even greater importance in view of the recent C.C. Plenum decision to give attention to the lighter industries which cover large numbers of women and youth.

To give greater emphasis to the struggle for women's equality it is necessary to repeat that women in industry comprise approximately one-third of Australia's wage earners! One-third of the working population whose labor power in industry has been valued at varying amounts from 54% of the male basic wage: 75%—Female Minimum Rates; 90% to 100%—Women's Employment Board—and for what?

Statistics published in the Quarterly Bulletin of the Commonwealth Bureau of Census and Statistics tell the story. In September, 1946, the average week-hour of work and rates of pay for all workers throughout Australia were:—

	Hours.	Wages.
MALE	43.67	£6 1 7
FEMALE	44.03	3 12 11

60% of the male rate for 1% longer hours.

Our tasks for the coming period are many and all important.

Experience during and since the war has proved women will fight for better conditions, will take

their stand, along with their menfolk, in the severest of struggles. As Communists we must win the women in the industries to the struggle for improved living standards. Attention must be paid to the conditions under which women are employed, lighting, hygiene facilities and amenities. More attention must be paid to the wage rates and prices. They must be organised around that which they know, their own particular problems. If we are able to give guidance on these matters, to lead the women around their specific problems, then we will win them to our side and in the decisive struggles they will be our comrades.

We must strengthen and improve our organisation, particularly in the unions, to ward off the coming onslaught by capitalism upon our wages and conditions, and to do this we need to mobilise the workers for further offensive struggles for higher

wages, price pegging, improved living standards and we must pay more attention to the women than in the past. They are part of the trade union movement, part of the Australian working class.

Women do not want preference of the type handed out by capitalism, preference in employment whilst our menfolk are killed on the battlefield; preference in employment whilst our menfolk are idle and we earn starvation wages. No, women reject that kind of preference—they want equality.

Whilst realising full equality can only be achieved with the advent of Socialism, nevertheless much can now be done. In the struggle for equal pay, in winning women to the campaign for equal opportunity and remuneration in industry, in bringing women into active participation in these campaigns we are taking them a step further along the path to equality, the path to Socialism.

## LENIN ON BANK NATIONALISATION

E. W. CAMPBELL

OPponents of the Chifley Government's bank nationalisation legislation have seen fit to draw the dead Lenin into the controversy. Lenin's name, which is normally banned from the columns of the monopolist press, has been featured in bold type in the big bankers' advertisements. Lenin's portrait, seldom displayed except in crude caricature by the ruling class, has brightened up the hoardings.

The purport of the bankers' propaganda is that Lenin is the real author of Mr. Chifley's bank nationalisation proposals, which they picture to be the first step towards a socialist regime in this country.

If the bankers are gambling on Lenin's name causing a panic-stricken revulsion of feeling against nationalisation they are backing a loser. They overestimate the efficacy of the sadly overworked red bogey. The colossal achievements of the Socialist Soviet Union in peace and war during the past 30 years have added a lustre to Lenin's name which all the red-baiting of the imperialists and their stooges cannot tarnish. Only big bankers, capitalists and phillistines tremble with fear at the mention of Lenin's name. To the common people of the world this name has become synonymous with freedom and a new way of life.

While the big bankers' inference that Lenin is the originator of Mr. Chifley's bank nationalisation plans pays a great, though unconscious, tribute to Lenin's genius and far-reaching influence, Lenin, if still alive, would be the first to disclaim this honor.

Bank nationalisation figured in the Labor Party's programme long before Lenin's ideas were widely known in Australia. It stemmed not so much from Socialist theory as it did from the strivings of small capitalists to halt the advance of monopoly and from the spontaneous opposition of workers to the increased downward pressure on wages and condi-

tions that accompanied the growth of monopoly capitalism.

Nationalisation of the banks is intended by its Labor Party sponsors to achieve a conservative and not a revolutionary object. The aim is not to weaken but to strengthen capitalism by centralising control over the financial institutions. The Labor Party hopes to be able to use the credit resources thus obtained to "cushion" the effects of the coming depression and prevent a swing to the Left and a mass upheaval which could sweep capitalism into oblivion.

The big bankers have other ideas. They are far from convinced that the Labor Party's policy is the best one for preserving the capitalist system from socialism. They know that once their eggs are scrambled they cannot be unscrambled, and that notwithstanding all the Labor Party's efforts there might nevertheless be a swing to the Left in the future and a change in the class composition of the government. They, therefore, prefer to hang on to the status quo and rely on the time-honored methods of brutal suppression to weather the coming storm.

The non-socialist, bourgeois-liberal character of the Labor Party is revealed in its reliance solely on parliamentary action to carry through its bank nationalisation proposals and its reluctance to mobilise the people for mass activity outside parliament in support of its legislation.

The big bankers and their spokesmen have no such compunction about resorting to extra-parliamentary action to defeat the Labor Government's measure. Not only are they spending hundreds of thousands of pounds on press and radio publicity and preparing to challenge the legislation in the conservative courts, they are also organising embryonic fascist bands to carry on the struggle if legal means fail.

The organised labor movement must meet this challenge by taking up the same weapons of mass publicity and organisation as those employed by the bankers. Rank and file Labor Party members should insist that their leaders throw their full weight into the campaign outside as well as inside parliament.

Nationalisation of the banks is not in itself a socialist measure, but it can become a step towards socialism if the majority of the people are brought into a conscious, united and active campaign to overcome the big bankers' resistance to its realisation.

The bankers' propaganda advertisements featuring Lenin's name run true to form by falsifying Lenin's views. One such advertisement purported to quote a speech by Lenin to the "Bolshevik Congress in April, 1917" (in the Victorian election the press advertisements attributed it to Stalin. Actually the author of it is W. C. Wentworth), in which he is alleged to have said that the role of the "small men can be made small to vanishing point and through the nationalisation of the banks they can be tied hand and foot." The big bankers' propaganda described this as the "prescribed technique of implementing Communism."

In the first place Lenin and the Bolshevik Party were not in power in Russia in April, 1917, and were not in a position to "implement Communism" by the "prescribed technique" or by any other.

In the second place Lenin proposed nationalising the banks not to tie the small man hand and foot, but among other things to free the small man from the grip of monopoly.

Lenin arrived in Petrograd from abroad on April 3, 1917. The Tsarist Government had not long been deposed and the State administration was being carried on by a Provisional Government composed of the representatives of the capitalist class of Russia. Alongside the Provisional Government there existed the Soviets of Workers and Peasants' Deputies. The Bolshevik Party was in a minority in the Soviets, and the majority consisted of people who had a political outlook similar to that of the leaders of the Australian Labor Party.

Lenin produced a ten-point plan for the further development of the struggle, which he read to a meeting of Bolsheviks on April 4. In this plan, which came to be known as the April Thesis, Lenin proposed that the Bolsheviks should give no support to the Provisional Government, which was a capitalist government quite incapable of solving Russia's problems, but that they should patiently explain to the people the shortcomings of this Government and carry on agitation for the transfer of power to the Soviets in which the Bolsheviks should seek to win majority support.

Point 7 in Lenin's April Thesis called for "the immediate amalgamation of all banks in the country into a single national bank, control over which shall be exercised by the Soviets of Workers' Deputies."

Point 8 proclaimed, "our immediate task is not to 'introduce' socialism, but only to bring social

production and distribution of products at once under the control of the Soviets of Workers' Deputies."

So much for the "prescribed technique of implementing Communism."

On April 10, 1917, Lenin produced a new draft programme for the Bolshevik Party in which he further elaborated his views on nationalisation of banking. In it he stated, "the party of the working class cannot set itself the aim of 'introducing' socialism in a country of small peasants as long as the overwhelming majority of the population has not come to realise the need for a socialist revolution."

"But only bourgeois sophists, hiding behind 'near-Marxist' catchwords, can derive from this truth a justification of the policy of postponing immediate revolutionary measures, the time for which is fully ripe, which have been frequently resorted to during the war by a number of bourgeois states, and which are absolutely essential in order to combat impending total economic disorganisation and famine."

