

# COMMUNIST REVIEW

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

No. 59

JULY, 1946

Price 6d.

## LIST OF CONTENTS

THE FEDERAL ELECTIONS AND THE UNITED FRONT	R. Dixon	195
SPEECHES TO THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE MEETING	(E. J. Rowe J. C. Henry)	197 198
NO THIRD WORLD WAR	R. Palme Dutt	199
THE VATICAN'S WAR ON PEACE	V. J. Jerome	206
RUSSIA'S FINANCIAL STRUCTURE	Norman Freehill	209
NATIONALISATION OF THE COAL INDUSTRY	Arthur L. Horner	212
THE FASCIST MENTALITY IN AUSTRALIAN ART	"Goya"	215
THE PROFESSOR'S MELODRAMA	Emile Burns	217
HOW N.S.W. TEACHERS WON NEW DEAL	H. Ross, B.A.	218
TRUE FACTS ABOUT THE SOVIET UNION	Y. Lazarev	219
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS		221
BOOK REVIEW	Joyce Metcalf	222
GEOLOGISTS AND GENESIS	Prof. J. B. S. Haldane, FRS	223

ORGAN OF THEORY AND PRACTICE OF THE AUSTRALIAN  
COMMUNIST PARTY

Editor . . . . L. L. Sharkey

## THE FEDERAL ELECTIONS AND THE UNITED FRONT

R. DIXON

(Abridged from a report delivered to the Central Committee, 31st May, 1946)

THIS year the Federal elections will be held, and coinciding with them there will be a referendum to strengthen the powers of the Federal Government on three important issues, Social Services, Marketing and Industrial Powers. The year 1946 will, therefore, be most important for the labor movement.

Already this year has been marked by the big struggles waged by the working class, struggles that tend to increase in number and power rather than to decrease. Taking the figures of strike struggles over recent years we get the following:

In the year 1944, a complete war year, over one million working days were lost by strikes. In the first six months of 1945 the figures were about the same as for the first six months of 1944. But from then on, as we get into the months following the end of the war, a big change takes place.

For New South Wales alone we get the following figures for 1945:

	Number disputes	Working days lost
March quarter . . . . .	217	153,872
June quarter . . . . .	203	223,608
September quarter . . . . .	256	289,105
December quarter . . . . .	419	1,256,415

Those figures indicate the growing struggles of the workers, the great rise in working class activity. It is in the light of the growing activities and struggles of the workers that we must consider the position of the Labor Party and the Communist Party.

In the first place, recent by-elections reveal a weakening of the position of the Labor Party, especially among the middle classes. The decline is not sufficient, it seems, to result in the defeat of the Labor Party at the Federal elections, but is serious enough to warrant special efforts on the part of the Labor Governments and the labor movement generally to, at least, arrest the decline. The Labor Governments, by failing to really face up to the needs of the present situation, had frittered away the goodwill and support of important sections of the people.

In the second place we must record the fact that, despite the growing struggles of the workers and the disillusionment with the Labor Party, there is no evidence of a substantial swing to the Communist Party. Interest in the Party is growing, as shown by the bigger attendances at public and factory meetings, but recruitment of new members and press sales and finance are unsatisfactory. As part of our Federal election campaign, therefore, we must develop a great mass activity, improve Party discipline and organisation and strengthen

our connections with the people. We must become the organisers and leaders of the growing mass movement, of the struggles of the people.

A number of the recent strikes, those that affected supplies of gas, electricity, meat and so on, have been seized upon by the millionaire press and Liberal politicians to undermine the influence of the labor movement among the middle classes and farmers. They have been made the excuse to establish strike-breaking organisations such as the Citizens' Rights Committee. Most of these struggles could have been settled quickly had the Labor Governments intervened on the side of the workers instead of forcing them into the Arbitration Courts, which function so consistently in the interest of the employers. By failing to do this the Labor Governments played into the hands of reaction, have provided the capitalist press and the Liberal-Country Party politicians with the opportunity to try and alienate the support of some sections of the people from the labor movement.

An examination of many of the big strikes of these last few months will show that they had their origin in victimisation and other forms of employer provocation. The strikes at Port Kembla, Tooths Brewery and Riverstone Meat Works and also the Queensland Meat strike—all commenced with the victimisation of Union delegates.

The fact that the employers deliberately provoked these strikes, and prolonged them in order to dissipate Union strength and finances, and to arouse resentment against the Unions, is a serious matter for the Union movement. The Trade Unions must avoid, so far as is possible, being provoked by the employers. They must strive to limit the spread of strikes that are waged for only small issues. If large numbers of workers are to be drawn into struggle then it should be for big objectives, for wage increases, shorter hours and improvement in conditions.

Now that the Federal elections are approaching the workers can expect more provocation on the part of the employers, who will not hesitate to precipitate disputes and deprive the people of essential commodities and services if this will help swing support away from the Labor and Communist Party candidates in the elections. They were anxious to see another coal dispute arising from the recent campaign of the Miners' Federation for State or Federal Government control of the industry. For weeks the capitalist press has been trying to stir up public feeling against the miners and even to force the Government to introduce rationing of gas and electricity at a time when coal

An index of the 1945 issues of the Communist Review is now available. Copies may be obtained by sending a stamped and addressed envelope to Review Management, 695 George Street, Sydney.

100 bound copies of the Communist Review for 1946 will be available early next year. Orders for these will be accepted now and should be sent to the above address.

was coming forward in sufficient quantity to meet requirements. The reaction wanted a coal strike.

We must take into account the tendency in this country to canalise all big Union campaigns for improvements into the Arbitration Courts, which usually results in killing the campaign. The 40-hour week is a case in point. It started off as a demand on the Government, and as the interest of the workers grew and the pressure increased, the Government shunted it into the Federal Arbitration Court. The Court is tackling this question not from the angle of the general needs of the people and the advance of industrial technique but as to whether the industrial magnates of Australia can afford it. Meanwhile the campaign in the factories is almost at an end. This is bad, because the Court will only grant the shorter working week under the strongest mass pressure.

The Queensland Shearers recently gave us a good example of what is needed. They decided to enforce the 40-hour week so that when the Queensland Court sat to consider shearers' hours they were faced with the fact that the forty-hour week was already in operation and they had no alternative but to grant it.

Because the Arbitration Court is dealing with this matter it is all the more necessary for the Trade Union movement to continue to campaign for the 40-hour week, where possible to enforce it as the Queensland Shearers did, and in each State to insist that the State Governments immediately legislate for it.

Since the end of the war the policy of the Federal Labor Government, both in its external and internal application, has gone more to the right. When the Labor Premier of Tasmania, Cosgrove, declared that the struggle for decent wages had ended and urged the workers to produce more goods at cheaper cost and to cease striking, he gave us the essence of Labor's policy today.

The Federal Government opposes the lifting of the wage-pegging regulations, does nothing about increasing the basic wage, referred the 40-hour week to Arbitration, and shows no signs of removing the burden of taxation from lower incomes. On the other hand, they urge the workers to produce more, to work harder.

If the Government wants an increase in production the first thing it must do is solve the immediate and pressing problems of the workers by lifting the burden of taxation from them, increasing wages and shortening hours. This is the starting point for increasing production.

Nationalisation of monopolies, and in particular in the present situation, of the coal industry, is also essential if problems of production are to be tackled and the living standards of the workers raised. For years the Miners' Federation and the Communist Party have insisted that a fundamental reorganisation of the coal industry is necessary in order that the growing needs of industry and transport could be met and that the starting point for this was the

nationalisation of the industry. Recent undertakings by the Government suggest that they are moving in the direction of reorganising the coal industry, but only very slowly. The Government proposes to establish some control over the conditions to open new mines and improve the conditions of mine workers, but it still evades nationalisation.

Because of its liberal-bourgeois policy the Labor Government constantly finds itself in opposition to the legitimate demands of the workers, opposed to the struggles of the Trade Unions, and the inevitable outcome of this situation is a growing disillusionment with the Labor Governments and the loss of support for the Labor Party among the middle classes and farmers.

The Communist Party must sharpen its criticism of the Labor Governments and rally the workers to press forward for the realisation of their demands.

The programme of the Communist Party in the Federal elections will be based upon the decisions of the National Party Congress, linked with the various national, state and local problems that have arisen in the meantime. We will fight for a foreign policy aimed at strengthening the relations between the great powers, Soviet Russia, Britain and U.S.A., for their collaboration for peace which is essential to any long-term peace, for friendly relations with all peace-loving nations and the development of trade, and for the right of all oppressed peoples to their independence.

Our internal policy will aim at a strong and free Australia, in which the working class will play an increasingly important role. We stand for higher living standards for workers, farmers and middle class people, for the removal of taxation from all lower incomes, for shorter hours of labor, a housing programme that will meet the need of the nation, for irrigation projects, water conservation and national measures sufficiently big to combat erosion. We are for the nationalisation of the coal industry and big monopolies, for a better organisation of the Australian economy to ensure that jobs will be available to effectively rehabilitate ex-service men and women and to provide work for all.

At the Federal elections we aim to secure the election of Communists to Parliament, the defeat of the Liberal-Country Party candidates, and the return of the Labor Government. The election programme we submit to the people is a programme to be fought for and we must rally the working class for the struggle to realise this programme. We must strive for a great increase in votes for the Communist candidates and this calls for the most thorough campaigning.

With the object of uniting the working class to defeat the reactionary Liberal-Country Party candidates and to strengthen the fight for the people's needs, the Communist Party will make united front proposals to the Labor Party.

The growth of working class unity in the factories has been most noticeable over these last months, in spite of the efforts of Labor's right wing to create division. We are determined to strengthen this development.

Two statements of policy of considerable importance to the labor movement have been issued by Labor Party executives recently. The first was the decisions of the Federal Executive of the Labor Party on strikes, which declared that the discontent among the workers today was caused by low wages, heavy taxation, long hours and the persistence of the Federal Government with its wage-pegging policy; further, that employer provocation was also the cause of many strikes. The Labor Party Federal Executive urged the need for the introduction of the 40-hour week, an increase in the basic wage, removal of taxation from low incomes and the lifting of wage-pegging.

The second statement came from the N.S.W. Labor Party Executive and dealt with the problem of coal. It proposed effective Government control to permit of nationalisation of mines and the improvement in the conditions and lives of the miners.

The Communist Party is in basic agreement with most of the views expressed in these two Labor Party statements. Our letter to the Labor Party urging a united front covers these same questions, as well as some others, including the struggle for peace and for a national housing plan. A real basis does exist, therefore, for joint campaigning by the two parties to achieve those things and this we point out to the Labor Party.

The fight for working class unity is not just a matter for the Communist Party, but for the labor movement generally and, knowing of the growing desire for unity amongst the working class, we shall continue the fight for unity until it is achieved, irrespective of the attitude of Labor's right wing splitters.

In Europe today the working class, united against reaction, are reshaping their countries in the

interest of the common people. The United Front between the Communist and Social Democratic parties, which is a feature of the European labor movement today, and which in some countries has already led, or is leading to a fusion and the formation of united working class parties—the united front has so enhanced the strength of the workers as to make them the decisive force in their countries. The right wing splitters who opposed the united front and slandered the Communist Party are being alienated or driven out of the labor movement. Reformism is being overcome.

The fight for the united front, which must be conducted both during and after the elections, does not imply a lessening of our criticism of the Labor Party; does not mean a weakening of our blows against the right wing. On the contrary it calls for the sharpening, the intensification of this fight, for a much more vigorous fight against those opposed to working class unity. During the big steel, coal and shipping strike at the end of the last year we waged the most determined and bitterest fight against the right wing betrayers in their history. What was the result? The strikers, Labor and Communist alike, became so hostile that the right wingers did not dare to face them, they were afraid to attend the mass meetings. The same thing happened among the factory workers generally, and when representatives of the right tried to speak in the Sydney Domain they were the object of a spontaneous demonstration started by Labor Party workers. The Labor Party workers associated with that struggle were, for the first time, seeing through the treachery of their leaders. In addition to this the attitude of the right led to division in their own ranks and various groups from among the reformists began to draw away from the extreme right.

The united front will be built only in struggle, in the struggle for the urgent demands of the working class and in the struggle against the reformist splitters.

## SPEECHES TO THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE MEETING

E. J. ROWE

In the first place I endorse all that has been said about the strikes that are developing in this country at the present time and the necessity for us to ensure a change in their character. The Australia bourgeoisie are engaged upon some economic blood-letting of the Unions under the guise of picking off workers here and there, and they are drawing powerful sections of the trade union movement into struggles for their reinstatement; struggles which leave the unions seriously weakened so far as finance is concerned. In this way they are attempting to break up the Unions so that their power will

be lessened, their capacity and preparedness weakened.

We have to strive in the trade unions to bring about a change in the character of the struggles and, as Comrade Dixon has said, we must link the trade union movement with the questions of hours and wages and so on in the shortest possible time. We have to take up the question of wages and hours and develop campaigns for them in various industries. If we do that, and I am convinced that we have to, then there are certain tendencies developing amongst our own comrades in the Unions against which we must guard.

Alongside the general bourgeois offensive against the working class there is also going on a powerful concerted attack within the trade union movement by Social Democracy, Catholic Action groups and allies which they have won which are undoubtedly having some effect. There are already a number of lessons to be drawn from this before we move on to this wider task of carrying through economic struggles on wages and hours.

There are a whole number of examples here in Sydney that show that our comrades can carry through economic leadership of trade unions and yet lose in trade union elections. One particular incident I have in mind is the Wharfies. There have been some unprecedented victories gained for wharfies from the abolition of the gang system right down to the present argument about double-dumps, there has been a long line of developments in the Wharfies' Union where our comrades have been able to win around these trade union issues; yet in recent elections in Sydney and Melbourne the reactionaries were able to register some successes. I understand that there are some circumstances to explain this, but this does not break down the general conclusion that it is possible for our comrades in the trade union movement to link themselves up with progressive trade union officials. Our Party still lags, still fails to come to the front and lead. We must emphasise particularly that portion of Comrade Dixon's report

#### J. C. HENRY

I AM in agreement with the report delivered by Comrade Dixon on Friday night. The drive towards the 3rd World War is very serious, and the fight for peace is the major question confronting the people of the world and consequently confronting all the Communist Parties today.

I agree with the point made by Comrade Dixon about the fact that our Party is not as conscious of the need to fight for peace as it should be; the reason, of course, why the Party membership as a whole is not seized with the acuteness of the war danger arises from the problem we have been discussing for quite some time past, and that is that we really did not understand completely, fully the changes that have taken place in the sphere of international politics since the defeat of Germany and Japan. And practically every problem confronting our Party today arises on this very same point.

Recently I have been through the greater part of the Northern organisations of the Party in Queensland and there, at every point, you can see that the problem is that the comrades do not understand and do not give practical expression in their work to the changes that have taken place.

So we have been talking about this for quite a long time and it appears that clarity has not been conveyed to the lower organisations, particularly to the Branches, in the way we require it to be

where he said we must strengthen our discipline and organisation in the Unions, but alongside that and organisation in the Unions, but alongside that must go the struggle by our comrades for the policy of our Party. In too many instances we mean economic translating work in the trade unions to mean economic demands and we are not leading our political paigns against the anti-Party attacks in a political fashion. Down amongst the rank and file of the trade unionists on the job this battle is proceeding fiercely and there are instances where reaction has won victories.

We were faced with a position in the A.E.U. which was almost a parallel. We were forced into a corner by a complete unity of diverse interests opposed to us, where complete agreement and tight exchange of preference was necessary. The situation developed where there was no other alternative for the Communists but to fight their way out of it by a full explanation of the role of the Party and what it meant in the trade unions. The cratic peace—they want an imperialist peace. They attack by reaction.

There is a lesson in this too, because we have by no means won the economic demands for engineering workers that Comrade Healy can claim for Wharfies. We found, too, that to get in and trade punches with the right wing brought about a strengthening of discipline and morale so far as our comrades were concerned.

carried. It is essential that we speed up in every possible way the struggle for political clarity on the international and national situation that arises from these changes.

Comrades have shown already, Comrade Sharkey in particular has brought out very clearly, that in the conditions of today British and American Imperialism is the main enemy of progress in every part of the world. The Anglo-American imperialists wish to throw over the Teheran, Yalta and Potsdam agreements, they do not want a democratic peace—they want an imperialistic peace. They are very annoyed with the Soviet Union because it fights to give effect to the aims for which the People's War against fascism was fought.

So that progressive struggle in any part of the world, whether it be in Europe, in Asia, in America or here in Australia for a forty hour week, increased wages and so on, everywhere, in broad general terms, we come up against the same problem, the power of what remains of imperialism.

In the conditions of today, comrades, the imperialists are undoubtedly on the defensive. That is the general world situation as I see it, and they are fighting very, very desperately; they are using armed violence in Greece, the Middle East, China, and America now is using violence against the working class of America. And the only reason why they are not using armed violence in a number

of other places in Europe, and to a greater extent in other places in Asia, is that they could not successfully do this at the present moment, because of the strength of the Soviet Union and the Red Army.

The anti-Soviet and anti-Communist campaign has the aim of isolating the Soviet Union and isolating the vanguard of the progressive struggle everywhere in preparation for war. The final aim of this can be nothing else than preparation for war so that every attack made by any capitalist press here in Australia and by Maloney and all the rest of them is just as much part of the general war preparations against the Soviet Union as are the acquisition of bases and other direct military preparations. The thing we have to face is that whether the struggle now raging will develop into full scale war or not depends upon the ability of the Communist Parties to expose the real character of the designs of imperialism and to engage, weaker and eventually destroy the power of the ruling class in each of the capitalist countries. And particularly must we strive to expose and isolate British and American imperialism.

In this struggle, viewing it in its historical setting, we must see that it is war to the death. We have reached the stage where it is going to be war to the death; there can be no shrinking from it, no holding back, it must be fought out to its final conclusion and the final conclusion must be the destruction of imperialism.

Our line, as the report stressed, must be for Big Three Unity to preserve peace, to slam every move which seeks to weaken that unity, seeks to stifle in any way a democratic peace, every move that slanders the Soviet Union; and to rally as much support as we can for the correct policy of the Soviet Union.

I am in agreement with what Comrade Sharkey had to say about aiming tremendous blows, the main blows, against American imperialism. Here a danger existed, previously at any rate; that is that in our country there has been a decided anti-Yank feeling which was quite unhealthy because it was directed against the American people, as it were, as American people. I think this action of Truman's, where he comes out against the labor movement of America, declares war on the labor movement of America, gives a very good situation to

launch the attack against American imperialism, expose its attacks on the American labor movement and dissociate it from the American people in every way so that it will help to develop a real hatred against American imperialism which is to lay the centre and spearhead of world reaction.

During this meeting it has been said, and I know from my own experiences, that there are far too many of our comrades who stand like stunned plovers and allow reactionaries to attack the Soviet Union and Communism without fighting back to the best of their ability. I think it was only recently at some Party gathering I remember hammering his particular point and drawing attention to the fact that our comrades are not fighting at all in the manner we fought prior to the war, right back to early in the 1930's, where if anyone said anything about the Soviet Union every Communist would bound up immediately, even if their tactics were bad, and I would much prefer to see them do this than to remain quiet.

I know in talking to some of the comrades in one of the centres in Queensland, a strong centre, one of the comrades told me he thought there was far too much material about the Soviet Union in the "Tribune." With this I disagreed very strongly because I thought it amounted to a capitulation to the capitalist attack against the Soviet Union. So these things certainly need to be attacked.

A word about the role of reformism in the conditions of today. Comrade Sharkey has already dealt with this fairly fully, but there are a few things I would like to say.

I do not think any of us here, at this meeting, should have any incorrect ideas about the role of reformism and we should not have illusions about the role of reformism in the developing situation. We know that when capitalism can afford concessions, then the reformists are prepared to fight, by legal methods, for reform, and when capitalism is sore beset the reformists fight by legal and violent methods to support capitalism. That is their role, this has all been dealt with for years by the World Communist Movement.

Today the capitalist class is sore beset and the crisis will not lessen but intensify, so the role of reformism will be to defend capitalism, to fight the masses, to preserve capitalism—that is the line of march that it must pursue.

## NO THIRD WORLD WAR

R. PALME DUTT

(From "Labour Monthly," April, 1946)

MUCH loose talk is being spread about a third world war. It is necessary to make a cool, objective and realistic appraisal of the present world situation, of the factors which are driving, whether consciously or unconsciously, towards a third world war, whether near or at a longer distance of time, and of the possibilities and conditions

for preventing such a third world war. The slogan of World War III was originally let loose by Nazism in the closing stages of the recent war. It is in the closing stages of the recent war by all Nazi openly looked forward to with hope by all Nazi and fascist elements, by the Franco Falange, Anders' Poles, Yugoslav Royalists and similar dispossessed reactionaries over Europe, who eagerly speculate

on the supposed "inevitable" coming war between Anglo-America and the Soviet Union as the signal for a counter-revolutionary restoration. Such speculations have been encouraged by Churchill's Fulton speech, by many utterances in the British and American press, and by certain trends in foreign policy.

At the same time we should not allow this cacophonous witches' chorus of socially decadent elements to lead to an exaggerated conception of their power or to create a kind of neurotic hypnosis of the supposed inevitability of the third world war. These speculators forget that wars have to be fought by armies and sustained by munitions, and that the British workers will not be so easily drawn into their facile plans to fight or make munitions against the Soviet Union. The power of the democratic forces of the world after victory over fascism is amply sufficient to prevent a third world war, provided a correct policy is followed. The overwhelming mass of mankind view with horror the prospect of a third world war. Such instinctive repulsion, however, and subjective wish is not alone sufficient, as past experience has shown, unless it is translated into positive united action based on a clear political understanding of the indispensable conditions for maintaining unity, defeating the reactionary warmongers and preventing war in the present period of world history. It is our present decisions and actions in 1946, in the first formative year after the conclusion of the war and the defeat of fascism, especially with regard to the relations of Britain, the United States and the Soviet Union, that will govern the future for many years.

Lenin long ago pointed out, during the first world war, at a time when the myth of "the war to end war" and "permanent peace" within capitalism was widespread, that if mankind did not learn the lesson from the first world war, then a second world war would follow: this remains absolutely true. It is absolutely true, and an elementary law, that the conditions of capitalism and imperialism, the insoluble contradictions of capitalism and imperialism inevitably breed war, and that any dream of permanent peace within capitalism, no matter by what machinery, is a dangerous and demoralising delusion. But Lenin was not thereby preaching a fatalistic doctrine of the inevitability of a series of world wars. On the contrary, he was pointing the path forward for the struggle of the working-class and the peoples against imperialist war and against imperialism. Marxism has always taught that the strength of the working-class and the peoples can check a particular menace of war, and by such success can be the stronger to check a further menace of war, and can in this struggle and by the time thus gained advance in strength to its final goal of ending capitalism and imperialism, which will alone finally remove the causes of war.

Before 1914 the old Socialist International sought to organise the working-class to prevent the

first world war—with the most implicit clearness in the Basle Manifesto of 1912, which outlined in concrete detail the character of the impending war and the revolutionary consequences that would flow from it. There was not yet the necessary strength, unity and leadership to prevent the first world war. But the revolutionary consequences of the first world war were such that by the time of the approach of the second world war the conditions were vastly altered. It is universally recognised that the second world war could have been almost easily prevented. Had the policy of the Soviet Union and of the working-class and democratic forces in Western Europe for a combined Peace Front of the Western Powers and the Soviet Union been carried out, the second world war need never have taken place. This policy only just failed, owing to the role of the Munichites and the assistance given them by Western Social Democracy in opposing working-class unity and the popular front.

Today the balance of forces is still further changed, with the defeat of fascism, the increased world strength of the Soviet Union, the advance of working-class strength and organisation and of working-class unity, the new democratic governments in Europe, the progress of the colonial peoples towards independence and the organisation of the United Nations partially reflecting the new balance of forces. Thus the conditions are enormously more favourable for preventing the third world war. But in approaching this task, it is necessary to study very closely the experience of the concrete conditions leading to the second world war, in order not to repeat old errors, and in order to carry forward our policy in relation to the new conditions today.

Why was the first world war followed by the second? The general answer is sufficiently manifest in the conditions of imperialism, the intensified economic contradictions between the advance of productive power and the monopolist restrictions which found expression in the world economic crisis, and the sharpening conflict for the new division of the world, which found specific expression in the challenge of the expanding imperialist powers, Germany, Italy and Japan, against the possessing colonial powers. All this reflected the normal conflict of imperialism developing to war, and reproduced the patterns of the first imperialist world war at a higher stage. But there entered a new element into the second world war, and this new element was decisive for its character. This new element corresponded to the new period of world history which had opened with the general crisis of capitalism, the first victory of the socialist revolution and establishment of socialism in Russia, the advance of the working-class in conditions of growing social crisis and the desperate counter-offensive of the ruling class through fascism to destroy the working-class movement, democracy and the Soviet Union. And it was this new element

which governed the historical process of events leading to the second world war and dominated its decisive character.

Thus the second world war differed decisively from the first world war in that, interpenetrating and dominating the familiar pattern of inter-imperialist conflict, the second world war developed from the outset as a war of liberation of the peoples, in unity with the Soviet Union, against fascism. This dominating character of the second world war was visible from the outset, from the earliest stages, from the war of the Chinese people against Japanese fascism, from the war of the Abyssinian people against Italian fascism and from the war of the Spanish Republic, supported by the International Brigade and the Soviet Union, against German and Japanese fascism.

All the counteracting efforts and policies of the imperialists could not defeat this decisive anti-fascist character of the war. Neither the policies of backing Japan and building up German fascism and its rearmament, nor Munich and its attempted bloc of Western imperialism with German and Italian fascism against the Soviet Union, nor the imperialist phase of the war launched by Chamberlain and Daladier, with the main weight directed against Communism and the Soviet Union, and with the "phony war" in relation to Hitler, could turn aside the current of history. These policies led to deadly consequences for the peoples of Britain, France and Europe. But these consequences led in turn to the necessity of the acceptance of the previously rejected British-Soviet alliance and the final establishment of the world alliance of the United Nations which led to the military downfall of fascism. It is the fruits and the gains from this victory in the war of liberation against fascism which now need to be maintained and extended, and no reversion permitted to the old fatal policies which led to the second world war.

The lessons of the fatal suicidal policies which led to the second world war need to be learned, remembered, driven home and acted upon today, if we are to prevent the third world war. Why did the victorious powers of the first world war, after defeating Germany, destroying its navy, air force, artillery and tanks, imposing the Versailles Treaty on Germany, and prohibiting its rearmament, proceed at once to rebuild the power of German militarism, tear up the clauses of Versailles, permit and even assist its rearmament until within twenty years German imperialism could threaten the world anew with an even more formidable armed power than in 1914? The answer is known to every one today. It was the anti-Soviet hostility of the Western Powers, the fear of Communism and popular revolutions, the division of the Western Powers and the Soviet Union which provided the basis for the revival of German militarism and imperialism, smoothed the path for fascist aggression, wrecked the League and brought on the second world war.

It was the "Anti-Comintern" banner which provided the grand shibboleth and Open Sesame for the fascist bandits to cover up their aggression, lull, disorganise, bully and blackmail the Western imperialists, and let loose the second world war. Behind the "Anti-Comintern" banner gathered all the battalions of infamy and aggression. Would it be believed that voices could be heard today, after all these years of slaughter, endeavouring to raise this shameful banner anew?

Why die twice of the same poison? In the ordeal of war the fatal error of British ruling class policy during the inter-war years, under the deadly lure of the anti-Bolshevik bait, had to be recognised, nor merely by critics, but by the official representatives of the ruling class. The Under-Secretary for Foreign Affairs, R. K. Law, stated in Parliament in January, 1943:—

During the twenty years between the last war and this, Germany played upon the fear of Bolshevism. That was why she was able to get away with murder for so long.

And The Times wrote in an editorial in August, 1943:—

It has often been remarked that the survival of German militarism through the catastrophe of 1918 was one of the essential foundations on which Hitler built. But it is less often recalled that the Allies, by their reluctance to tolerate revolutionary movements in Germany in the winter of 1918-19, unwittingly connived at its survival, and that cunning propaganda of "the fear of Bolshevism" was the force which impelled them to this connivance.

"The devil was sick, the devil a monk would be." With the manic cries of Hitler proclaiming the Communist Parties of the world the menace to civilisation and world peace still ringing in our ears, with the blood of the victims still soaking the earth, within nine months of the end of the war, the mantle of Goebbels is assumed by the victors, and we find a Churchill proclaiming that "the Communist Parties constitute a growing peril and challenge to Christian civilisation" or a Bevin announcing to UNO that "the danger to the peace of the world" arises from "the Communist Parties in every country." Where that path leads, history has shown.