"Such measures as the nationalisation of the land, of all the banks and capitalist trusts, or, at least, the immediate establishment of the control of the Soviets of Workers' Deputies over them — measures which do not in any way imply the 'introduction' of socialism — must be absolutely insisted on, and, wherever possible, effected by revolutionary action."

"Without such measures, which are only steps towards socialism, and which are entirely feasible economically, it will be impossible to heal the wounds caused by the war and to avert the impending collapse; and the party of the revolutionary proletariat will never hesitate to lay hands on the fabulous profits of the capitalists and the bankers, who are scandalously enriching themselves on the war."

Here there is no mention of tying the small man hand and foot or reducing his role to the vanishing point. But there is stress on the need to lay hands on the fabulous profits of the big capitalists and bankers, not to immediately implement socialism but to avert pending economic collapse.

Five months later, in September 1917, the economic collapse, which Lenin had foreseen, had become an immediate prospect and Lenin again raised as a matter of extreme urgency the need to nationalise the banks and big capitalist monopolies.

In a pamphlet entitled *The Impending Catastrophe and How to Combat It*, written between September 10 and 14, 1917, Lenin wrote, "Russia is facing an inevitable catastrophe. The railways are progressing, the railways are disorganised and still. The transport of raw materials and coal to the factories will cease. So will the transport of grain. The capitalists are deliberately sabotaging production, hoping that a terrible catastrophe will spell the collapse of the republic and democracy,

of the Soviets and the proletarian and peasants' unions generally, thus facilitating the return to a monarchy and the restoration of the full power of the bourgeoisie and landlords."

The measures for combating the approaching catastrophe and famine were quite clear, simple and well known, Lenin wrote. The principal measures — control, supervision and accountancy — were recognised in all democratic newspapers. And yet nothing was done. Nothing was done because the Provisional Government feared to lay hands on the fabulous profits of the big bankers and monopolists.

Lenin wrote that "if our government really wanted to introduce control in a businesslike and earnest fashion, if its institutions had not condemned themselves by their servility to the capitalists to 'complete inactivity,' all the government would have to do would be to draw largely on the rich store of measures of control which are already known and already being put into effect. The only obstacle to this, and still is, that control would bring to light the fabulous profits of the capitalists and would cut the ground from under those profits."

Lenin set out five principal measures, the first of which was, "amalgamation of all the banks into a single bank and state control over its operations, or the nationalisation of the banks."

"The banks," Lenin wrote, "are the ganglions of modern economic life, the principal nerve centres of the whole capitalist economic system. To talk about 'regulating economic life' and at the same time to evade the question of the nationalisation of the banks is either to betray the most profound ignorance or to deceive the 'common people' by florid words and grandiloquent promises with the deliberate intention of not fulfilling those promises."

The big bankers try to fool people with the idea that it would be a very difficult and complex operation for the State to take over the banks. "But as a matter of fact," Lenin wrote, "the nationalisation of the banks, which would not deprive a single 'owner' of a single farthing, presents absolutely no technical or cultural difficulties whatsoever."

... If the nationalisation of the banks is so often confused with the confiscation of private property, it is the bourgeois press, whose interest it is to deceive the public, that is responsible for the dissemination of this confusion of ideas."

The monopolist press in Australia today does not differ much from the bourgeois press in Russia to which Lenin referred. It deliberately confuses bank nationalisation with all sorts of side issues to keep the truth from the people and prevent them from supporting a measure that is in their own real interests.

Explaining why bank nationalisation should not be confused with confiscation of private property, Lenin wrote, "the ownership of the capital wielded by and concentrated in the banks is certified by printed and written certificates called shares, bonds,

bills, receipts, etc. Not a single one of these certificates would disappear or be altered if the banks were nationalised. Whoever owned fifteen rubles in a savings bank account would still be the owner of fifteen rubles after the nationalisation of the banks; and whoever had fifteen million rubles would continue after the nationalisation of the banks to have fifteen million rubles in the form of shares, bonds, bills, commercial certificates and the like."

"What, then, is the significance of nationalisation of the Banks?" Lenin asked. "It is that no real control of any kind over the individual banks and their operations is possible (even if commercial secrecy were abolished) because it is impossible to keep an eye on the extremely complex, involved and intricate tricks that are resorted to in drawing up balance sheets, forming fictitious enterprises and branches, in resorting to the services of agents and so forth."

Only the amalgamation of all the banks into one, which in itself would imply no change whatever in respect to ownership, and which, we repeat, would not deprive a single owner of a single farthing, would make it possible to exercise real control."

"Only by the nationalisation of the banks can a state of affairs be brought about in which the government would be in a position to know where and how, whence and when millions and billions of rubles flow. And only control over the banks, over the centre, over the core and chief mechanism of capitalist exchange would make it possible to introduce real and not fictitious control over the whole economic life of the country and the production and distribution of the more important goods."

"The advantages from the nationalisation of the banks to the whole people, and especially — not to the workers (for the workers have little to do with banks) but — to the mass of peasants and small industrialists, would be enormous. The saving in labor would be gigantic, and, assuming that the State would retain the same number of bank employees, nationalisation would signify a highly important step towards making the use of the banks universal, towards increasing the number of branches, the accessibility of their operations, etc. The accessibility and the easy terms of credit, precisely for the small owners, for the peasantry, would increase immensely. For the first time the state would be in a position first to survey all the chief monetary operations, which would be unaccounted, then to control them, then to regulate economic life, and finally to obtain millions and millions for large scale public works without paying the capitalist gentlemen sky-high 'commissions' for their 'services.' That is the reason — and the only reason — why all the capitalists and those who serve them foam at the mouth and fight nationalisation of the banks."

Big Business and its party, the Liberal Party, fight bank nationalisation in Australia for the same

selfish reasons. They are not interested in the people's democratic rights but only in their own right to go on making fabulous profits at the people's expense. The clamor for a costly referendum is not to give the people a chance to express their views but to give the monopolists a further opportunity to delude the people.

Menzies never had a mandate to send pig iron to Japan, nor did he conduct a referendum on this vital issue. He never had a mandate nor did he consult the Australian people by referendum when he followed Chamberlain by declaring Australia at war in September 1939. He never had a mandate to suppress the Communist Party and censor trade union newspapers. All of these anti-demo-

## THE HOUSING SHORTAGE

J. O.

THE so-called housing shortage, which plays such a great role in the press nowadays, does not consist in the fact that the working class generally lives in bad, overcrowded and unhealthy dwellings. This shortage is not something peculiar to the present; it is not even one of the sufferings peculiar to the modern proletariat in contradistinction to all earlier oppressed classes. On the contrary, all oppressed classes in all periods suffered more or less uniformly from it. In order to make an end of this housing shortage there is only one means: to abolish altogether the exploitation and oppression of the working class by the ruling class. What is meant today by housing shortage is the peculiar intensification of the bad housing conditions of the workers as a result of the sudden rush of population to the big towns; a colossal increase in rents; a still further aggravation of over-crowding in the individual houses, and for some, the impossibility of finding a place to live in at all. And this housing shortage gets talked of so much only because it does not limit itself to the working class but has affected the petty bourgeoisie also." (The Housing Question, Frederick Engels.)

Include a phrase about the effect of the war on the housing shortage and this could have been written today. Yet it was written by Frederick Engels in 1872.

There has always been a shortage of good healthy dwellings for workers under capitalism, but at times, due to special conditions, the housing shortage becomes so acute that it affects the middle class and also even some of the big executives of the capitalist class. It is then that we hear about it from the press. Especially when a situation exists as it does today, where the capitalist can use the housing shortage to attack labor govern-

ments. What makes the capitalist press particularly vicious on housing today is the fact that the major-

ity of the homes being built are being built through government agencies, which interferes to some extent with private enterprise; and that a proportion of these houses is being allocated to the working class. The basis of their attack is an attempt to discredit Government housing and to turn back the clock to the "good old days" of unrestricted private enterprise.