Cardinal Griffin, in a recent address at Westminster Cathedral, solemnly proclaims that the present world situation is "worse than Munich," world affairs are in a more perilous position than before Munich." He and his kidney may well find it "worse than Munich." No longer the easy agreement with Hitler and Mussolini, and hopes of the grand anti-Soviet crusade. Hitler and Mussolini in the dust; the Soviet Union stronger than ever; and the peoples of Europe rising to clear out the pro-fascist scum and take possession. No wonder he and his company lament. But this is not exactly what he intended to convey. He and a

thousand propagandists like him, including on the B.B.C., are trying to turn the shameful memories of "Munich" and "appeasement" inside out, and to suggest that a policy of friendship with the Soviet Union is "Munich" and agreement with the Soviet Union is "appeasement." This is double-dealing with a vengeance. The essence of Munich and appeasement was the policy of hostility to the Soviet Union and support of fascism. And now these double-dealers try to utilise the popular fury against the memories of Munich and appeasement in order to repeat the same policies of hostility to the Soviet Union and support of pro-fascism. Such transparent double-dealing will take in few.

In the spring of 1939 Stalin gave warning of where this line of policy of the Western imperialists was leading, and his words are worth recalling, when attempts are being made to revive the same basic line in new conditions today. Speaking to the Eighteenth Congress of the C.P.S.U., he said—

It is a distinguishing feature of the new imperialism war that it has not yet become universal, a world war. The war is being waged by aggressor States, who in every way infringe upon the interests of the non-aggressive States, primarily England, France and the U.S.A., while the latter draw back and retreat, making concession after concession to the aggressors.

To what are we to attribute this one-sided and strange character of the new imperialism war? He answered by explaining the significance of the policy of "non-intervention."

The policy of non-intervention reveals an eagerness, a desire not to hinder the aggressors in their nefarious work; not to hinder Japan, say, from embroiling herself in a war with China, or, better still, with the Soviet Union; not to hinder Germany, say, from embroiling herself in European affairs, from embroiling herself in a war with the Soviet Union; to allow all the belligerents to sink deeply in the mire of war, to encourage them surreptitiously in this; to allow them to weaken and exhaust one another; and then, when they have become weak enough, to appear on the scene with fresh strength, to appear of course "in the interests of peace," and to dictate conditions to the enfeebled belligerents.

He concluded with the famous warning that "the big and dangerous game started by the supporters of the policy of non-intervention may end in a serious fiasco for them." This analysis is worth bearing in mind today, when certain similar tendencies are revealing themselves anew in altered conditions; for this analysis throws a sharp light on the role of the most reactionary sections of the Western imperialists in the second world war and today.

When the British ruling class found themselves faced with the fiasco which Stalin had predicted,

with the consequent domination of the Continent of Europe by Hitler, and their own peril, they accepted in the moment of opportunity the policy of the British-Soviet Alliance which they had previously rejected, and which proved the turning point of the war and the corner stone of final victory over Hitler. The credit for this historic decision, which corresponded to the deepest interests of the British people, rests with Churchill. But this did not mean that Churchill (as he was himself at pains to make clear) or the British ruling class had changed their attitude to the Soviet Union and to Communism, or were fighting the war with the same anti-fascist conception which inspired the peoples.

British imperialism pursued a double objective in the war, which was thinly concealed in official expression, but which was patently visible, not only in unofficial expression, but in the practical strategy of the war and in the accompanying Anglo-American diplomatic conferences. On the one hand, the Western imperialists sought, in alliance with the Soviet Union, to ensure the defeat of Hitler. On the other hand, they were concerned that the downfall of fascism should not lead to the advance of Communism or popular anti-fascist revolutions in Europe endangering the old social order, or the strengthening of the Soviet Union. They calculated that the weight of the war would not only destroy Hitler, but either equally destroy or fatally weaken the Soviet Union, and that the Anglo-American forces would emerge as the main victors to police Europe and control the world.

This double strategy of Western imperialism in the war, which becomes of exceptional importance to analyse and recall today in the light of fuller facts now known, for the direct bearing that it has on present reactionary tendencies which have now come into the open, was exposed at the time in the Labour Monthly in October, 1941, in dealing with reactionary tendencies in ruling class policy—

Seeking to hold the British forces immune and inactive during the critical time when their action could most decisively help the common cause, they openly calculate on intervening fresh, and at the peak of production, later, when both combatants in the East are exhausted, and thus ensuring the Anglo-American domination of Europe and preservation of the old order after the collapse of fascism. Such becomes the New Munichism.

This calculation received naive and open expression in the famous indirection of the Government Minister, Moore-Brabazon, when at a private meeting on July 31, 1941, speaking on an occasion when he declared he was "glad there were no reporters present," he expressed, according to the unchallenged summary of the chairman of the A.E.U. at the Trades Union Congress, the

hope that the Russian and German armies will exterminate each other, and while this is taking place, we, the British Commonwealth of

Nations, will so develop our Air Force and other armed forces that, if Russia and Germany do destroy each other, we shall have the dominating power in Europe.

The innocent Moore-Brabazon was only giving away the calculations of higher authorities. When the revelation was made, which cost him his seat in the Cabinet, official indignation was turned against those guilty of reporting a private meeting, and it was explained in mitigation that the Minister had been speaking without notes and only thinking aloud. As Gallacher said—

The Minister of Aircraft Production has given an explanation of his speech: it was extempore; he had not been thinking of what he was saying. But because he was not thinking of what he was saying, his inmost thoughts came out.

This double policy found practical expression in the strategy of the war. The strategy of the war was so conducted that the main brunt should fall upon the Soviet Union. It had originally been anticipated in all government circles that the Nazi offensive would wipe out the Soviet Union in a matter of weeks, or at most a few months. While the most terrific military onslaught in history was let loose on the Red Army, no British army was in action on any front. Churchill and Roosevelt met in mid-Atlantic and attended divine service with the appropriately chosen hymn, "Onward, Christian Soldiers" (while the Soviet and Chinese soldiers were battling against odds, only the Christian soldiers were not engaged) "Onward, Christian Soldiers, marching as to war" (the operative words being "as to war.")

When the Soviet Union, against all Western official expectation, withstood the onslaught ("unlooked for, undreamt of," as Churchill said), when the first Soviet counter-offensive was launched in the spring of 1942 with the expectation of parallel action in the West, when Molotov came to London, to demand parallel action in the West, the official pledge was given of the Second Front in the West in 1942. That pledge was dishonoured and subsequently explained to have been a bluff. For three years from the Nazi attack on the Soviet Union, when all the pundits began with one accord to write about Hitler's fatal error in incurring the two-front war in Europe, the Second Front in the West was postponed and delayed until June, 1944. For three years the Soviet armies had to meet alone the main weight of the Nazi armies.

All the babblers and sycophants of official expression poured scorn upon the Communist campaign for the Second Front in the West and jeered at the "armchair strategists" who dared to intervene on matters of strategy when it was obvious that the military experts alone could judge and knew what was best. Those babblers look foolish enough today, when it has been revealed in the memoirs of Captain Butcher, the aide-de-camp of

General Eisenhower, that General Eisenhower and his military experts favoured the Second Front in Europe in the summer of 1942, that the opposition came primarily, not from military, but from political sources, and that the decisive opposition which blocked and delayed the Second Front came—what could not be stated at the time—from Churchill. When Churchill's decision to ban the Second Front in 1942 was conveyed to General Eisenhower, General Eisenhower called it "the blackest day of the war."

That decision prolonged the war. As General Sir Gifford Martel has since written in his book, *Our Armoured Forces*—

The troops in England were ready a year before they were used, and were even becoming stale by 1944. Could we not have been ready sooner if we had settled on our main plan at an earlier date?

It threw upon the Soviet Union the main weight of the war, to confront alone for three years three-fourths of the Nazi forces, and at terrible cost to tear those forces to pieces before the Anglo-American forces intervened in the West at the last hour to share in the victory. The cost was revealed in the grim figure of war losses. The Soviet Union lost seven million dead. The total of Anglo-American losses has been compared by noble speakers in the House of Lords on traffic problems to peacetime road casualties.

The same twofold policy was revealed in the diplomatic conduct of the war. The Anglo-American diplomatic conferences preceded and were conducted apart from the meetings of the representatives of the three powers, and, as the war progressed, were more and more obviously preoccupied with post-war questions of maintaining the old order in Europe after the downfall of fascism. It is an ironic sidelight on the Canadian espionage trials that the greatest alarm is expressed because it is alleged that the secret talks and plans of Churchill and Roosevelt at Quebec in 1943 and 1944 may have become known to Stalin—

Interest in the Canadian spy-ring disclosures centred today on the realisation that details of the secret Churchill-Roosevelt discussions at the Quebec Conferences could have been transmitted to Moscow, owing to the leakages at Ottawa.

Officials are perturbed when they recall that the first Quebec Conference in 1943 included delicate discussions on Second Front pressure from Marshal Stalin.

The second conference in 1944 . . . dealt with post-war plans to assure democracy in the Western style in liberated Europe.

—Daily Telegraph, 6th March, 1946.

It will be recalled that it was at the second Quebec Conference, as Churchill subsequently revealed, that the decision was reached to intervene in Greece after the departure of the Germans

in order to overthrow the National Liberation Movement.

When in the later stages of the war the unbreakable strength of the Soviet Union stood revealed to all, it was recognised that a shift would have to be made in policy, that the original calculations of a wrecked and prostrate Soviet Union at the end of the war had miscarried, that it was inexorably necessary to recognise the full status of the Soviet Union as an equal world power after the war and that a basis of Three Power collaboration would have to be maintained as the foundation of the post-war settlement. This found expression in the pledges of the Moscow, Teheran and Crimea Agreements for the Three Powers "to work together in war and in the peace that would follow," "to maintain and strengthen in the peace to come that unity of purpose and of action which has made victory possible," and "to destroy the last vestiges of Nazism and Fascism." These pledges and the accompanying concrete agreements of Moscow, Crimea and Potsdam laid down the plain and indispensable path for post-war peace and democratic settlement.

It is the violation and even repudiation of these pledges by the Western Powers, once the danger of war has passed, that underlies all the present difficulties. The Teheran and Crimea Agreements, solemnly signed on behalf of Britain, the United States and the Soviet Union, had laid down the basis of Three Power collaboration and leadership in the post-war world as the indispensable foundation of peace and condition of success of the United Nations, the only alternative to which would mean the renewal of rivalries and antagonism, two-Power combinations against a third, and all the instability of balance-of-power politics. Yet official British, and to a certain extent American Government declarations today shamelessly repudiate the basis of Three-Power politics. Thus Noel Baker declared on behalf of the Government in the House of Commons on February 20—

The Government did not agree that we could get peace and co-operation between ourselves and Russia by withdrawing important questions out of the framework of the United Nations Organisation and by going back to Three-Power politics.

The same violation could be traced in detail in relation to the operation of the Potsdam Agreement and the pledge to "destroy the vestiges of Nazism and Fascism." It is this, and not any imaginary shift of policy of the Soviet Union, which has remained loyal to the Crimea and Potsdam Agreements, that is responsible for the present difficulties.

What led to this dangerous reversion of Anglo-American policy at the end of the war from the Three-Power basis to the old plans for Anglo-American domination and anti-Soviet manoeuvring? The evidence tends to indicate that the decisive shift came from the atom bomb, and the illusions

of grandeur to which the new weapon gave rise in the heads of the Anglo-American strategists and reactionary statesmen that the monopolist possession of this weapon changed the entire balance of world forces and made possible the renewal of the plans for Anglo-American world domination against the Soviet Union and the rising democratic forces. As Churchill declared in his report to the House of Commons on August 16—

The decision to use the atomic bomb was taken by President Truman and myself at Potsdam . . . from that moment our outlook on the future was transformed.

The decision to maintain monopolist possession of the atom bomb broke the basis of strategic collaboration and confidence, and was accompanied by the launching of a wholesale anti-Soviet propaganda offensive. As the Observer declared on August 12, 1945—

The declaration that Britain and the United States will not reveal the secret of the atom bomb until means have been found to control the bomb is reassuring. But it means a great change in world-power relations . . . It binds Britain and America together as never before . . . It shifts the balance of power among the Big Three . . . The possession of the monopoly of the atom bomb makes American-British power preponderance for the time being a fact.

Such was the heady wine of strategic illusion which led to the renewal of the dreams of Anglo-American world domination and found reflection in the present worsening of the international situation. It was not until the anti-Soviet propaganda campaign from the West, launched since the summer of 1945, had reached extreme heights, that the Soviet Union abandoned its policy of loyal silence in public on the actions of its Western allies and began to reply in public on behalf of the democratic anti-fascist forces of the world.

At this point it is worth recalling the final speeches which Goebbels was making on behalf of Nazism only a year ago, on the eve of the Nazi collapse. Goebbels described how Europe and Germany would be divided between the Anglo-American and Soviet forces. He painted a picture of how Eastern Europe would be organised by the Soviet Union behind an "iron curtain" (it is worth recalling that that phrase, the "iron curtain," was first coined by Goebbels, which is so eagerly repeated today by all the Western reactionary publicists, including Churchill). He prophesied how this would lead to inevitable future conflict between the Anglo-American Powers and the Soviet Union in World War III. On this basis he foresaw the return of Nazism. This indication of Nazi post-war strategy is all-important to bear in mind today, if we are to understand the true significance of the reactionary campaign which is being conducted with such fidelity along the lines laid down by Nazi

strategy in so many countries today. This tendency already began to reveal itself in the shady episodes which made such a ragged and even disparate ending of the war in Europe, with the wholesale surrender of German armies without a struggle in the West alongside desperate fighting in the East, the affair of the Doenitz Government, the prolonged recognition of German Wehrmacht formations in defiance of Potsdam, etc.

It is against this background that we need to see the significance of Churchill's speech at Fulton and his continuing campaign. The fallen crime-soaked mantle of the Anti-Comintern Pact is picked up to be worn on new shoulders. The cracked clarion-call of the "crusade of Christian civilisation" against the "menace" of Communism and Soviet "expansion" is proclaimed from new lips. The time-worn spectre of Hitler and Ribbentrop and Goebbels, which had already done duty for so many years to cover every rascally and criminal project of world aggression, walks again; and Goebbels' sneering ghost may rub his hands over his new convert.