In their attacks the capitalist press implies that the whole of the housing shortage was caused by the war. This is not so. Private enterprise has never supplied enough decent homes for workers.

In 1939 at least 100,000 homes were needed in the Commonwealth to eliminate overcrowding. And in addition to this, there were thousands of slum dwellings which should have been demolished. According to Mr. Walter Bunning, Chairman of the Town and Country Planning Committee, "237,000 dwellings, or one in every eight in Australia, were sub-standard in 1943." The vast majority of these would have been sub-standard in 1939. As a clear symptom of the desperate shortage in N.S.W. in 1939, there were Housing Committees in Sydney, Newcastle and Yollongong agitating for homes for the workers.

The whole of the legacy of shortage, slums and over-crowding that existed in 1939 is due, not to a special emergency such as the war, but not to the general system of production for profit. It is true that during the war, when all the country's resources were mobilised for defence, home building ceased and the situation became more and more acute, affecting the middle class seriously for the first time for many years, and also even causing the big capitalists occasional inconvenience, especially when there was talk of taking over large empty mansions.

But despite an incessant press campaign for the raising of restrictions on private building, the capitalists in their own exclusive journals are frank-

ly and candidly state that the same selfish actions were taken in face of widespread public opposition. The Liberal Party, which has consistently shown its utter contempt for public opinion in the past, now finds it convenient to fall back on the demand that the people be consulted about the bank nationalisation plan.

At the same time the entire propaganda resources of the monopolists have been mobilised to give people a distorted picture of the legislation.

There should be no yielding by the Labor Party to the pressure of the monopolists. All the resources of the labor movement should be mobilised to tear the mask from the Liberals, expose the selfish aims of the big bankers, and clarify the significance of nationalisation for the people.

There should be no yielding by the Labor Party to the pressure of the monopolists. All the resources of the labor movement should be mobilised to tear the mask from the Liberals, expose the selfish aims of the big bankers, and clarify the significance of nationalisation for the people.

They admit their failure. In the U.S. monthly *Fortune*, Aug. 1947, was an article entitled "The Industry Capitalism Forgot," which stated in part:

"To anyone unfamiliar with the housing industry, the incredible news of 1947 is that home construction is in the doldrums. In the first five months of the year, in spite of the worst housing shortage since the James River landing, the industry showed no appreciable gain over 1946 except in the price of its product, which advanced enormously. In 1946 every conceivable shortage and, by testimony of builders, every obstacle that a sinfully evil bureaucracy could design stood between the homeseeker and a house. Now materials are comparatively plentiful, government regulations are only a vestige — and the industry is perilously close to falling on its face.

"A student of the housing industry would not be surprised. The industry has been behaving like this for the last thirty years. When it was returned to private management after World War I, with the inspiring task of providing "Homes for Heroes," it met the challenge by inflating the cost of an ordinary five-room house 40 per cent, in less than twelve months. Thereupon the volume of new construction fell off by two-thirds. . . ."

But why is it that capitalism fails to provide adequate housing for the workers? In order to answer this question, it is necessary to go back to the early period of industrial development. There was a time when "housing" for the workers was a very profitable business. In the early days of industrial England any sort of shelter was considered good enough for the common people. Conveniences such as water supply and elementary sanitation were only for the rich, and the building industry had a wonderful time covering every square foot of available space in the industrial towns with jerry built shacks which were let to the dispossessed peasants flocking into the industrial cities. At exorbitant rents. But soon cholera, typhus, typhoid fever, smallpox and other ravaging diseases spread their germs in the pestilential air and the poisoned water of these working class quarters. . . . the germs hardly ever died out completely, and as soon as circumstances permit it they develop into epidemics and then spread beyond their breeding places also into the more airy and healthy parts of the town inhabited by the capitalists. Capitalist rule cannot allow itself the pleasure of creating epidemic diseases among the working class with impunity; the consequences fall back on it and the angel of Death rages in its ranks as ruthlessly as in the ranks of the workers." (The Housing Question, Frederick Engels.)

As soon as they knew that bad housing conditions caused epidemics which affected them personally, the capitalists fell over themselves to remedy the worst of the evils. Health laws and regula-

tions were passed and policed, making minimum standards of sanitation and hygiene compulsory.

But health regulations and minimum standards of sanitation made building for the workers more expensive; the worker could not afford to pay sufficient additional rent to make workers' homes a profitable real estate investment — and this position has persisted up to the present time. To take an example from Australia today—If 1/6th of the income were allowed for rent (the maximum figure recommended by the Commonwealth Housing Commission) the provision in the basic wage for rent would be 18/6. A sound house and land costs at least £1,200, probably more. At 18/6, the total rent for the year would be £48/2/-. When rates and taxes and maintenance are paid and an allowance is made for capital repayment, there is absolutely nothing left as profit for the capitalist. It doesn't pay private enterprise to build homes for workers, so they just don't build them.

The workers in the main have had to accept the cast-off, worn-out homes discarded by the middle class — or pay much more than they can afford in rent, which means going short on food and clothing.

That is why slums, overcrowding and a shortage of housing has always been the lot of the worker under capitalism. That is why in almost all capitalist countries, workers' housing is becoming accepted more and more as a function of the government.

From our point of view this is a step in the right direction because it brings the building of houses for the people under more democratic control.

There are a number of advantages to the people in Government housing in Australia, especially as it is linked with a system of price and materials control. The black market in materials is partly avoided. Large-scale purchasing and building is made possible, which should lead to considerable economy. Banking profits are curtailed to the prevailing interest rates on State loan money. Some control is exercised over production and quality of materials. Houses are distributed on a far more equitable basis than in a free market where all commodities go to those best able to pay. A limited system of rental rebates operates in favour of those with a large number of dependents and on low incomes.

But our Government Housing under existing conditions has some grave defects. These arise from the fact that the housing authorities are organs of a capitalist state apparatus operating in a system of capitalism. While the banking capitalist by profit in the realm of in which the money is reducing the interest rate at which the money is still carried out under normal capitalist conditions. Prices of materials and profits are still paid as for any other commodities and a rent is charged based on the cost of the house. The consequence is that

the rents are in many cases far too high (even though they are considerably lower than those charged in the open capitalist market).

Though State Housing methods are an improvement on those of unrestricted private enterprise, production results are still far from satisfactory. There are a number of ways in which home production could be immediately accelerated. One of these is by the more extensive use of prefabrication. There are systems of prefabrication available which have been approved by the Commonwealth Building Research Station — systems that have been worked out deliberately to avoid materials in short supply; yet the Housing authorities are hesitant to use these new methods fully because they depart somewhat from conventional housing practice, and they fear press criticism. This situation has been aggravated by the backwardness of local Councils (in which private real estate interests are prominent), many of which have refused to permit prefabricated homes in their districts.

## DENNIS CHALLENGES "UN-AMERICAN" COMMITTEE

(The following statement was made by Eugene Dennis, General Secretary of the Communist Party of the United States, immediately before Judge David Pine sentenced him to one year in prison and \$1,000 fine.)

"Your Honor, before the court passes sentence I would like to make a very brief statement.

"As an American and as a Communist, I cherish and will always defend the democratic institutions of our country and the genuine interests of our people.

"I desire to make clear why I believe that my failure to respond to the subpoena unlawfully issued by the House Committee on Un-American Activities is wholly consistent with my respect for and devotion to the instruments and traditions of American democracy.

"Those who conceived this nation in liberty could not foresee that a vast empire of monopoly capital would one day come along. Nor could they foretell that the economic royalists would attempt to enslave America's working men and women with a Taft-Hartley Law and other repressive measures.

"But the Founding Fathers wisely sought to provide all future generations of freedom-loving Americans with the means to defend themselves against whatever new forms of tyranny the uncharted future might hold.

"Those who dedicated this nation to the proposition that all men are created equal could not envision the race hatred and terror rule of fascism, be it of foreign or domestic origin.

"Those who brought forth a new nation on this continent could not conceive of a Truman-G.O.P. doctrine proclaiming America the enemy of the newer democracies and the ally of decaying monarch and fascist quislings.

Many of the design and construction methods used by the government departments are obsolete and inefficient and due for considerable overhaul. In one construction section, things were so bad that recently a group of carpenters went on strike against inefficient methods of work.

If these obstacles were overcome, they would help to increase the speed at which homes are produced, but they could not solve the contradiction that the basic wage worker does not receive sufficient wages to pay an economic rent.

No partial reforms will overcome the fact that all our housing is being built under capitalist conditions and that the whole approach to the question by labor governments is still one of patching up a doomed social order. Bad housing is only one of many intolerable conditions which the working class suffers under capitalism. The housing problem can only be finally solved after the replacement of the capitalist system by a socialist one.

"But the Founding Fathers did foresee that their posterity would have need to struggle against new enemies and new instruments of oppression. Those who endowed our people with the spirit that cherished liberty as the heritage of all men, in all lands everywhere — also sought to arm us against whatever threats to liberty the future might bring.

"For these wise purposes, those who shaped our Declaration of Independence and our Constitution proclaimed certain rights to be inalienable. They reserved to the people, and for all time, the right to exercise their sovereign power and domestic will and to pursue happiness and progress. Moreover, they erected an enduring barrier of law embodied in the Bill of Rights, designed to prevent the rule of desperate men.

"It is true that there are today men who hold these principles and democratic institutions in contempt, and seek to undermine and destroy them. It is not true that I am guilty of that criminal intent.

"I deeply regret that the real issues in this case were not joined in the course of the trial.

"Through my counsel, witnesses and documents, I sought to submit evidence establishing it as a matter of fact that the House Committee on Un-American Activities is in contempt of the Constitution and Bill of Rights, that it is trying to establish a system of totalitarian thought control, police inquisition and the hated gestapo card-indexes and political blacklists. That, in short, it

is an instrument of those who seek to impose a form of fascism on our America.

"But, unfortunately, the jury was not permitted to hear this evidence.

"I also sought to establish, as a matter of law, that the House Committee on Un-American Activities is not a proper legislative committee, is without constitutional authority, and acts in violation of the First and Fourteenth Amendments.

"But the evidence amply supporting this contention was also excluded.

"My liberty as an individual is, of course, dear to me. But more precious is the liberty of the whole American people.

"The time has come when not I alone, but millions of Americans — through due process of law by mobilising broad public opinion and action — can preserve our freedom only by effectively challenging the usurpation of power by the pro-fascists and their House Committee on Un-American Activities — which has become a gnawing cancer in the body politic.

"I repeat, this committee has abrogated to itself inquisitorial and repressive powers specifically forbidden it by the Constitution and Bill of Rights.

"I submit, your honor, that Chairman Thomas standards are those of Standard Oil of New Jersey — which has been found guilty of war and peacetime cartel practices more advantageous to our Nazi enemies than to the United States.

"I submit that the standards of Representative Mundt, a member of this committee, are those of the self-styled America First Committee — an anti-Roosevelt and pro-Axis group — condemned and repudiated by all true patriots.

"I submit that the standards of John Rankin, whose presence on this committee violates the 14th Amendment and the American conscience, are the standards of the convicted Columbians and of the lynch mob.

"It is not to be wondered at that this committee, whose standards of Americanism are alien to democracy and run directly counter to the standards held by the majority of Americans, recently spent no more than 10 minutes on its hillyhood investigation of fascist activities in the U.S., which daily become more menacing.

"Instead, it is only natural, that such a committee, and its pro-fascist backers in the N.A.M. and U.S. Chamber of Commerce, should be whipping up anti-Communist hysteria, in an effort to abolish free trade unions, to lower the living standards of the common people, to drastically curtail the civil liberties of the Negro people, the Communists and all other progressives, and to disrupt American-Soviet friendship, and thus the unity of the United Nations and the cause of peace.

"In so doing this committee and its sponsors aim to drag our country down the German road to imperialist expansion, fascism, war and catastrophe.

"I am confident, your honor, that the lessons

of this trial will not be lost on the American people.

"I recall that at the turn of the 19th century, Matthew Lyon and others temporarily lost their freedom when they challenged the infamous alien and sedition laws which were directed against the followers of Thomas Jefferson. Their devotion to democracy contributed to the recapture and preservation of the freedom of the American people. The people removed the cancer and the alien and sedition law from the body politic.

"I recall that Henry David Thoreau and others also temporarily lost their freedom for challenging the Fugitive Slave Act. Subsequently the cancer of chattel slavery and all its legal instruments were also cut from the body politic.

"Today the American people understand how truly Thoreau spoke when he said: 'They are the lovers of law and order who uphold the law when the government breaks it.'

"I plead guilty, your honor, of upholding the Constitution and the democratic traditions and basic laws of our land at a time when they are being violated by the House Committee on Un-American Activities and its reactionary sponsors.

"I need be, I shall appeal my case to the Supreme Court. At the same time I and my party will carry the real issues in this case to the court of public opinion for the supreme judgment of the people themselves.

"Although it was not given an opportunity to hear important evidence, the jury that found me guilty of contempt arrived at its decision only after long deliberation and with great difficulty. I do not entertain the slightest doubt that legions of my fellow Americans share my determination to protect and extend our form of democracy and, at all costs, to prevent fascism from coming to power in America.

"I have every confidence that these millions will come to understand that the pro-fascist House Committee on Un-American Activities must be curbed and eventually abolished if democracy is to endure in our land.

"I have firm faith that the American people will not only win my freedom and full exoneration — but that they will also put the necessary limitations on the activities of the evil forces of aggressive monopoly reaction which the House Committee now shields and in whose interests it acts.

"In this connection I am confident that in the fateful elections of 1948, the American people will draw the necessary conclusions concerning the administration of the G.O.P.-dominated 80th Congress, which gave the House Committee on Un-American Activities its new coercive and iniquitous status.

"Through unity of action, the people will rebuff the un-American men of the trusts. They will find the ways and means to register the popular will for democracy, jobs and peace.

"Your honor, I am ready to hear the sentence of this court."

## ON GRADUAL TRANSITION FROM SOCIALISM TO COMMUNISM

A. P. LYAPIN

(A lecture delivered under the auspices of the All-Union Lecture Bureau, Ministry of Highest Education, U.S.S.R., Moscow, 1946.)

AFTER the victorious ending of the Great Patriotic War, the Soviet Union entered into a new era of its historical development, the era of peaceful economic and cultural development and construction.

The new Five-Year Plan Law, adopted by the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R., deals with the reconstruction and development of the people's economy of the U.S.S.R., and opens before our land new perspectives for the greatest rise of productive forces, of the material and cultural standards of the people, of the economic and military might of the Soviet State.

The fulfilment of the new Five-Year Plan will constitute an important step forward in completing the building of Socialist society and in the gradual transition from Socialism to Communism.

The full establishment of Communism in our country is the aim of the Bolshevik Party and the Soviet people. While this aim has not yet been achieved, it can and must be achieved in the future. Comrade Stalin established the possibility of building Communism in our country even under the conditions of capitalist encirclement, and pointed out concrete ways of gradual transition from Socialism to Communism. Comrade Stalin's theory on the possibility of establishing Communism in the U.S.S.R. is an important contribution to Marxist-Leninist social science.

Comrade Stalin teaches us that the question of the victory of Socialism and Communism in our country has two distinct sides, one dealing with internal, the other with external, relations.

From the point of view of internal relations, the Soviet Union has every condition and opportunity for the establishment of full Communist society. During the past Stalin Five-Year Plans, the Soviet Union established an advanced large machine industry, the material base of Socialism. The collectivisation of agriculture was completed, the exploiting classes were liquidated, and the Socialist society's foundations were established. The victory of Socialism thus opened to our country the path to the highest phase of Communism.