It is not difficult to understand the fury behind this last desperate crusade of the beaten Churchill, whose original attempts to crush in blood the infant Soviet Republic ended in a costly and inglorious fiasco, and whose pre-war eulogies of Japanese expansion, of Mussolini, of Hitler and of Franco helped to pave the way for the war. The post-war world has not turned out as he intended. The Soviet Union is not prostrate and submissive, begging for favours from the Anglo-American lords of the earth, but, despite all the terrible losses, striding forward along the path of reconstruction, and more bold and strong and confident in policy than ever, while it is British and American capitalism that are more and more clearly faced with gigantic economic problems. Europe has not obeyed the dictation of Anglo-American finance; even France, thanks to Communism, is eluding the snare of the Western bloc. The reactionary proteges are gone or going; Mikhailovich, Badoglio, Darlan, Peter, Victor Emanuel, Leopold—where are they now? Churchill himself has been rejected by the British people; and, alone of the three war leaders, Stalin continued stronger than ever in the confidence of a united people. So the defeated gambler calls for the last stand—the military coalition of Anglo-American reaction (Europe is already despairing of as lost) against the world: 200 millions against 1,800 millions, with the one hope the devil's lure of the atom bomb.

The choice before the British people is plain. It is not surprising that Churchill and Tory reaction should embark upon this reckless defeatist adventurist course; their bolt is shot; their star is setting.

But it is a matter for serious concern that a Labor Foreign Secretary should by his own actions and speeches have helped to pave the way for Churchill's speech, and, while formally dissociating himself from the responsibility for the speech, should do nothing to repudiate the policy set forward in the speech and blazoned to the world (especially to German Nazism, where the effect of the repeated B.B.C. broadcasts of the speech to Germany is stated to have been electric) with all the devices of British official publicity, and should in his own concrete policy so closely approximate to many of the main lines of Churchill. This is a state of affairs which needs to be put right; for the whole future of the British people and of the British labor movement is involved in this basic issue of foreign policy. We welcome the action of the 105 Labor M.P.s. who have shown their understanding of the importance of this issue and the necessity for a public and practical repudiation of Churchill's policy and turn to democratic foreign policy.

The choice before the British people is clear. Either forward with the advance of the progressive peoples of the world, with the Soviet Union, the new democracies in Europe, the colonial peoples, world trade unionism and working-class unity. Or back to enslavement to American finance-capital and its British reactionary partners. The voice of Churchill is the voice of the most reactionary sections of Anglo-American finance, which fear the advance of the peoples and socialism over the world. His crusade is not merely directed against Communism and the Soviet Union, any more than was the crusade of Hitler, which used the same public device. It is directed not least against the advance of the labor movement and socialism in Britain. His policy is not merely anti-Soviet. It is anti-British. His policy would make Britain the pawn of the American millionaires, their strategic outpost against a socialist world, the cockpit and the victim of the planned third world war.

In vain Churchill speaks of "fifth columns," and seeks to conceal the fact that the Fifth Column is the classic engine of fascism. The British people want no Wall Street Fifth Column here. Their patriotism rises against enslavement to the American billionnaires for the benefit of the reactionary money-bags, here. They seek the path of friendship and firm unity with the Soviet Union and all the progressive peoples of the world, to maintain peace, while they advance on the long overdue tasks of social change in Britain. That is the path which will defeat the reactionary plans for a third world war. And the first indispensable step along this path is the change-over to a democratic foreign policy and the establishment of working class unity in Britain.

## THE VATICAN'S WAR ON PEACE

V. J. JEROME

(From "Political Affairs," April, 1946)

THE appointment of the 32 new cardinals and all the pomp and circumstance surrounding it need to be evaluated in relation to the closely connected, concerted drive of American and British imperialism to undermine the basis of the peace and to effect a complete break in the victory of the coalition of the Soviet Union, the United States and Britain. The highly dramatised action of the Consistory must be seen in full context with this drive—whether expressed in the atomic-terror diplomacy; in the conspiratorial manoeuvres within the UNO; in the speeches of a Vandenberg, a Byrnes, or of visiting "vacationists" with a purpose; or in the feverish grooming of Iran as a new "little Finland."

Particularly, one must view the appointment of the new cardinals against the political background afforded by the Pope's Christmas Eve radio speech and his address of February 25 before the College of Cardinals and the diplomatic corps.

The speeches were both calls for mobilisation against the Soviet Union—first by innuendo, then blatantly. The Pope has signalled to the world that the Church Spiritual is not only the Church Militant, but also the Church Militarist.

It was in preparation for the task of mobilising a new "Holy Alliance" that the Pope put repeated stress on the "universality of the Church," on the "supra-national" character of the Church. This alliance is directed at the Soviet Union, at the peoples' democracies that have arisen in Europe out of the struggles against fascism, and at every advancing coalition of labor-democratic forces anywhere in the capitalist world.

We should, however, be deceived if we assessed the strength of the Vatican by its bluster. The drum-roll of the Romish reveille betrays desperation.

The Catholic Church is in crisis. This crisis of today is deeper than any other in its long history. The ravaging schisms of the past—even the Protestant Reformation—left the Church, though truncated, with a basis for further consolidation and a prospect for existence in "time without end." Today, such a basis is greatly undermined and such a prospect narrowed by the weakened state in which world capitalism as a whole came out of the war and by the general crisis of its system, which has been chronic since the First World War.

The waning influence of the Catholic Church in many European countries is paralleled by the rise of the democratic forces who, in their struggle against fascism, saw the collaboratorist role of many Church leaders and especially the pro-fascist policies of the Vatican during and preceding the war.

The Church of Rome was greatly reduced in power during the Anti-Axis War, sustaining terrific losses on the European continent. Pius XI's plan for a Catholic union extending from the Adriatic to the Baltic is utterly shattered. Although still fighting to regain power, the Vatican has forfeited its most prized sphere of influence in Eastern Europe—Poland; it has lost its dominion over the millions of Catholics in Lithuania, Yugoslavia, Ruthenia, and Bessarabia. It has lost much of its power in Hungary; and the grand Papal plan nurtured during the war (with British support) is now blasted—the plan for a restored Austro-Hungarian monarchy, under Hapsburg rule, linked with Italy and Poland in an anti-Soviet combination.

In France, despite the strategic advantage it had in the presidency of General de Gaulle, and notwithstanding the rise of the Christian "Socialist" Mouvement Republicain Populaire (M.R.P.), the Vatican's position is critical. This is attested by the wide opposition to Catholic encroachment upon the French educational system, begun under the Vichy regime, and, most manifestly, by the anti-Franco stand of popular and official France.

In Spain, the existence of the fascist regime is precarious, and with it that of the Church which is wedded to it. We must face the likelihood that the British Social-imperialist government, together with American imperialism, will in Spain, as in Italy, Bavaria, and elsewhere, endeavour to protect the ideology and power of clerical fascism, even after the regime of fascism is ended. It is far from likely, however, that the Spanish people of '36-'39, once liberated from the Franco who was brought to power on foreign fascist bayonets, will remain subservient to his "spiritual" aides.

Alarmed at its diminishing base, the Vatican is seizing on the post-war situation in the hope of re-establishing its power. The Church Hierarchy knows well how to exploit for reactionary ends the post-war moods of disillusionment, distress and despair.

In doing so, it receives every support from monopoly capital, which, weakened on a world scale by the war, is more desperately than ever in need of the aid of the Vatican. With Social-Democracy, its main social buttress, now greatly diminished in strength as compared with the period following World War I, imperialism leans increasingly upon the Vatican. And more and more the Catholic Church functions as an open and direct political force. Today the Vatican shares with Social-Democracy the task of ideological mobilizer of the masses on the side of imperialism and its anti-Soviet crusade.

What franker admission of this Papal "Socialist" united front could one demand than the following statement in the Social-Democratic New Leader (March 2, 1946) by its editor, William E. Bohn:

"Whereas I found the address of Stalin (to his constituents) alien and inhuman, I found that of the Pope (to the new College of Cardinals) humane and decent and close to the things which lie in the minds of Protestants and rationalists and other varieties of non-Catholic people of good will we have in this country.

And, continues this voice of Social-Democracy, "we find the Catholic Church, as officially represented by a solemn pronouncement of the Pope, lined up on our side!"

The Vatican is further aided by the dominant policy of the A.M.G., whose favorable disposition to the anti-democratic elements in the Allied zones of occupation is notorious.

Now that Truman has appointed Hoover to "survey Europe's hunger," we shall witness the second command performance of this Santa Claus of reaction. The role the G.O.P. chieftain played with such notorious success on the stage in Europe in the political crisis following World War I is not forgotten.

In Italy, France, Belgium, Austria, Bavaria, and in other countries on the continent, the Vatican has set up or strengthened its political parties. These are catch-all parties both for the most backward social strata and for the conscious reactionaries who cannot now band together in open fascist or pro-fascist formations. Sensitive to the popular hatred of fascism, the Hierarchy seeks to exploit the fact that some Churchmen (mostly lower priests close to their communities) served in the Underground.

Today, the broad masses of the peoples are moving forward in Europe, in the colonial and semi-colonial world; and in the United States, along with the rising struggles of labor, the people are evidencing (even though inadequately) their desire for peace and democracy. But the Vatican is striving to regain its position and to consolidate a world-wide imperialist-clerical alliance of reaction. Herein lies the political essence of the recent large scale installation of new cardinals.

The 1946 additions to the College of Cardinals represent the largest single appointment of Princes of the Church in its long history. Thirty-two prelates were elevated to the College from nineteen countries and all the five continents.

For the first time in six hundred years the Italian cardinals become a minority, now constituting twenty-seven out of the almost completed traditional maximum of seventy (established by Sixtus V. toward the end of the sixteenth century). And for the first time the United States component, including the previously appointed cardinal, Dennis

J. Dougherty, Archbishop of Philadelphia, was raised to a total of five.

The national allocation of the new College of Cardinals is as follows:

	Newly Appointed	Previously Appointed
Argentina . . . . .	1	1
Armenia . . . . .	1	
Australia . . . . .	1	
Austria . . . . .	1	1
Belgium . . . . .	1	1
Brazil . . . . .	2	
Canada . . . . .	1	1
Chile . . . . .	1	
China . . . . .	1	
Cuba . . . . .	1	
England . . . . .	1	
France . . . . .	3	4
Germany . . . . .	3	1
Hungary . . . . .	1	
Italy . . . . .	4	23
Netherlands . . . . .	1	
Peru . . . . .	1	1
Poland . . . . .	1	1
Portugal . . . . .	1	1
Portuguese Mozambique . . . . .	1	
Spain . . . . .	2	1
Syria . . . . .	1	1
U.S.A. . . . .	4	1
	32	37

TOTAL 69.

An analysis of the new appointments, at the outset, shows the Vatican to be stretching out its tentacles to every continent, closing in especially upon France, Spain, Germany, Poland and, with unprecedented force, upon the Western Hemisphere.

A closer view will reveal a direct correlation between the appointments and the main political task that the Vatican has set itself in the respective regions.

Thus, if France has the second largest number of Cardinals, this quota cannot be separated from the fact that in that country the Vatican's shares, so to speak, have fallen much below par. Vastly discredited among the masses for the backing it gave to Vichy and for its more than intimate relationship with Spanish fascism, the Vatican is naturally anxious to mend its French fences. The election outcome which gave the Communists the highest popular vote of any party threw the Catholic hierarchy into consternation. It would, however, be a mistake to underestimate the power of the Catholic Church in France. The fact that the clerical M.R.P., holding a close third place, has leaped forward to the position of a major party since its recent formation shows the Vatican's strength in postwar France to be far from insignificant. The 75 per cent increase in French cardinals is clearly designed to bolster the Vatican's political party, to influence French foreign policy, holding back the anti-Franco tide and sharpening French imperialist antagonism to the Soviet Union.

The choice for England, Archbishop Bernard Griffin of Westminster, fits in well with the anti-Soviet role which is the distinguishing feature of British imperialism's Labor Government. This worthy earned his promotion by a wartime cam-



paign of calumny against Britain's Soviet ally waged traitorously even during the most trying stage of the struggle for the national life of his own country. Equally notorious is his support of General Anders' band of traitors to the Polish people.

The assignment of three additional cardinal to Germany is clearly a move to reinforce the pro-fascist Catholic groups in their attempt to hold together and reorganise the remnants of defeated Nazism on a new demagogic basis. In this, the Vatican is seeking to repeat, under new conditions, the role it played after the First World War, when Pope Benedict XV advanced his notorious peace terms designed to save reactionary Prussianism from destruction. The Vatican sought then to preserve a Germany that would be the linchpin to hold together a reactionary Europe. It sought to build up a postwar Germany that would carry through—as it did carry through—an assault upon the Soviet Union. That peace offensive, in which Apostolic Nuncio Pacelli—now Pope Pius XII—was greatly instrumental, brought State Secretary Lansing to write to President Wilson of the Vica of Christ that he "has become the agent of Germany." When, six months after Hitler's accession to power, the Vatican concluded its concordat with Nazism, the Papal Chamberlain von Papen exulted: "The Third Reich is the first power in the world not only to recognize but to translate into practice the high principles of the Papacy." In adherence to these high principles, the prelates of the Church in Germany, despite Catholic persecution under Hitler, declared in their pastoral letter of 1939:

"In this decisive hour we admonish our Catholic soldiers to do their duty in obedience to the Fuehrer and to be ready to sacrifice their whole individuality. We appeal to the Faithful to join in ardent prayers that Divine Providence may lead this war to blessed success."<sup>(1)</sup>

The new German cardinals may be counted on to work for the prevention of Germany's democratic reorientation. Cardinal Von Galen devoted his Rome sermon of February 18 to what was in essence a denial of the basis for carrying through the Yalta and Potsdam agreements, which call for the extirpation of Nazism and the economic and military disarmament of Germany. His white-washing plea, "equal wrongs have been done to the Germans themselves," voiced similarly on repeated occasions by his fellow-cardinal, Konrad von Preysing, is an absolution given to Germany for her war guilt. Well, indeed, can the cleric appointment of these two cardinals, comment on be worthy princes of the Church and both have a great role to play in the reconstitution of Germany."

The appointment of Archbishop Sapieha of Cracow as the second cardinal for Poland is

(1) See Heinz Pol, "Pius XII and World War II," *The Protestant*, May 1943.

doubtless a face-saving move designed to neutralise the discredit brought upon the Catholic Church by Cardinal Hlond's desertion of the Polish people in their heroic struggle against the German invaders. Sapieha remained in Poland during the occupation. But his dependability, from the Vatican's standpoint, is attested by the revelation in *Izvestia* of January 27, 1946, that he "stands behind clerical circles defending Polish reaction and opposing the demoralization of Poland."