But besides internal relations, the question of the victory of Communism has another side, that of external, international relations. The U.S.S.R., building Communism under conditions of capitalist encirclement, is not guaranteed against the danger of military attacks from outside and against attempts to restore capitalism. Proof of this is the war of 1941-45, which the German-fascist invaders forced upon us.

This war ended in complete defeat of Hitler-Germany and imperialist Japan, the two countries closest to our boundaries and the strongest imperialist robbers. During this war, the international prestige of the U.S.S.R. grew stronger, and its international connections became broader than ever before. All these factors create new and favorable conditions for peaceful Socialist construction in our country after the war. At the same time it should be remembered that as long as the capitalist world exists, the possibility of new wars and robber attacks upon the U.S.S.R. is not eliminated.

While continuing to develop peaceful Socialist construction, we must maintain maximum vigilance, not for a moment forgetting the intrigues of international reaction hatching plans for a new war. Hence, even during the process of further Socialist construction and the gradual transition to Communism, we must in every way strengthen our Socialist state, raise the military-economic might of our land, and constantly strengthen the armed forces of the U.S.S.R.

The question of establishing Communism in our country has a world-wide, historic significance. For ages, the best representatives of mankind dreamed of the future Communist society. Marx and Engels founded the scientific theory of Communism. Lenin and Stalin, living in a new set of historic conditions, in a struggle for building Socialism in our country, developed this theory and put it into practice.

For the first time in history the U.S.S.R. has already fundamentally realised the first phase of Communism, and the gradual transition to second, or highest phase, is now a matter of practical task. The successes already achieved in the building of Communist society furnish spiritual armament for the Soviet people, move them forward, strengthen their belief in their own forces, and mobilise them for new Communist victories and achievements.

The works of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin furnish a scientific characterisation of Communist society. Marxism-Leninism teaches that, in the process of its development, Communist society goes through two basic phases. The first is Socialism, the second and highest is Communism. These are not two different social-economic formations, but only two stages of development of one and the same Communist society.

The principles common to both Socialism and Communism are that, in both, the means of production are no longer in the hands of private

owners, but are social, common property; the country's national economy is conducted according to a single plan; exploitation of man by man is done away with; and competition, anarchy of production, crises and unemployment, are absent.

These principles, common to both Socialism and Communism, make it impossible to draw any distinction between them except as different stages or phases of the development of Communist society. In characterising Socialism as the first phase of Communism, Lenin wrote:

"In so far as the means of production become common property, the word 'Communism' is also applicable here, providing we do not forget that it is not complete Communism." (*Selected Works*, Vol. 7, p. 90.)

Socialism and Communism, as two phases of Communist society, differ from each other in certain characteristics and peculiarities.

Under Socialism the productive forces have not as yet reached a stage of development which would ensure an abundance of all articles of consumption. Labor has not yet become man's most important life necessity; society still has to exercise the most stringent control over labor, over the production and consumption of commodities. The distribution of articles of consumption is regulated by the principle: "From each according to his capacity, to each according to his labor."

Social, or common property, still exists in two forms — state and collective-farm co-operative, which finds its practical expression in class differences between workers and peasants, hangovers of capitalism still exist in the economy and consciousness of the people. The contradiction and differences between town and country, between mental and physical labor, are not yet fully liquidated; there still remain remnants of the old social division of labor.

Under the highest phase of Communism, the productive forces reach such a high stage of development that they bring a full abundance of all products and articles of consumption. Labor becomes man's prime life necessity. Distribution of articles of consumption takes place according to the principle: "From each according to his capacity, to each according to his needs." There is only one form of common or social property, Communist ownership of all means of production. There is a complete liquidation of all remnants of class distinction and hangovers of capitalism in the consciousness of the people. There is a complete elimination of any contradictions between town and country and between mental and physical labor, and a liquidation of any remnants of the old social division of labor, etc.

The transition from the first phase of Communism to its highest phase assumes the character of gradual transition, and thus represents an entire historic phase of development. We know, of course, that the change from Capitalism to Social-

ism constitutes the change from one system of production to another, a radically different system. Hence, this transition cannot be realised in any other way than through revolution.

But the process of transition from Socialism to Communism is entirely different. The change from Socialism to Communism is not a change from one social-economic formation based on individual ownership, to another one based upon common ownership of means of production. Under Socialism, the exploitation of man by man and the exploiting classes are liquidated.

Under present conditions in the U.S.S.R., where Socialist society is fundamentally already established, where the Socialist system rules fully over the whole national economy, the further development of Socialism, as well as the transition to Communism, proceed on their own basis. The second, highest phase of Communist society will naturally grow up and develop out of Socialism, its first phase. Hence, the transition from Socialism to Communism will be characterised by rapid development of the productive forces, rapid growth of national wealth, and an unheard-of advance of the level of the material and cultural living standards of the people.

The gradual transition from Socialism to Communism does not exclude the possibility of irregular, zig-zag stages in the process of development of Socialist society. For example, the transition to Communist principles of distribution cannot take place simultaneously with all articles of consumption. Of necessity, such a change must be gradual, in accord with the growth of the productive forces and the achievement of an abundance of commodities. But the very transition from a Socialist principle of distribution, according to labor, to a Communist principle, according to needs, constitutes a leap into a new set of conditions.

The same rule is applicable to technological progress as well. During the transition from Socialism to Communism, technological development will demonstrate itself in great technical changes in the different branches of national economy. The use of the most important scientific and technical discoveries will denote a new stage in the development of man's productive forces, man's conquest of nature.

Of course, it would be erroneous to assume that social development during the period of gradual transition to Communism would proceed without struggle, simply and smoothly, of its own accord. In his report to the Seventeenth Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, Comrade Stalin ridiculed those who thought that now "we can lay down our arms and retire — to sleep and to wait for the advent of classless society."

Transition to Communism means the enormous unheard-of development of the productive forces. This alone demands the raising of the level of activity of the Soviet people, the concentration of their efforts in the building of the new form of

society. At the same time the building of Communism presupposes strenuous struggle against routine and prejudice, against any and all hangovers of capitalist society. Comrade Stalin pointed out that classless society cannot come of its own accord, that it must be conquered and built up by the efforts of all toilers in the struggle against the enemies of Socialism.

It would also be wrong to visualise the social developments of this period as a picture, where the building of Socialist society would first be completed, and only then would begin the transition to Communism. These two are a single process, and not two consecutive processes. The process of gradual transition to Communism will come together with the further development and strengthening of the Socialist system of production, together with the completion of the upbuilding of Socialist society.

In order to achieve the transition to Communism, it is imperative to strengthen and develop in every way all the foundations, all the principles, of Socialism, of Socialist productive relations. The transition to Communist distribution, "according to need," will be achieved through the strengthening and development of Socialist distribution, "according to labor," through the strengthening of the monetary system, the all-round development of Soviet trade, etc.

The transition from the first phase of Communism to its second, highest phase, calls for ceaseless growth and development of the productive forces, the production of an abundance of articles of consumption.

The advantages of the Socialist system of economy furnished the possibility of transforming the U.S.S.R. within the briefest historic period from a backward country into an advanced industrial and collective-farm State. But during this first stage of Communism the development of the productive forces do not as yet reach the level necessary to guarantee an abundance of consumers' goods. Therefore, articles for consumption are distributed not according to the needs of members of society, but in proportion to the quantity and quality of the work they perform for this society.

In the process of further development, as a result of the gigantic growth of the productive forces, it will be possible to guarantee an abundance of consumers' goods; and society will find it possible to pass gradually from the Socialist principle of distribution, "according to labor," to the Communist principle, "according to needs." The road lies through a ceaseless upward advance in all branches of our national economy, through the growth of our industries, agriculture, and transport.

One of the most important requisites for the transition from the first phase of Communism to the second lies in the realisation of the main economic task of the U.S.S.R. — to catch up with and surpass the major capitalist countries in an economic sense, i.e., in the volume of industrial production

per capita of the population. The Soviet Union has already surpassed all capitalist countries in tempo of development of economy and technique of production. The U.S.S.R. has already surpassed all capitalist countries of Europe in the total volume of industrial production. The U.S.S.R. is still behind England and the U.S.A. in the per capita volume of industrial production.

The per capita volume of industrial production constitutes the basic criterion of a country's economic might. Therefore, the task of achieving such a level of production as to enable the country to surpass the per capita norms of consumption existing in major capitalist countries becomes the basic economic task of the U.S.S.R., the decisive condition for the transition from Socialism to Communism.

Comrade Stalin posed this problem before the Eighteenth Congress of the Party:

"Only if we outstrip the principal capitalist countries economically can we reckon upon our country becoming fully saturated with consumers' goods, on having an abundance of products, and on being able to make the transition from the first phase of Communism to its second phase."

The war against Hitler-Germany interrupted the realisation of this basic economic task of the U.S.S.R. and inflicted enormous damage on our national economy. The new Five-Year Plan calls for full reconstruction of the damaged areas, reconstruction of the pre-war level in industry and agriculture, as well as a considerable raising of these levels. The new Five-Year Plan calls for a considerable step forward in the solution of the basic economic task of the U.S.S.R.

In his historic election campaign speech to the voters of the Stalin election district in Moscow, on February 9, 1946, Comrade Stalin outlined a programme for a new and mighty upsurge of the national economy of the U.S.S.R. which would enable our country to raise its industrial level about 300 per cent. over that of 1940. Comrade Stalin set the following tasks: To raise the annual production of cast iron up to 50 million tons; steel, up to 60 million tons; coal, to 500 million tons. "Only that our homeland will be guaranteed against all possible accidents. That will probably require more. But it can be done, and we must do it."

The new Five-Year Plan for the reconstruction and development of the national economy of the U.S.S.R. is a part of the great programme for the economic and cultural upsurge of our land. The branches of our national economy; special attention is also given to technical progress and the raising of the material and cultural level of the life of the toilers. In 1950 our industrial production will be nearly 150 per cent. that of 1940. Toward the

end of the five-year period, production of heavy metals will be 35 per cent., coal 51 per cent., electric power 70 per cent., machine construction 200 per cent., and agricultural production 27 per cent. greater than in 1940. On the basis of the ceaseless growth of labor productivity, our national earnings and consuming power will be considerably higher.

In order to fulfil the basic economic task of the U.S.S.R., special attention will be paid to future growth of our industry, further development of construction of new enterprises, and further technological progress in all branches of our national economy. The new Five-Year Plan calls for enormous capital construction. Within these five years, about 5,000 reconstructed and newly built enterprises will be brought into operation; 157.5 billion roubles have been appropriated for capital construction during these five years. Thus, capital construction becomes a most important condition for rapid growth of industrial production.

Toward the end of the new Five-Year Plan, the per capita industrial production of the U.S.S.R. will surpass France's pre-war level, and will come closer to that of England. But it will take a longer period to catch up with and surpass the industrial per capita production of the U.S.A.

In order to solve our basic economic task, it will be necessary to raise still higher our labor productivity, improve the organization of labor, and raise the skill and qualifications of our working and engineering cadres. "The higher our productivity of labor, the more our technique of production becomes perfected, the more rapidly can we accomplish this cardinal economic task," said Comrade Stalin at the Eighteenth Congress of the Party.

Labor productivity rose 2½ times during the first and second Stalin Five-Year Plans as a result of the technological reconstruction of our national economy, the growth of power equipment and mechanisation of labor, the development of Socialist competition and the Stakhanovite movement.

The Soviet Union has made tremendous gains, not only in the tempo of growth, but also in the

level of labor productivity in industry, as well as in other branches of our national economy. This growth of labor productivity in industry, while increasing the output of existing enterprises, also serves as a source for accumulation of Socialist wealth, for the construction of new plants, and industrial undertakings.

Socialist competition and its newest form, the Stakhanovite movement, play an enormous role in the struggle for higher labor productivity. The Stakhanovite movement, Comrade Stalin points out, "opens to us the path by which alone can be achieved those high indices of productivity of labor which are essential for the transition from Socialism to Communism."

The Five-Year Plan provides for a 36 per cent. growth of industrial productivity in 1950, as compared with the pre-war level. During the new Five-Year Plan, 70 per cent. of the new total growth of industrial production is to be provided by advance of labor productivity. This struggle to raise the productivity of labor, this development of Socialist emulation, constitutes a struggle for a new upsurge of productive forces.

This new and higher level of labor productivity presupposes a new and higher level of development of productive forces in means of production, as well as in human force, the basic productive force.

The transition from Socialism to Communism calls for the establishment of new and higher technique. It is well known that in so far as technique of production, the full equipment of new technological means for industrial production, is concerned, the U.S.S.R. holds the first place in the world. The Soviet land, taking advantage of the world's latest technological achievements, introduces them widely into all branches of its national economy. Contrary to the capitalist countries, where technological development is in contradiction with the social-political system, in the U.S.S.R. the advantages of a planned Socialist economy enable new technological means to develop unimpeded at a greatly accelerated tempo.

(To be concluded)



## Questions & Answers

conducted by  
**L.H. GOULD**

What was meant by the statement in Kerdelf's article that "Socialist achievements have already become the substance of the entire genuinely democratic development in the world"?—B. F. Stone.

The statement reads—"The construction of Socialism is no longer an isolated phenomenon confined to the U.S.S.R. It is no longer something which still has to prove its value in practice. The

great Socialist achievements of the October Revolution have not only stood the test of history, but have already become the substance of the entire genuinely democratic development in the world. There are no longer any governments today which venture openly to defend the capitalist system. On the contrary, capitalist reaction is resorting to all kinds of pseudo-Socialist forms and phrases, in

order to delude the masses. Even the fascists liked to hide, and are hiding again today, behind Socialist signboards and phrases. This means that it is becoming increasingly difficult for imperialist reaction to wage an open struggle against Socialism. This means, further, that the ideal of Socialism, first realised in the Soviet Union, has stood the test of history and emerged triumphant." (*Communist Review*, July-August, 1947).

The point made by Kardelj emphasises the Marxist conception of one of the fundamental features of democracy, namely, that the main content of democracy, its spirit, must always be the aims and aspirations, and the actual political movement, of the most progressive social force in the given historical period.

Society has been evolving since the Middle Ages from feudalism to capitalism (capitalist democracy), and from capitalism to Socialism (Socialist or proletarian democracy). What were the particular problems confronting society in the different periods, and which class was capable of providing the answer? What are the democratic tasks now in comparison, let us say, with 50 or 100 years ago? What is the "substance of the entire genuinely democratic development" in the world today — is it the establishment of parliamentary democracy, or defence of existing democratic liberties against reaction, or prevention of imperialist wars? And, most important, which class today is alone capable of defending and advancing democracy?

Democracy, if it is genuine and not make-believe, refers to the actual conditions of the class struggle at each period in history, and to the demands of the advanced class. (It should be noted that we are dealing here particularly with the democracy arising from the bourgeois-democratic revolution, with the democracy associated with the epoch of the capitalist mode of production, and not with the higher form of democracy, the proletarian democracy that exists as yet only in the Soviet Union.)

The history of democracy is divided into two main periods:—

1. The bourgeois-democratic revolutions in their classic forms in the west in the 17th and 18th centuries. The bourgeois revolution in England (Civil War, 1642-49) and in France (Revolution of 1789) are classic in the sense that the bourgeoisie was the only class capable at that time of successfully carrying through the revolution against feudalism (the proletarians, in the persons of the Levellers, the followers of Babeuf, etc., were still far from organisation as a class). The feudal monarchy and nobility, establishment of parliamentary democracy, the further and rapid development of industry and of the home and world markets. Historically, the bourgeoisie "has played a most revolutionary part" in providing mankind with the material prerequisites for the

advance to Socialism, in calling into existence the proletarians, the "gravediggers" of capitalism, and in supplying the proletarians through democracy "with its own elements of political and general education, in other words, it furnishes the proletariat with weapons for fighting the bourgeoisie" (quotations from Manifesto of the Communist Party).