Troops of the fascist Polish General Anders, which are kept in Rome by British Government subsidy, accorded due homage to their new cardinal on the occasion of his elevation, although, as a dispatch to the *Tablet* reported, "he was greeted with affectionate but subdued salutes by Polish soldiers, who had evidently been warned not to make his return to Poland more difficult by a too-open display of fidelity."

Significant is the assignment of a cardinal to Armenia. The luxury of having a Prince of the Church is hardly warranted by the negligible number of Armenian Catholics, of whom there are scarcely any in Soviet Armenia and only a scattering in the Levant and Turkey. The appointment reveals itself as a move directed at Soviet Armenia. Cardinal Agagianian's assignment, one can well assume, includes the job of aiding to thwart Soviet Armenia's claim for the restoration of her former territories, now held by Turkey. Turkish anti-Sovietism, spurred on by British imperialism, will thus receive impetus to greater insolence. Implicit in the appointment, too, is a possible Anglo-Vatican attempt to foment an Armenian separatist movement to set up a buffer State in the Armenian provinces now under Turkish rule. Such a "State" would be useful only as a counterweight to Soviet Armenia and as a centre of agitation for Soviet Armenian secession from the U.S.S.R.

In view of the existing cardinalate in Syria, the Armenian assignment points, further, to the Vatican's attempt to strengthen its base in the Middle East by consolidating all the Catholic congregations in that region under a tighter reactionary sway. This would further its anti-Soviet and pro-imperialist operations. In addition, the calculation no doubt includes the hope of playing its well-tried game of manoeuvre and intrigue in the growing Anglo-American rivalry for oil resources, military bases, and trading advantages in that highly strategic zone.

The pattern becomes clearer when we note the Vatican's current concentration on the sphere of the Oriental Church. Revealing is the Rome despatch of February 22 to the *New York Times* by Herbert Matthews, which reported:

"In making the assignments of Congregations, Pope Pius XII gave one of the most striking evidences that this Consistory is among other things a strengthening of the Catholic Church against Communism, for eight of the

twenty-eight Cardinals present were assigned to the Congregation for the Oriental Church. This congregation has exclusive ecclesiastical powers in the whole Middle East, the southern part of the Balkans, Egypt and Ethiopia.

"There are only sixteen Cardinals of previous creation in the Oriental Congregation which means that the Pontiff has enlarged it by 50 per cent."

The naming of Cardinal Spellman as a member of the Vatican Congregation of the Oriental Church is clearly not without significance for U.S. aspirations in the Middle East.

## RUSSIA'S FINANCIAL STRUCTURE

NORMAN FREEHILL

RUSSIA alone of the Great Nations is giving adequate attention to post-war reconstruction. More, to post-war reconstruction it is adding industrial expansion that will lift it to the foremost place among the nations of the world.

Russia is planning and doing even while World Reaction strives to rally forces for its destruction. The murder furnaces are hardly cold; the mass graves are still giving up their dead; millions still mourn for the millions murdered, masses of rubble mark what once were cities and towns, but the Fascists in every land are clamoring for another war—war against Russia.

In this unfavorable atmosphere, its efforts hampered by the necessity of maintaining expenditure on defence, Russia goes on with its plans to lift the living and cultural standard of its people to the highest position in the world. New Five Year Plans are being formulated, plans of industrialisation on a scale to make the world gasp. These plans involve finance: finance of a volente unknown to Governments of capitalist countries.

What is the financial machinery which will handle these new Plans? It is the same financial system which handled the problem of Russia's rise from a backward, agrarian economy at the time of the November Revolution to an industrial nation that could face and smash Germany, mightiest military power in history.

"Financial questions constitute one of the most important parts of the general problem of wartime economics, and, as such, have become the subject of intensive attention and study." Professor M. I. Bogolepov opens his latest work. The Soviet Financial System, with that statement. Bogolepov, one of Russia's older economists, is Director of the Financial Division of the State Planning Commission of the U.S.S.R. Today he would add: "And equally important in the post-war problems."

Obviously the Russian financial system differs from the system which operates in all other countries. Equally evident is its superiority in opera-

The "universality of the Church," requiring for its expansionist program new claims to the allegiance of Africa and Asia, has brought ecclesiastical princes to Portuguese Mozambique and China. As regards the former appointment, we have both a bow to the colonial world (although, significantly, a non-Negro was selected) and a helpful tribute to Portuguese fascism. With the appointment of Chinese Bishop Tien, the Vatican seeks to round out its embrace of the globe, hoping with its spiritual arm to help strangle the people's anti-fascist and anti-imperialist forces on the Asiatic continent.

(To be continued)

That superiority is derived from the economic system which makes the financial system possible.

The latter did not come ready made, but was built up through the early years of struggle, famine, fighting, sabotage, foreign intervention. As late as 1925, small-scale private enterprise (44.7 per cent.) and capitalist remnants (6.5 per cent.) accounted for 51.2 per cent. of Russia's productive machinery. Progress from 1925, however, was rapid.

Soviet finance runs smoothly and to plan because, in a Socialist State, there can be no conflict between the component parts of the national productive structure. And, in a Socialist State, with production organised for use and not for profit, economic crises do not bring industry periodically to tragic idleness.

The Soviet financial system comprises six sections:

Primarily there is the State budget. Secondly, short-term credit controlled by the State Bank.

Thirdly, financing of the various branches of the national economy.

Fourthly, the finances of the Soviet Insurance Fund. (The operation of the fund is in the hands of the trade unions.)

Fifth section consists of the various forms of State-controlled insurance.

Sixth, the system includes the finances of the collective farms and co-operative societies.

The financial system is under the direction of the Council of People's Ministers of the U.S.S.R. The Ministry has charge of the Union budget which, each year, has to be approved by the Supreme Soviet. Special bodies supervise the distribution and check the expenditure. The Chairman of the State Bank of the U.S.S.R. is a member of the Council and has the same status as the Minister of Finance.

The bulk of Budget revenue is derived from the Turnover Tax—which absorbs most of the capital

July, 1946

accumulation of the Union's industrial establishments. The Turnover Tax follows the planned prices. "For example, if it is planned to market a given commodity at 150 roubles per unit, its production cost being 100 roubles, Turnover Tax may be fixed at 30 per cent. (45 roubles) leaving 5 roubles for profit."

But before continuing consideration of revenue sources, it will be as well to examine the price system.

Cost price covers production marketing and depreciation. Wholesale price, which is fixed by the Government, consists in general, of cost price, Turnover Tax and profit. (There are exceptions. In some cases profit does not figure in wholesale price; in others, only production cost. In some instances, wholesale price is even less than production cost, the deficiency being made good by the State.)

Prices of goods and services play an important part in the Soviet financial system. Price policy aims at a favorable relation between industry and agriculture; between the allied classes, the workers and collective farmers. It aims at raising living standards. By providing production equipment at low prices it is possible to keep prices of raw materials—iron, steel, coal—and of capital goods, low, to the benefit of industry and the farms. If prices of iron, steel, coal are high the higher price will be reflected in the prices of all goods in which they are used.

Systematic reduction of production costs is a duty imposed on all production units. It is obvious that, in an economy where production, in the aggregate, is enormous, even a small reduction in costs represents hundreds of millions of roubles.

Reduction of production costs allows of reduction of prices. Reduction of prices provides funds which make possible further reductions in the same or other fields. It is a progressive, continuous process. Factory managers and workers are encouraged to decrease costs by increasing production and efficiency.

Of profit, a specified proportion goes to the Budget, the balance to the establishment responsible. The State's share of profits amounts to a substantial sum. Every establishment has the right to make a profit which it can distribute in accordance with certain rules—to its own requirements, to workers' welfare, to bonuses for workers.

Having examined the price structure, we can now revert to consideration of revenue sources.

The Turnover Tax is paid only once. Trading establishments do not pay it. It varies widely. If economic policy makes low price advisable or necessary the tax is reduced. By means of the Turnover Tax the Government regulates profits. Without it, goods such as alcohol and tobacco, marketed at high retail prices, would yield high profits and lead to unnecessary accumulation of idle funds.

Trading profit represents the difference between wholesale and retail price, the latter, like the former, being fixed by the Government. Any trading surplus in excess of the expenditure fixed by the plan goes into the Budget.

Income tax on workers provides a very small part—less than 2 per cent.—of total revenue.

Collective farms are taxed on their total income. (They do not pay Turnover Tax.) Farmers are taxed on their individual incomes. This second tax is because farmers draw income from outside sources as well as from the collective. Although tax total from collectives is relatively small, expansion from 223,000,000 roubles in 1932 to 800,000,000 in 1940 (latest available figure) indicates the rising prosperity of the peasants. Nor should it be forgotten that the State provides the collective farms with machinery at production cost, or less; supplies them with cheap credits whereby to buy expensive equipment; is the chief purchaser of their products.

Substantial tax reductions are allowed collective farms which pioneer new areas. Those in the far-northern areas are completely exempt. Reduction ranging to complete exemption is allowed farms damaged by flood or fire.

City populations receive income chiefly as wages. Wages are based on the Socialist principle: "From each according to his ability; to each according to his work." Soviet workers alone of all the workers of the world, have "freedom from want," in that they buy cheaply, are covered as to pleasure, medicine, health, old age, and care of their children and families.

The average wage in industry is based on average productivity in the industry. Individual workers add to their wages from improvement in quality or increased output. Because of this variation in earnings, income tax is progressive.

Tax exemptions are: Interest on State Loans (in Russia State Loans—Government Bonds—are held by workers, peasants)—on savings bank deposits, pensions, soldier's pay. Heroes of the Soviet Union and Heroes of Socialist Labor, and Stalin Prize winners are exempt. Persons with three or more dependents get a 30 per cent. reduction.

It is impossible to make a wage and taxation comparison which is of value because of the different significance of wages in Russia, where, as stated in the preceding paragraphs, monetary remuneration is only one part of the worker's return.

Transport services pay a special tax; the tax on non-commodity operations. The principle is the same as the Turnover Tax.

Commodities made by the co-operatives and sold within the co-operative system are not taxed. But profits of co-operatives are subject to income tax.

Loans are a useful budget item. Although loans are raised nominally to cover budgetary deficits, it is obvious that there is no true deficit,

July, 1946

because the financial authorities base the budget on the national economic development plan which completely controls the economic and financial resources of the Union. (Actually a true deficit is possible in circumstances such as crop failure or catastrophe of some kind.)

Then why loans? The explanation lies in the fact that savings banks (deposits, R.7,000,000,000 in 1940, had risen to R.10,000,000,000 by April, 1946), insurance institutions and co-operative societies have surplus funds. These resources, instead of lying idle, are absorbed by loans and put to work. But, as well as being a useful, additional financial stream, loans are viewed as an encouragement to the people to save; as a medium through which they can express their faith in their Socialist State.

As Bogolepov says: "The success of State loans is primarily due to the general recognition by the population that the U.S.S.R., as laid down by its Constitution, is a State of workers and peasants." And the "success" and the "recognition" declare themselves thunderously in figures: the May, 1946, loan of R.20,000,000,000 was closed in eight days, over-subscribed by R.1,800,000,000. Previously more than R.126,000,000,000 had been raised by way of loans, including R.66,000,000,000 raised in war loans in 1942-44.

Soviet loans have a currency of 20 years. They are interest-bearing (4 per cent. usually), and non-interest lottery loans with a large number of prizes.

Today income tax and mass loans are somewhat more important than in the past. This is understandable with so much of the industrial fabric shattered by the Nazis.

Here is a statement of revenue (1940 figures). The table shows the division of budgetary revenue among the U.S.S.R. and Republic budgets, which latter also include local budgets.

	Union Budget	Republic Budgets	Combined
	In Millions of Roubles		
Turnover Tax	95,600	10,300	105,900
From Profits	12,800	8,900	21,700
Machine and Tractor Stations	1,000	1,000	2,000
Income Taxes	1,900	7,500	9,400
Local Taxes	—	1,900	1,900
State Loans	6,200	5,300	11,500
Income Tax on Co-operatives	200	3,000	3,200
Social Insurance Funds	6,600	2,000	8,600
Customs	2,900	—	2,900
Other Revenue	8,700	4,400	13,100
	135,900	44,300	180,200

So much for income. Now for expenditure (1940 figures):—

	Union Budget	Republic Budgets	Combined
	In Millions of Roubles		
National Economy and Welfare and Cultural	49,900	8,400	58,300
Cultural	12,900	28,900	41,800
Defence	56,800	—	56,800
Debt Repayment	2,800	—	2,800
Other	9,800	5,700	15,500
	132,200	43,000	175,200

Expenditure—the allocation and distribution of the national income—is covered by the economic plan. Disbursement is chiefly on heavy industry, transport, tractor stations, defence, and welfare and cultural services.

Most of the means of production belong to the State, which carries on large-scale economic operations which form the basis of the Union's economic life. The collectives and co-operatives are next in importance.

Defence still takes a huge sum. "Every time a Russian wants to buy a bookcase we remind him to buy a gun!"

It is a basic policy of the Soviet Union to develop economically and culturally the areas occupied by the 102 nationalities which comprise the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics. Much in this direction was done during the war, intense industrialisation being brought to areas East and South-east of the Urals, either by transference or by completely new construction. Nor was cultural development of the backward areas neglected, even through the darkest days, when the blood-drunken Nazi hordes were sweeping to the doors of Moscow and to the foothills of the Caucasus.

Pursuance of both policies—cultural and industrial—was largely responsible for the steadfast, determined rear which was one of the decisive factors in ensuring victory over the Nazi armies.

The war was a test for the Soviet financial system. Under almost incredibly difficult conditions it proved flexible. The fact that, in peace, income taxation had been light, made it possible to enter this field with war and special taxes, although the greatest volume of revenue came from cutting economic development and outlay on cultural and welfare plans, and from loans, voluntary contributions and gifts.

Peace presents the financial authorities with enormous problems. The devastated areas have to be rebuilt. Construction of homes, hospitals, theatres, institutions, farms must be financed. The problems are faced with confidence.

Analysis of the Soviet financial system discloses that production provides the basis of Russia's finances. The huge expansion now begun will result in a vast increase in the national income, thereby making easier the process of financing the industrialisation. Thus the reconstruction and expansion of the Soviet Union will be based on, and spring out of, the process of reconstruction and expansion itself.

Out of the description of Russia's financial structure emerges a picture; a picture not of dry figures but of the welfare of human beings—children, women, men, the sick and the striving. Astronomical sums translate into industries and undertakings, gigantic by any measure, all aiming at making life easier and happier for the Russian

people. In the plans of new railways, mines, giant factories, huge dams, are mirrored the new homes, creches, kindergartens, schools, hospitals, health resorts, sanatoria, and theatres that they will give to the people.

Only in a Socialist economy can production and finance translate into terms of human welfare.

## NATIONALISATION OF THE COAL INDUSTRY

ARTHUR L. HORNER.

(From "Labour Monthly," February, 1946.)

THE Coal Industry Nationalisation Bill has now been presented to Parliament. It will come up for second reading and discussion in the House of Commons within a few weeks, when the views of the various parties will be freely expressed. The attitude of the Tory Party, which at first officially pretended to accept the inevitability of the nationalisation of this industry, is passing through a sharp change. It is becoming increasingly clear, especially from the Kemsley Press, which has already commenced to use phraseology expressive of their frustration, that they intend to make the passage of the Bill as difficult as possible. Every endeavour will be made by them to place responsibility for the fall in the output of coal during 1945 upon the present Government and to conceal from their readers that the fall would undoubtedly have been very much greater had the Tory Government been returned to power.

Tired workmen and exhausted pits have achieved remarkable results during the fourth quarter of 1945: the workmen, encouraged by the National Union of Mineworkers and by their faith in the Labor Government, have drawn upon the maximum of their strength in order to give the best results possible. It should not be forgotten that the main cause for the reduced output capacity of the British mining industry is the reduction in the number of persons employed and their exhaustion due to age and war weariness, as well as the exhaustion of a considerable number of the pits. These facts, superimposed upon the neglect, inefficiency and worse which prevailed under private ownership, must bear the responsibility for the present unsatisfactory state of affairs.

In the coming discussions, it is imperative that all progressive elements in our society shall give general support to this vital legislation for the following reasons.

The coalmining industry is the basic industry of the country. The production of Britain's coal cannot be permitted to be the private affair of those engaged in the industry. It is of too great a significance for the whole population, whose future means of subsistence is dependent upon it. Without adequate coal supplies, Britain cannot again become a great industrial country, with a capacity to export manufactured goods on the scale required to enable the purchase of essential goods from abroad. This question enters into every phase of

the people's lives, housing, employment, demobilisation, social security, etc. A matter of such vital and general importance should, therefore, have become long ere now the responsibility of Government charged with safeguarding the wellbeing of the people as a whole.

To realise this aim it is necessary to secure possession of the industry, either through purchase or confiscation. The mandate sought by the Labor Party was to compensate, and I see no point in holding up or delaying the change-over from private to State ownership because of discussions around the question of the principle of compensation. It is necessary, however, to utter a word of warning. Two conditions must be fulfilled in determining the amount of compensation: (1) There must be the strictest application of the principle of "reasonable net maintainable revenue" as laid down by the Trades Union Congress at Blackpool in 1945, and (2) the capitalisation of the new authority should be computed quite apart from what has been paid in compensation. The Board's capital should be fixed at a figure which the industry, having in mind the heavy capital expenditure which will be needed to place the industry on its feet. The National Coal Board cannot be expected to bear the full burden of the compensation to be paid if over-capitalisation is to be avoided.

The single possession of the coal mines of Britain is the only way through which this natural resource can be efficiently exploited. Mr. Robert Foot, in his so-called plan, admitted (and found, in general, colliery owners' support for his admission) that the future of the mining industry, even under private ownership, was dependent upon its ability to treat the industry as a national unit. The National Union of Mineworkers accepted this point of view, but disputed the ability of the various district colliery owners to cancel out the sharp differences between them arising from their contradictory economic interests, which were bound to make the unification desired by Mr. Foot unrealistic. This unification of the industry can alone make possible the technical reorganisation on a sound basis. Under a system of national unification, the coal resources of the country can be viewed as a whole and their exploitation be determined in a scientific manner. It will now become possible to

utilise the most modern methods of production, so that the unnecessary utilisation of human labor shall cease. Only by this means will it be possible to make coalmining a tolerable industry in which to work and one that will attract its manpower by voluntary means in the open labor market.

The National Union of Mineworkers, however, expects more from the Coal Board which is to be set up than the technical reorganisation, which we consider to be essential. The Charter herein contained reveals that mineworkers anticipate progressive reforms in the existing working and living conditions as well.

### Charter

The Minister of Fuel and Power having raised with the National Executive Committee of the National Union of Mineworkers the question of the recruitment of manpower to the coalmining industry, and the Committee having undertaken to give it the most serious consideration, has now arrived at the following conclusions.

In the view of the National Executive Committee, the extent to which the following changes are introduced will determine the rate of entry of new recruits to the industry:—

(1) The modernisation of existing pits and the sinking of new ones as rapidly as possible whilst strictly observing as a minimum the standards laid down in the Reid Committee Report; the provision of adequate compensation for those who become redundant; and at the same time aiming at the general application of the day-wage system.

(2) The adequate and careful training of youth in the various phases of mining operations, and the establishment of a clearly defined scheme of promotion; the provision of further training and tuition required in cases where workers desire to enter for a colliery technician's career.

(3) The introduction of new safety laws to meet the conditions of modern mining and especially to suppress the development of industrial diseases.

(4) The payment of compensation rates to meet incapacity due to industrial injury or disease which shall guarantee the injured person from financial loss and the provision of an adequate income for the dependants of those killed as a result of injury or who die from an industrial disease.

(5) The average wage standards shall not be permitted to fall below those of any other British industry.

(6) The restoration of the 7-hour day for underground workers; the introduction of the 40-hour week for surface workers; and the establishment of the 5-day week without loss of pay.

(7) The continuation of the principle of the guaranteed weekly wage when the Essential Work Order is withdrawn.

(8) Payment to be made for two consecutive week's holiday and six statutory holiday days in each year.

(9) The provision of pensions for mineworkers who cease to be able to follow their employment after 55 years of age and the payment of a subsidiary pension from the industry in addition to pensions provided from other legal enactments.

(10) The building of new towns and villages of a high standard and situate at places calculated to enable miners to have increased opportunities for social facilities and to break down the segregation of mineworkers and their families from the rest of the community, accompanied by the provision of adequate transport services at reasonable rates.

(11) The complete reorganisation of health and welfare services so as to put a brake upon the wastage of manpower due to ill-health.

(12) Compulsory medical examination with training arrangements at full wages pending employment as a skilled workman in another industry if withdrawn from the coal-mining industry on medical grounds.

The National Union of Mineworkers, having in mind the manpower crisis which exists and recognising the complete dependence of our country's economy upon coal production, calls upon the Government through the Minister of Fuel and Power to give guarantees that effect will be given to the foregoing measures in accordance with a timetable and a progressive plan.

It is realised that whilst the manpower requirements of the industry will tend to fall as the industry is modernised, during the immediately ensuing years it will be necessary to depend upon the technical equipment now in existence. The only permanent source from which new manpower can be drawn and adequately trained is youths under 18 years of age. In the past the maintenance of the industry's manpower by the continuous supply of youths to compensate for wastage has come mainly from the ranks of mineworkers' sons. The mining community, however, is not willing to accept a special responsibility for the supply of new mining labor. Quite rightly, miners and their wives have come to regard their sons as citizens entitled to seek a livelihood more congenial, less dangerous and better paid employment in the same way as do the sons of other people. Young persons will only be attracted to the coalmining industry in sufficient numbers when it offers to them conditions of employment which compare favourably with those offered in other industries and a higher standard of living than has been the

July, 1946

lot of those who have toiled in the industry in the past.

It must, however, be appreciated by all concerned that the foregoing measures, even given most favourable conditions, will take time. The sinking of new mines is not a matter of months, but years. The amount of labor which can be employed in sinking a shaft is limited by the area of the shaft in which the men are called upon to work. It is true that new methods must be sought and probably will be discovered, for expediting the sinking of shafts. It is not anticipated, however, that these developments will produce any revolutionary change in the rate of sinking. Similarly, we are anxious that the Coal Board shall lay out the workings, the roadways, etc., of the future mine, according to a plan made beforehand and that the old hand-to-mouth methods of private enterprise will be abandoned.

In mines to be reorganised, the cost of which is to be met out of the £150,000,000 provided in the Bill, months, if not years, must elapse before the full benefits of new methods of work are experienced. A great deal will have to be done and will remain to be done after the first years of public ownership. That progress is possible on a gigantic scale is demonstrated not only by experiences in Holland, U.S.A., Poland, Germany and the U.S.S.R. before the war, but also in certain mines of this country. To achieve this advancement it will be necessary to institute a new appreciation of the possibilities latent in the situation. Old standards of judgment which have limited productive capacity and which have impeded the adoption of new methods must be set aside. The technique of coal-mining can no more afford to be static than the technique applied to the production of any other commodity.

The danger of the static mind applies not only to the actual technique of the industry but, in addition, to the relations between it and its manpower. The highest supervisory and technical grades must in future be regarded as employees of the industry. It is true that the functions and the role of various categories will differ and that remuneration will not be equal irrespective of responsibility, training and capacity. There will, however, be the possibility of introducing into the industry a team spirit which has never previously existed. In the past, held to be the representatives of the colliery companies, whose duty it was mainly to concern themselves with the application of measures calculated to reduce costs at the expense of the general body of workers. In future, all categories will be compelled to appreciate that the struggle must take the form of a joint struggle against Nature, to extract quantity of coal.

It is only to the extent that the people engaged in the industry, whoever they may be, are able to master the problem of production that it will become possible to raise and maintain the standard of life of all concerned at the level which men who

are performing such vital work deserve from their country.

I desire to stress that the so-called nationalisation of the mining industry must not be regarded as a legislative act which automatically will supply satisfaction to all the needs. It is rather the beginning of a process which will enable the progressive overcoming of all the disadvantages, human and technical, which have been attached to the mining industry up to the present time. It would be exceedingly dangerous if the idea were to become widespread that, having secured the state ownership of the mining industry, all needs will automatically be supplied. Producers as well as consumers of coal must now appreciate that it is not easy to eradicate the mental state of mind which has grown up in an industry in which the most savage industrial struggles have taken place over a number of years. The habit of mind of the workmen expressed in their subconscious opposition arising from their fear, especially towards new methods of work, will continue for a long time. Educational and propaganda means will have to be devised to remove these fears and we shall succeed because the industry in future must be in a position to give clear guarantees that progress in methods of work resulting in greater productivity shall not be permitted to result in hardship and destitution for thousands of workers, which was undoubtedly the case in the past.

State ownership of industry in class society is, however, not Socialism. The purchase of various industries will not terminate the kind of society in which we live. The system in which one class lives by the purchase and exploitation of the labor power of the other is not brought to an end.

State ownership under a democratic government is, however, a progressive and important stage in the march towards greater productive efficiency, made possible by the unification of industry nationally through single ownership. It will enable many measures to be undertaken in the national interest, and will bring benefits to the workers engaged which have not been previously considered possible or even desirable by those who were in a position to make decisions.

The framework of the machinery to be instituted in the mining industry in the new set-up has already been partially revealed in the "Bill for the Nationalisation of the Coal Industry," "Bill for the National Coal Board" composed of nine persons chosen for their capacity to manage the affairs of this great vital industry. Each is to be an expert in his particular field of activity, i.e., production, commerce, finance, science, health and welfare, labor relations, etc. At the same time they must be capable of operating collectively and of arriving at decisions on the various questions which arise from time to time. In short, they will function as an efficient working Board of Directors answerable to the Minister of Fuel and Power, and through him to Parliament.

July, 1946

The Mineworkers Union will not participate in a representative way in the decisions of the Board which will occupy the position of employer in relation to employees.

The union will still have to contend for improvements for its members which it holds to be justified, as would be the case under private ownership, although it expects much better reactions from the new organisation than it experienced from the old. The Board, functioning as an employer, may resist demands which involve fresh financial obligations. The union, therefore, must preserve its independence and remain quite free to organise or to withhold the sale of labor power, i.e., it must reserve to itself the right to strike. It is unlikely that the need will arise to the same extent as before—it is hoped not at all. I refer to this because it makes clear the fact that class relations will continue. The change from private to state ownership in class society is not fundamental: that is to say, it does not produce a change in the character of our existing society, which will remain capitalist society.

It is important to stress this, because we are not entitled to anticipate results from it which can only be realised through socialism. That there will be an improvement is beyond question. Moreover, the union members will apply themselves at every level to the task of assisting the work of the Board, through joint consultative organs which must be established for the purpose at the pits, in the districts and at the centre in London.

The union members who may be appointed to positions of responsibility in the new organisations will cease to have any further organisational associations with the union, for two reasons. This is

necessary in the first place because they cannot function as employer and employee, and secondly, the union cannot permit any persons other than its chosen representatives to act on their behalf, or even to appear to do so.

This does not mean, however, that such persons can be regarded as having "gone over to the other side." On the contrary, they are men who are expected to convey to and impress the workers' viewpoint upon the Board, and to permeate the whole organisation with a high appreciation of the workers' contribution and to cause their colleagues to place a high value in concrete terms upon it.

This most interesting and vital experiment in the field of public ownership, brought about by a Labor Government, with the overwhelming approval of the Miners' Union and the electorate generally, must be made a success. To fail would result in a coal shortage so serious as to wreck the reconstruction plans, and in such an event to bring down the Government. Even limited success could slow down the implementation of these plans, and cause discouragement in carrying the policy of public ownership into other industries whose efficiency expressed in increased productivity is so vital to a country called upon to export for imports to the extent Britain is today.

Thus while the nationalisation of a single industry, or even of more than one industry, is to be distinguished carefully from the fundamental change into a socialist society, it is nevertheless of very great importance. The nationalisation of the coal industry, with some aspects of which I have dealt in this article, is a democratic measure, absolutely necessary at the present time and a great step forward in the right direction.

## THE FASCIST MENTALITY IN AUSTRALIAN ART AND CRITICISM

"GOYA"

(Continued from last issue)

One of the minor attributes of Fascist thought is the idealization of rural life as compared with the life of the city. Rader remarks: "Fascist literature is full of manegrics to the spiritual character of rural life. The metropolis, in contrast, is represented as the den of materialism." This tendency, which might be considered a reversion to the heyday of Australian "squatterocracy," is evident in the belief held by J. S. MacDonnell that Arthur Streeton's paintings "point the way in which life should be lived in Australia, with the maximum of flocks and the minimum of factories. But we have to be like the rest of the world, feeling out of it if we cannot blow as many ~~net-to-work~~ whistles, punch as many bundy-clocks, and show as much smoke and squalor as places that cannot escape such things. . . . Let others if they are bent upon it, mass-produce themselves into robots; thinking and

looking like mechanical monkeys chained to organs whose tunes are furnished by rivetting machines."