2. By the middle of the 19th century the proletariat replaced the bourgeoisie as the "champion of democracy." The capitalists by then had abandoned the principles of their own democratic revolution, and linked themselves with the feudal reaction (revolutions of 1848 throughout Europe) out of fear of the working class. The proletariat had become the leader of the struggle for democracy. What were the basic democratic tasks facing society a century ago? What was then the "substance of the entire genuinely democratic development"? Answer: To establish the capitalist democratic republic (or, simply, capitalist democracy) where feudalism was still partly or entirely in power, as in Prussia, Russia, Spain, Austria, Italy, etc.; and to extend democracy where the bourgeois-democratic revolution had already been achieved, e.g., in England, around the struggle for increased franchise, the shorter working day, trade union rights, etc. (Note again that these are demands within capitalist democracy; there is no need to struggle for trade union rights in a Socialist society!)

The workers are the champions of democracy within capitalism because the fullest development of democratic liberty provides "the most suitable battle-ground wherein the final battles of the class struggle can be fought out. . . . It gives the workers the opportunity of free speech and propaganda and agitation. . . . It presents the opportunity more easily to build vast mass organisations, such as trade unions, to conduct strikes and other actions of the workers against the capitalists" (L. Shaker).

These actions represent the development, within the framework of capitalist democracy, of a much higher form of democracy, namely, proletarian democracy. But the co-existence of these two forms does not mean their eventual fusion. The new form replaces the old, through the revolutionary action of the proletariat and its allies. Capitalist democracy stands for capitalism, for the perpetuation of capitalist exploitation; it is democracy for the rich. Proletarian democracy, manifested in the trade unions, working class political parties, etc., is the new social power that will end the rule of capital. But the supremely important feature of the struggle for Socialism is precisely the defence and extension of democratic liberties within capitalism (e.g., to end the gerrymandering in Victorian State electorates, to end the undemocratic franchise in local councils everywhere, etc.).

The enemies of democracy, to cloak their oppression and warmongering, pretend that the Communists are seeking to "destroy democracy and

the democratic way of life." Everything in Communist theory and practice refutes this slander. Thus Lenin: "Just as Socialism cannot be victorious unless it introduces complete democracy, so the proletariat will be unable to prepare for victory over the bourgeoisie unless it wages a many-sided consistent and revolutionary struggle for democracy."

And Engels: "They cry despairingly with Odilon Barrot: 'La legalite nous tue (legality is the death of us)'; whereas we, under this legality, get firm muscles and rosy cheeks and look like eternal life. And if we are not so crazy as to let ourselves be driven into street fighting in order to please them, then nothing else is left for them but for themselves to break through this legality so fatal to them."

The role of the proletariat as the champion of democracy was most clearly expressed early this century in Russia, where the central democratic task was the replacement of Tsarist autocracy by a democratic republic. Which class was capable of acting as leader (hegemon) in the bourgeois-democratic revolution in feudal-autocratic Russia? In the 1905 Revolution the Mensheviks, characteristically timid, doctrinaire and capitulatory, argued that the workers could not, they ought not to, assume the responsibility that "belonged properly" to the liberal bourgeoisie. The Menshevik programme called for the workers to aid the bourgeoisie to establish capitalist democracy; then the workers were to receive from the bourgeoisie in power a kind of "political education" similar to the experience of the workers in the west from their bourgeoisie; and then, later (10, 50, 100 years), the workers could go on to Socialism.

This spurious programme was trenchantly answered by Lenin, who found the "substance of the entire genuinely democratic movement" in Tsarist Russia in the working class: "The outcome of the revolution depends on whether the working class will play the part of a subsidiary to the bourgeoisie . . . or whether it will play the part of leader to the people's revolution." "The proletariat must carry to completion the democratic revolution, by allying to itself the mass of the peasantry in order to crush by force the resistance of the autocracy and to paralyse the instability of the bourgeoisie." "At the head of the people, and particularly of the peasantry — for complete freedom, for a consistent democratic revolution, for a republic! At the head of all the toilers and exploited — for Socialism!"

Thus, for Lenin, the substance of the genuinely democratic movement in early-20th century Russia was the struggle for the Socialist Revolution. This was to be achieved in two stages, first the struggle for the democratic republic, second, the Socialist revolution itself, and without "a Chinese Wall separating one from the other by a period of time more or less protracted, in the course of which

the bourgeoisie, having come to power, develops capitalism, while the proletariat accumulates forces and prepares for the 'decisive struggle' against capitalism" (Stalin).

It is of interest to recall that the handing over of the land to the Russian peasants, which is one of the essential tasks of the bourgeois-democratic revolutions, was not done following the coming to power of the bourgeoisie in the February, 1917, Revolution. This task, and others (i.e., bourgeois-democratic tasks) were completed only after the October Revolution.

To come now to the quotation from Kardelj. What are the basic democratic tasks facing mankind today? These are the fight to prevent World War Three, to curb the monopolists by economic planning on a national scale and through ever-increasing popular control (nationalisation of banks and key industries), defence of national independence, freedom of colonial peoples. It would be criminal folly to expect the bourgeoisie to agree even in small measure to such steps, because they threaten the very basis of capitalism. The essential character of the rule of the bourgeoisie, i.e., the domination of the monopoly-capitalists or imperialists, is their "striving towards violence and reaction" (Lenin). Peace, democracy and improvements in the economic conditions of the masses are fatal for the imperialists; hence their policy of destroying the genuine democratic and patriotic movements of the people everywhere. The democratic cause today necessarily includes defence of the traditional gains of the bourgeois-democratic revolutions of the past — historic gains which the imperialists of USA, Britain and Australia are as determined to smash as were Hitler and Mussolini.

And what is "curbing the monopolists" and "popular control of the national economy" but the acceptance of the principles and lessons of the October Revolution? Sometimes the monopolists and their right-wing lackeys announce "plans" for industry and reconstruction — a "three-year food plan" or a "five-year homebuilding plan." These are the pseudo-Socialist forms and phrases mentioned by Kardelj. But it is also an involuntary tribute to the power of the example set by Socialist planning and construction in the Soviet Union which, to repeat, have become the substance of the entire genuinely democratic movement in the world.

Finally, democracy refers to all social and cultural matters of significance to mankind, as well as to the direct political and economic issues. Democracy, if it is to possess a genuine content, must stand for great art, for the advancement of science, for the full free development of the human personality. Capitalist rule is negative, destructive and full of deadly menace. Kardelj makes a convincing point in regard to the all-important question of atomic energy:—

"The parasitical character of imperialism, the fact that imperialism is decaying capitalism, has never yet appeared in such a drastic form. Let us only recall current discussions on the use of atomic energy. The release of atomic energy is undoubtedly the outstanding contemporary discovery achieved by the human mind, and is bound to have extremely far-reaching consequences for the entire development of human society. This discovery should give an entirely new trend to the

whole technique of production. The application of atomic energy in the technical field could bring about a tremendous advance in the welfare of the working people. It is, at the same time, a discovery which, by its very nature, points to the inevitability of Socialism, whose full application necessarily requires the existence of Socialism."

(References: Lenin, "Two Tactics of Social-Democracy;" Varga, "Democracy of a New Type," Nov.-Dec. Communist Review.)



## BOOK REVIEW

MATERIALISM AND EMPIRO-CRITICISM (V. I. LENIN)  
J. P. CALLAGHAN, M.Sc.



It is gratifying that Lenin's great exposition of Marxist philosophy is again available, and at a price well within the reach of most people. In the past, altogether too few Communists have been familiar with *Materialism and Empirio-Criticism*, a fact towards which the scarcity of the book and its comparatively high cost have been contributing factors.