The conception of the state as an organism or a group-mind is one of the central features of Fascist literature. It is to be found in its mature form in Baylebridge's National Notes: "The God that we, as a nation, shall have made ourselves, is perhaps the only one to which man has yet never offered serious worship and sacrifice." The Nazi ideal of complete and final national regeneration is paralleled when he says: "Every man then, thinking in a truly national character, will consider himself but as a means and instrument of national service."

One of the commonest confusions among fascist writers is the identification of the development of modern art with the growth of Communism on the one hand, and "Jewish exploitation"

on the other. Writing on "Culture and Commerce" in 1939, Norman Lindsay says, "To be sure the uprush of communistic principles among all peoples has had one extremely disastrous result, for to their claim to a share of the world's culture the lower orders have taken to practising art themselves; hence the peculiar uproar of disintegrated values labelled Modernism. Later and more discerning generations will undoubtedly define this movement under the heading 'The Wharf Lumpers in Art.' Wharf labourers have of course been blamed for many things, but only a Norman Lindsay would blame them for the art forms of e.g. Salvador Dali. Hitler of course felt very much as did Lindsay in the matter of modern art. He passed laws against it, called it Jewish, international, foreign, degenerate. He forced modern artists such as Klee, Kandinsky, Beckmann out of their art schools, and drove them from the country. Their works were removed from museum walls and hidden or sold abroad.

But Lindsay's statement is not an isolated case, anyone who takes the trouble to go through the material in art publications in Australia in the period between the wars will find ample evidence of the widespread nature of the "Bolshevik-Modernist" confusion. Before leaving the matter it is perhaps worth quoting E. Wake Cooke's contribution. "There is a curious parallelism between Bolshevism and the Modernity movements; Lenin promised Russia a heaven and gave it a hell, the Modernists are actuated by the same spirit." If Mr. Wake Cooke had been in a position to examine the facts he would have found the Modernist painters, at the time that he wrote his criticism, were far too absorbed in the investigation of their own private heavens and hells to worry about presenting sideral gifts to the Soviets.

Perhaps the most obvious, because the most terrible and irrational of its tenets, has been the Fascist persecution of the Jews. This trait developed much later in Australia than the other Fascist traits that we have noted. But the 1940 Exhibition of the Contemporary Art Society brought a virulent attack upon the "Jewish" contributors to that exhibition in the form of a letter from Sir Lionel Lindsay to the *Sydney Morning Herald*. Lindsay's book *Addled Art* confirms the anti-Semitic nature of his art-criticism. But as several million Jews have been done to death upon the altar of anti-Semitism since Lindsay wrote his notorious letter, he has considered it advisable to include a qualification, by which he hopes to attack "Jewish" painting and at the same time absolve himself from the charge of anti-Semitism. Lindsay patronizingly admits that there are some "good" Jews: Heine, Dostoev, Einstein, Monah and Phillips Fox. This is not a new qualification.

Sigmund Freud is numbered among the "bad" Jews, and this is accounted for largely because—quite literally—Lindsay does not like the look of his face. "Glance at Freud's face. The look of concentration in the eyes is confounded by a gen-

eral expression of sulky disquietude and their sadness tempered by a vague hostility. It is the face of a man soured and ill at ease with himself or the world." The "sourness," according to Lindsay, following his predilection for "racial" arguments, is due to one extreme of the Jewish character. If Lionel Lindsay had been a Jew living through the thirties in Vienna, he may have been able to find other reasons for the "sadness tempered with hostility." It is very doubtful whether an intelligent man could feel anything but sad and hostile at Goebbels' "description" of the Jew to the Nuremberg Party Conference, in September, 1937: "This is the world enemy, the destroyer of civilisation, the parasite among nations, the son of chaos, the incarnation of evil, the germ of decomposition, the plastic demon of the decay of humanity."

The general tenor of *Addled Art* is strongly anti-democratic. Lindsay has the same hatred of democracy as the leading fascist theorists, Gobineau and Chamberlain, and the fascist writer Alfred Rosenberg. He speaks of the "mob's invasion of art" and that art can only survive this invasion if bad art is discouraged. To Lindsay a democracy cannot produce great art. He objects to art being included in the school curriculum because art cannot be taught. By including art in the curriculum, "the democracies level and lower all culture."

The pre-fascist mentality of *Addled Art*, however, is not limited to its anti-Semitism and a hatred of democracy. There is the same emphasis upon a "natural elite" that provides the "leaders," to be found throughout Fascist writing: "Natural man, guided by a profound instinct, destroys the weak and malformed at birth. Mistakes of nature, he knows that if they were allowed to propagate they would menace the vitality and continuity of the tribe. The weak chicken is pecked to death." Like Hitler and Mussolini Lionel Lindsay is also a red-baiter: "The tactics of the international Communists would serve: (the 'bolshevik-modernist' confusion) corrupt, undermine, flatter the groundlings; put the boot in. The thing was to kick the stuffing out of the aristocrat Drawing."

Anti-Semitism has not been isolated to one or two critics in Australia. In a statement by Alcedo Gigas in *The Publicist*, we read, "We Kookaburras think that the Australian community cannot be possibly saved or advanced by Jews; we think the Jews' advocacy of so-called internationalism and their antagonism to nationalism constitutes a menace to Australians." Ghetos, Klu Klux Klan Kookaburras, Bunyip gods and Jindyworobaks are some of the archaic fossils left by the ebbing of objectivity in Australian thought and criticism that has proceeded steadily since the 1890's.

The final answer to the increasingly reactionary nature of the "criticism" proceeding from the pens of Lionel and Norman Lindsay has been written by Jack Lindsay, son of the latter, nephew of the former: "Wherever we probe this 'German culture' we find a regressive entanglement of dark magic thinking and flat scholasticism, which, if

left to itself, would revert to a barbarous Medievalism. So rapidly can the mass-roots of culture be cut."

This article has endeavoured to show that there is a direct line of theoretical descent from the aestheticism which grew out of the Melbourne Bohemian circles of the nineties, and the increasing mysticism associated with the practice and criticism of landscape painting, to the development of an arrogant nationalism—all of which are outlined in *Bernard Smith's Place, Taste and Tradition*—and finally to an arrogant mysticism which

takes on all the attributes of the fascist mentality. There is to be observed in Australia during the twenties and thirties the gradual growth of the anti-human tendencies of Fascism in Australian cultural development as in certain aspects of its political development. Nor must we delude ourselves that those same tendencies have been finally and completely defeated. Their reappearance in whatever form must give us cause to be vigilant. For the final common denominator of these "cultural" tendencies is to be found in the concentration camps of Dachau and Belsen.

## THE PROFESSOR'S MELODRAMA

EMILE BURNS

(From "World News and Views")

THE Labor Party Executive's long-promised melodrama on the subject of affiliation has at last been produced. Its author is Professor Harold Laski, and it is called *The Secret Battalion*.

Act I is a short bout between "Authoritarian Socialism" and "Democratic Socialism," in which the first gets gently knocked round the ring; but as both are entirely illusory visions, no bones are broken.

Act II begins to warm up. It is modelled on the famous Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde, the parts being played by "The Open Profession" and "The Secret Purpose." Dr. Jekyll is most respectable and democratic; Mr. Hyde is "like a secret battalion of paratroopers" and acts "without moral scruples." The dialogue is a bit dull, but the knockabout is the main thing.

Act III introduces "Socialism by Consent," who is declared the winner against "Socialism-ready-to-fight-capitalism," an ignorant fellow who is pushed out of the ring by the referee (Professor H\*\*\*\* L\*\*\*\*).

The melodrama ends with Act IV, in which the referee, a little punch-drunk with his own punches, staggers round hitting out at his own hallucinations, which he calls Dimitrov.

Maybe not a very exciting melodrama; but good enough for Transport House. It gives vent to their emotions of hate for the Villain, the Communist Party. With this aim it was not necessary—in fact it would have been by no means helpful—to stick to the truth; so the Professor was able to exercise his talents in the other direction.

The method is simple. "Explain" or "reveal" what the Communist aim is; then arouse horror and hatred of the ninepin you have just set up; then knock it down.

The central theme is that the Communists base their whole policy on the belief that a war of Anglo-American imperialism against Soviet-European Socialism is inevitable, when we shall make a revolution. This is one of the most stupid suggestions imaginable. The Communist

Parties of all countries are working to prevent another war; and we see as one of the principal safeguards the coming to power of democratic governments. Far from wanting another war, or regarding it as inevitable, we urge the unity of the working class parties in order to ensure the triumph of democracy against the warmongers. The Professor, on the basis of his distortion of our aims, calls us "organisers of catastrophe." If he had presented facts instead of hallucinations, he would have drawn a picture of how the Communist Party constantly warned the working class against the catastrophe that was being organised by Hitler and Chamberlain; and how the Labor Party executive had failed to heed the warning. Again today, we warn against the catastrophe to which the present foreign policy of the Labor Government may lead; our aim is to avoid the catastrophe, not to bring it about.

The Professor's second theme is that the Communists are out to stab the Labor Party in the back. He can only bolster up this nonsense by completely distorting a recent speech by Dimitrov.

For example, in this speech to the Communist Congress in Bulgaria, Dimitrov referred to the need for Communists to make themselves efficient, so that they could play a responsible part in the reconstruction of their country. Laski handles this as follows: "Communists must be able to supply the best experts so that our cadres are always in the first place" in any Party to which they gain admission." This is barefaced distortion; Dimitrov never referred to gaining admission to other Parties. His actual words are: "Wherever there is any kind of competition between us and our Allies (in the Fatherland Front) we must be in a position to supply the best experts so that our cadres are always in the first place and justify the confidence which is given to them."

But it is on the basis of this distortion that the virtuous Professor goes on to say: "Under the guise of a yearning for unity, Dimitrov avers without hesitation that the Communist aim is to stab the

Social Democratic Parties in the back." There is not one word like this in Dimitrov's speech.

Again, the Professor puts into Dimitrov's mouth the statement that the Communist Party must disguise itself as "an ordinary democratic Party"; that any Communists who are troubled by this duality of outlook "are either not Marxists or they are provocateurs." What Dimitrov really says is that people who see a contradiction between the struggle for the Fatherland Front programme and the struggle for Socialism are either not Marxists or they are provocateurs. In fact, Dimitrov's whole speech was the very opposite of the "organ-

isers of catastrophe" lie that Laski tries to establish. He stresses the "historic democratic revolution which has been taking place in many countries since the war," and goes on to say: "This course of social development, comrades, may to some appear slower than the policy of 'take up your arms; hit right and left and set up your dictatorship!' However, the former course is not only possible and realistic, but it is also undoubtedly much less painful for the people." In fact, not violence, "stabbing in the back," and "catastrophe," but democratic advance is the keynote of Dimitrov's speech.

## HOW NSW TEACHERS WON NEW DEAL

H. ROSS, B.A.

THE barrister in charge of the N.S.W. Public School Teachers' Federation salaries claim stated that the agreement signed on April 26th between the Federation and the Public Service Board was, in the present situation, an extraordinary one, and this for a number of reasons. First, although the results fell short of the original claim substantial gains were made and several principles improving the pay and status of young and temporary teachers and giving much-needed opportunities for promotion, were won. Next, the conduct of the campaign merits comment and, lastly, attention should be drawn to the results this win is having. Already evidence is to hand of the interest of teachers in other parts of the world and of the interest of other progressive and public service bodies.

The Public Instruction Act of N.S.W. laid the basis for the development of education for the people in this State. Certain sections continued to use the Church and other private schools and have never concerned themselves in the education of the sons and daughters of the masses, nor in the miserable conditions under which teachers worked to give it. To the Teachers' Federation goes the credit of taking up this matter, and of enlisting the support of the parents of the children, trade unionists, small farmers and lower middle classes through the Trade Unions, the Parents' & Citizens Associations, and local councils, etc. Thus the union has a dual capacity.

The Teachers' Federation was formed in 1920 in response to mass discontent and activity of the interests for some organisation to look after their interests and to win better pay, and its debut was followed by increases in many cases of one hundred per cent. In 1927-29, when the teachers approached the Court for further increases, there was no mass activity of the members to back the claim and after a long and lifeless business, the results, as was to be expected, were practically nil.

The organisation was at its lowest ebb in the days of the depression, when the 22½ per cent.

Public Service cut was followed by the savage basic wage reduction and by the introduction of the Married Women Teachers and Lecturers Dismissal Act, a retrenchment measure which, although allegedly to give employment to young student-teachers, permitted the dismissed married women to return and to work at lower rates of pay. The Superannuation Fund, to which teachers contribute, was also at this time unscrupulously milked by the Government. Then it was that a group of rank and file teachers rallied the ranks and eventually induced the organisation to take action. The President, a "personal friend of Mr. Stevens," was replaced by one known for his fighting qualities, and several assistant teachers won seats on the Executive, hitherto almost entirely sacrosanct to Heads.

During this time the membership, which had been slipping dangerously, climbed back, and under a progressive lead has been improving ever since. The salaries cuts were restored after mass meetings of teachers and other Public Servants in the Sydney Town Hall and before Parliament House. The new vitality of the organisation expressed itself in moves for educational progress, enlisting the interest and help of unions, Parents' & Citizens' Associations, medical, dental and other professional workers.

The outbreak of the war halted progressive moves, but the Federation leadership, with its eye to the future, submitted the basis for a salaries claim to the 1944 Conference and 1945 was spent in working out details and in getting the active support of the rank and file. When it is considered that these are scattered the length and breadth of N.S.W., and that there are some 160 associations, the size of the task can be visualised. Thus, while negotiations were proceeding, the vast majority of the membership were holding meetings, enlisting the support of the people, getting letters into the papers and finally so impressing members of the Government with their determination that promises

were made by the latter that the money for salaries increases would be made available.

Mr. Sweeney, the barrister employed by the Federation on the case, paid tribute not only to the skill and tenacity with which the officials fought it out point by point, but to the united, steady and active support by the membership.

But the same reactionary element that works in other unions, in obedience to orders from who knows, to smash a strong and progressive organisation, reared its ugly head in our ranks and, as Mr. Sweeney said, constantly embarrassed the negotiations. The win is the triumphant answer to their miserable and puny efforts, and few, if any, are their supporters today. A great lesson in unity has been learnt.

Since the successful conclusion of the negotiations, there have been requests from teacher bodies in U.S.A., Britain and New Zealand for copies of the agreement, and a similar interest has been shown in it by local Public Servants, showing that

while on the one hand, the Teachers' Federation enlisted the support of these bodies, these now are tremendously impressed by its significance for claims which they may make, and so the lessons of unity and united action unfold before us.