This work of Lenin was written in 1905, during the period of reaction following the defeat of the Russian revolution of 1905. The Czarist nobility and landed aristocracy, together with the Russian bourgeoisie, were using the most vicious measures of repression against workers and peasants and their organisations. Under these conditions, attacks on the basic theory of Marxism were to be expected, as well as on its political practices. Thus there appeared numerous books openly attacking Marxism, but more serious than these were a number of works by people who called themselves Marxists, attempting to "revise" Marxism or to "bring it up to date."

No thorough-going Marxist, from the time of Marx and Engels themselves, has believed that Marxist theory is something complete, final, unalterable. On the contrary, its very vitality lies in the applicability of its basic principles to an endless variety of changing situations and conditions, and its ability to predict the direction of movement of previously unencountered systems, a process which itself enriches Marxism and extends its scope and power.

The revisionists, however, sought not to apply Marxism to new conditions — to extend the work of Marx and Engels — but to alter the basic principles of Marxism, to undermine the theoretical foundations of the revolutionary movement and to render them innocuous as a weapon against the Russian ruling class.

In the field of philosophy this trend was evidenced in criticism ostensibly of the materialist conceptions of Marx and Engels, and "revision" of materialism "in the light of modern science." The result, however, was the rejection of materialism itself, and the advocacy of a reactionary philosophy.

In exposing these dangerous developments in philosophy, Lenin shows that they are not new, differing not at all in essence from the many previous attacks on materialism. He shows, further, that far from requiring any drastic change in the fundamental theory of dialectical materialism as expounded by Marx and Engels, the revolutionary developments in science of the first decade of the twentieth century served to provide new proofs of its validity. As Engels wrote: "Nature is the test of dialectics, and it must be said of modern natural science that it provides rich and ever increasing materials for the test."

It should be noted, however, that as scientific research develops, and new knowledge is added to our store, progressive changes are necessary in scientific theories. Consequently, so far as detail is concerned, some of the writings on scientific matters by Engels eighty years ago, and by Lenin forty years ago, require restatement today to adapt them to our modern scientific views. To the Marxist, however, it is not surprising that, limited as they were by the science of the time, the fundamental conclusions reached then require no change. Further, due to their greater theoretical clarity, both Engels and Lenin were able to reach conclusions far in advance of their contemporaries, conclusions which later scientific work has proved correct.

*Materialism and Empirio-Criticism* will not be found easy reading. It requires careful study, in conjunction with the earlier philosophical writings of Marx and Engels, but the labor involved will be amply repaid.

## LANGUAGE OF BEES

PROFESSOR J. B. S. HALDANE, F.R.S.

EIGHT years ago I gave an account in the *Daily Worker* of the early work of von Frisch and others on the language of bees.

This July, I was at the London Zoo with Professor Hadorn, of Zurich. We watched bees coming in to the glass-fronted hive laden with pollen of different colors in the bags on their legs. He was able, by watching them, to tell me from what direction they had come, and roughly from what distance. So will you be, after reading this article.

The facts previously known were these. When a bee has found a rich source of pollen or honey she comes back to the hive, and before handing it over to the other workers whose job it is to eat it in the comb, she does a peculiar "dance."

During the dance other bees touch her with their antennae, so that they know what smell is associated with the kind of food in question. Then they fly off to visit flowers of the same kind, or dishes of sugar water impregnated with the same smell, for example, of peppermint.

When the flower or the sugar water is placed within fifty yards of the hive, bees fly out in all directions to visit flowers or dishes with the same smell. But when they are placed at distances over about a hundred yards, they not merely fly out in the right direction, but for the right distance. As some of them arrive before the original finder has unloaded her honey, or pollen, it is clear that she must have told them in which direction to go, and how far.

Von Frisch has discovered how the information is conveyed.

If the food is within fifty yards, the finder dances round and round. If it is more than a hundred, the dance is quite different. She goes forward in a certain direction for an inch or two, wagging her abdomen, then runs back without any "dancing," and repeats the dance again and again.

The more she has found, and the sweeter the sugar water, the longer the dance lasts, and therefore the more other bees are able to learn what smell is associated with food, and the more so for food.

If the finder dances the round dance they go out in all directions, but not for further than a hundred yards. The other kind of dance gives them the direction.

The dances are generally carried out on the comb, but sometimes on the landing-stage in front of a hive. If it is horizontal, the dancer moves

in the direction of the food, and the other bees fly out in the direction of her dance.

If, however, the surface of the comb is vertical, something much odder happens. As the day goes on, the dancer moves in different directions after coming from the same place. Supposing the food is southwest from the hive, then at 9 a.m. the dancer moves horizontally to the left, at noon she moves at 45 degrees upward, at 3 p.m. vertically upward, and so on.

It is most remarkable that bees know the direction of the sun, even in cloudy weather. Perhaps they can feel the heat rays coming through the clouds.

The distance is given by the rhythm of the dance. Food only 150 yards away elicits a dance with 40 tail-wags a minute. This number sinks to 20 when the food is half a mile away, and to only eight at a distance of two miles.

Von Frisch believes that the same language is used by scouts which go out from a swarm of bees and come back to tell it where they have found a place suitable for a new hive. But this is uncertain, for swarming is rare, whereas hundreds of observations can be made every summer day in an ordinary hive.

Besides the dances, the bees have at least one other "word," namely a sweet smell which they make when they have found rich food, and which attracts other bees to the place.

These observations seem to have a great philosophical importance. It is often said that animals' "language" is a mere expression of the emotions, and cannot convey statements of fact. But it is clear that the bees can tell each other not merely that they have found food, but where they have found it.

It is true that the bees' language seems to be inborn, and not learned like ours. It is like that of the young lady in Shaw's "Back to Methuselah," who emerges from an egg talking perfect Shavian English.

However, some birds have to learn a good deal of their language.

It is also clear that bees have an amazing sense of direction. If a hive is turned round, the dancer moves over the comb in a curved path as if she had a compass needle in the head. Perhaps she has some kind of magnetic sense which we lack.

Their perception of rhythm must also be superior to our own.



A reader may well ask whether it is not possible that von Frisch is pulling our legs, or at least letting his imagination run away with him, and has invented the amazing story.

The answer is that, although he made some mistakes in his interpretations of dancing, most of his earlier work has not only been confirmed, but applied in practice by Gubin Komarov and others in the Soviet Union, as well as by von Frisch himself in Germany and Austria.

Red clover is normally fertilised by bumble bees, and does not set seed without fertilisation.

Bumble bees are not common enough to fertilise an area of an acre or more of red clover. And ordinary bees prefer other flowers, as their probosces are not long enough to get all the nectar of a red clover flower.

The following method is, therefore, used. Beehives are brought near to the clover fields. Glasses containing sugar water and red clover blossom are placed among the clover.

Bees soon find them and come back to dance. Their comrades fall for the propaganda and search for flowers with the correct smell. A few of them find the sugar water. The majority search the clover flowers. They do not find much nectar there, but in their searches they carry pollen from

one flower to another. Enough of them find sugar water to keep up the stream of propaganda in the hive.

The system rather reminds me of the football pools, where a few people win large prizes, but the vast majority merely enrich the organisers of the pools and keep the postal workers busy.

Economically it pays the seedsmen. For an expenditure of about 12 pounds of sugar per acre over five weeks, von Frisch got an increased yield of 36 pounds of clover seed per acre. As a pound of clover seed cost as much as 16 pounds of sugar, this was a good bargain, except perhaps for the bees.

Possibly an even bigger return could be got by inducing bees to visit orchards.

It is important that the bees visiting prepared sugar water should, if possible, perch on the blossom and also suck up juice into which blossom has been crushed to give it the right scent.

I do not know whether we shall be able to learn the language of ants, and get them to clean our kitchen floors instead of raiding our sugar.

But I am quite sure that research on these subjects will tell us things which we need to know, not only about animals, but about human societies.

*(World Copyright Reserved)*