The interest aroused in Education generally through this case will put the teachers in a better position to work for improvements in school buildings, in educational methods and in training and equipment of staff.

In fact, the time is ripe for a new deal for Education, for better schools for workers' and farmers' children, and there is every prospect, if campaigns are conducted which enlist the support of the people and which draw them into activity, that much can be done to make the schools places where the best possible is done for the healthy mental and physical development of our children, and workers, through their organisations, should give these moves and campaigns their strong support.

## TRUE FACTS ABOUT THE SOVIET UNION

Y. LAZAREV

TO-DAY, after the termination of the war which was won thanks to the tremendous efforts and sacrifices of all the people of the Allied Nations and, of the Soviet people especially, we find in Australia some people who are again carrying on a campaign of lies and slander against the U.S.S.R.

Maloney, ex-Minister of Australia to the Soviet Union, goes so far as to deliberately distort facts and express his glee over the difficulties which are natural in a country that has borne the brunt of the devastating war. Soviet people make no secret of these difficulties. All they want is that they should be represented as they actually are, not in the shape of the lies spread by Maloney.

Maloney asserts, for example, that last February when he was leaving the Soviet Union the price of bread there was from 60 to 100 roubles per kilogram. The truth is that rationed bread in the Soviet Union costs from one rouble for rye to 2.8 roubles for wheat—per kilogram. Throughout the war rationed bread was being sold at the same price as before the war. It is still sold at the same price to-day when the war is over.

Throughout the war and to-day when the entire world is up against food difficulties, Soviet workers have been receiving all products to which their rations entitle them. I happen to live in the neighbourhood of "Dynamo" factory—an electrical engineering plant. It is a state-owned enterprise such as many others in the Soviet Union and the average earnings of the worker of this factory is 800 roubles per month. Each worker receives a monthly ration card which entitles him to:—

16.5 kilograms (36.3 lbs.) of bread.
2.2 " (approx. 5 lbs) of meat.
0.8 " (approx. 1½ lbs) of butter or fats.
2.0 " (approx. 4½ lbs) of cereals.
0.9 " (12 lbs) of sugar.
and an assortment of other necessary products.

That isn't much, of course, but the entire cost of these products doesn't exceed 80 roubles. If a husband and wife both work at the factory they both receive the same rations. The bread ration for children is smaller (0.3 to 0.35 kilograms per day—approx. 0.7-0.8 lbs.), but the entire ration includes a number of special products for children. Like many other plants and offices in the U.S.S.R. it has its own subsidiary farm, supplying its restaurant in which workers can get dinners at a normal price, and also a factory store where the workers can purchase products over and above the official rations.

Apart from this there are victory gardens which became very widespread in the Soviet Union during the war. The State provides free of charge a plot of fertile land and several hundred square yards to anyone desiring to grow garden crops. In 1945 there were over 18,500,000 workers and office employees who had such gardens. Many workers kept cows, pigs and poultry. Furthermore, prices in the market and in what are called "commercial" shops where products are sold without ration coupons, have been steadily dropping.

Certain categories of office employees receive a somewhat smaller ration than factory workers, but they too receive 0.45 kilograms (1 lb.) of bread per day.

Another point to be borne in mind is that there are a number of other elements that go to make

up the standards of living of the Soviet people. For one thing there is the State social insurance system whose beneficiaries are all workers, clerks and office employees. Social insurance funds are made up entirely of contributions from various enterprises. Workers and other employees pay nothing towards them.

Soviet workers or office employees do not lose their earnings in payments for doctors, and illness does not mean for them impoverishment and ruin, as in some other countries. They receive medical assistance entirely free of charge, in addition to sick benefits from social insurance funds for every day of their illness.

Every Soviet working man or woman receives two to four weeks holiday with pay every year. Those who wish it, are given accommodation in sanatoriums and rest homes. This year Trade Unions alone will provide accommodations in rest homes, sanatoriums and health resorts for 1,500,000 of their members, twice as many as last year. Accommodations are provided free of charge or for payment amounting up to 30 per cent. of the actual cost. Accommodations in sanatoriums and rest homes are also provided for by Public Health bodies and various Government departments. Before the war over 6 million people were accommodated every year in sanatoriums, rest homes and health resorts.

Further, aid given by the Government to mothers in the Soviet Union must not be overlooked. Upon the birth of the third child the mother receives a grant of 400 roubles, upon the birth of the fourth child the grant is increased to 1,300 roubles and in addition the mother receives a monthly allowance of 80 roubles during the course of the next four years. Grants and allowances increase with the birth of each new child.

The Soviet people take legitimate pride in their creches and kindergartens, where children are fed and taken care of by experienced pedagogues. Even in the hardest years of the war the Government saw to the functioning of creches and kindergartens. What this means to the working woman may be seen from the following: In kindergartens maintained by the "Krasnaya Rosa" Textile Mill in Moscow, all the mother has to contribute to the maintenance of her child is 60 roubles at the most and mothers of several children and wives of soldiers pay nothing.

Education in schools is free of charge. This summer over four million school children will be accommodated in camps situated in picturesque health places. About two million of them will be maintained by Trade Unions.

In his recently published "Russian Journey" J. B. Priestley speaks highly of facilities for recreation and amusement provided for the workers of the Soviet Union. Priestley visited many towns and villages in the Soviet Union where he saw people

who were dressed not as well as they'd like to be. He saw people living in flats more crowded than they would have been if the Soviet people hadn't had to fight to defend their country and all mankind from fascist slavery. The German invaders left 25,000,000 people in the Soviet Union homeless. War interrupted the ambitious programmes of housing construction. Priestley and other conscientious observers who have visited the Soviet Union in recent years are aware of this. He gives an unbiased picture of life in the Soviet Union, whereas Maloney, on the other hand, belongs to those who spare no effort to sow prejudice and hostility against the U.S.S.R.

In March, 1944, the Soviet Government, while retaining the rationing system, organised the sale to the population of foodstuffs and consumer goods without cards, but at higher rates, at special non-ration shops and restaurants opened for this purpose.

By the beginning of 1946, 130 stores in the cities and 1,000 at railway stations were selling foodstuffs at higher prices, while other consumer goods were sold at non-ration shops in 40 cities of the country.

Before the war, when there was no rationing, the total number of shops in the country, according to the official statistics, was more than 355 thousand. This number probably decreased slightly during the war, but comparing this with the number of present day "commercial" shops, you will see that the latter represent only a very small per cent. The bulk of food and consumer goods obtained by the population is distributed through the normal ration system, at normal prices.

By the end of the Five-Year Plan 28 per cent. more goods will be sold to the population than in 1940. This means that by 1948, the middle of the Five-Year Plan, retail trade turnover will have attained and exceeded the pre-war figure. With regard to many types of goods, the pre-war turnover will be reached still earlier. This will be achieved by increased production of foodstuffs and other consumer goods (Plan provides for an average annual increase in production of 17 per cent.) as well as the reduction of supplies to the Army in connection with gradual demobilisation.

In order to ensure the abolition of rationing on bread, flour, cereals and macaroni in 1946 the Soviet Government has approved of the plan for expansion of sown areas this year by 8,200,000 hectares as compared with 1945. A great number of tractors, motor vehicles, farm machinery and large quantities of fertiliser and fuel have been sent to farms.

The new Five-Year Plan provides for transition in 1946 and 1947 from the rationing system to a widely ramified system of Soviet trade. The rationing of bread, flour, cereals and macaroni products is to be abolished in the Autumn of 1946.

## QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

J.R., Queensland, asks:

Mr. Maloney, Mr. Bevin, Mr. Menzies and others have accused the Soviet Government of being imperialist, is there any basis for such a charge?

The classic explanation of imperialism is the work of that name by Lenin, written in 1916. There Lenin defines imperialism as "the highest stage of capitalism," a stage at which it has already become transformed from industrial capitalism to monopoly, finance capitalism. Imperialism is parasitic decaying capitalism.

The indisputable correctness of Lenin's analysis is apparent when we survey the world around us today.

(1) Production is dominated by the monopoly giants on a national and international scale. Imperial Chemical Industries, General Electric, General Motors, Dunlop Rubber, Shell and Standard Oil and Lever Bros. are typical examples of a number that operate on a world scale and have considerable interests in Australia. The B.H.P. is the best example of Australian monopoly. Its interests include iron and steel, coal, shipping, goldmining, aircraft, chemical works and shipbuilding. Through its London board it is connected with the Bank of England.

(2) Finance capital, i.e. the merging of banking and industrial capital, is obvious when 12 directors of two Sydney Banks directed (in March, 1940), 25 other companies, including C.S.R., British Tobacco (Aust.), Tooth & Co., Associated Newspapers, Goldsbrough Mort, and shipping, insurance and trustee firms. The same general picture is true of Melbourne, Adelaide, New York, London and any other city of the imperialists.

(3) The monopolists exploit the colonial workers even more intensely than those at home. Australian monopolists are no exception. C.S.R., Theodore-Packer, W. R. Carpenter, Burns Philp & Co., Sir Walter Massey Greene, are included in those who have investments in Fiji, New Guinea and Papua, Solomons, Siam and elsewhere to the North of Australia, from which they receive high profits, because of very cheap native labor treated no better than slaves.

The extent to which monopoly capital has achieved dominance in the capitalist world is reflected in current economic and political problems. The industrial strife in America, England and Australia, coupled with serious threat of widespread unemployment, the conflict over the Anglo-American Financial Agreement, the struggles in the Middle East, India, Indonesia are but a few of the symptoms of imperialism. Even worse are the attempts of reaction (whose economic base is monopoly capital) to stir up a third world war, the evitable "ambition" of the imperialists who see the Soviet Union as the inspiration of progressive movements everywhere. The imperialists seek markets

and sources of raw materials, which they divide and re-divide by military conquest.

Before World War I the whole world had been divided between a few great powers, including Britain, Germany, France, Czarist Russia, Holland and U.S.A. As a result of the two world wars changes have taken place in the distribution of the colonies and the relative strength of the different capitalist powers, but although one-sixth of the earth has been torn from the exploiters by the Soviet workers, a few great powers strive to continue their domination over the other five-sixths. That, in the real reason for British intervention in India, Indonesia, the Middle East and American intervention in China, the Philippines, etc. These are the principal features of imperialism as revealed by Lenin.

It would probably be too much to expect Mr. Bevin or Mr. Maloney (any more than Churchill or Menzies) to accept any Leninist principles. In 1914, Lenin already characterised the imperialists who cloaked themselves with labor phrases as "Social-chauvinists." Such "Labor leaders" were worse than liberal economists such as Hobson (quoted by Lenin), who described the Bevins, Attlees, Laikis, Maloney, Fallons, etc., of that time, as "Fabian imperialists." These "Labor imperialists" are the tools of reaction.

What is there in common between the Soviet Union and Imperialism?

The Soviet Union has no monopoly capitalists, no financial magnates, no idle parasites, and no oppressed colonies. The Soviet Government has consistently fought for peace, in opposition to the imperialist war-mongers.

The Red Army did not intervene in Greece, Indonesia, Egypt, China, etc. On the contrary, it has withdrawn from the territories in Persia and Manchuria which it occupied in the war years. The U.S.S.R. is a voluntary union of over 40 nations, comprising 16 self-governing Union Republics. Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia joined the Soviet Union as late as 1940 in response to the expressed desire of the people, through their elected Parliament.

There are no minorities deprived of all citizenship rights (as for instance the Australian aborigines), no "second rate" peoples as the masses in the colonies and semi-colonies are regarded by the imperialists.

In short there are none of the imperialist characteristics in the Soviet Union. The agents of reaction in the working-class movement conjure up a vision of "Red Imperialism" on the instructions of their master, monopoly capital, the real essence of Imperialism. In economic and political outlook they are behind the liberal bourgeois economists of over 40 years ago.

The opportunists are themselves another symptom of decaying capitalism, which they everywhere

desperately try to save. Lenin showed how the imperialists corrupted and bribed a privileged section of the working class, created a "labor aristocracy" from colonial "super profits" as a bulwark against the masses in the advanced and colonial countries. The opportunists inevitably shed many crocodile tears because one-sixth of the earth will

not facilitate their betrayals, but stands as a living inspiration to the revolutionary workers of all countries, and an all powerful confirmation of the correctness and strength of Communism today, Marxism-Leninism developed further by the creative genius of Stalin.

## BOOK REVIEW

### Hubbub in Java (John Thompson)

JOYCE METCALF

JOHN THOMPSON, Australian poet and war correspondent in Java for the A.B.C. November-December, 1945, has written the first general survey of events, developments and leading personnel in the New Indonesia. A more serious work than the title would indicate, *Hubbub in Java* can do much to arouse those unacquainted with the facts, and as yet unresponsive to the great national struggles in the colonial countries today.

The opening scene of the book, a banquet, "an entertainment of studied artistry and calculated tempo" in the palace of an Indonesian Prince, to some extent indicates the new situation in Java. Dining at the tables, instead of the Dutch masters of Java were the "new men of Indonesia." "It was exciting to see Sjahrir, Sjahrudin and many of their followers . . . Sukarno and Hatta, solid Luat and rugh-hewn Amir from Sumatra—revolutionaries, republicans, several of whom had long penal servitude—sitting at their ease where the Dutch had yawned in their pride."

Owing to inability to speak the language, Thompson says, "my real contacts were confined to the sophisticated few (Indonesians who were Dutch-educated intellectuals) and I could only gaze at the many." He describes Premier Sjahrir, young, keen, modest, a man of wide learning, who had suffered prison and exile, and who had organised resistance under the very noses of the Japanese. A man of great faith in his own people, "he may be assassinated . . . but his spirit will not die. Throughout Java there are picked young educated activists who worked with him in the underground and will play a big part in the future Indonesia."

President Sukarno is characterized as the aspirator, "a demi-god in the eyes of the masses, Sukarno could lift congregated thousands into frenzies and ecstasies. Sjahrir's every effort was to make them calm and firm." His words were remembered when others were forgotten.

A skilful blend of historical background, events, personal observations and pointed anecdotes, the various sections of the book answer soberly and irrefutably the lies and distortions from the agents and mouthpieces of imperialism. How puny are the claims of Dutch and press that this vast national

upsurge is a mere Japanese-made revolt, in face of the unanimous demand and determination to achieve independence that Thompson was able to observe and describe. How silly the claims that the Indonesians are unfit to govern themselves and run their own country when it is precisely that that they are doing with enthusiasm and competence.

It is their own crimes with which Dutch and British imperialists are charging Indonesians when they accuse them of atrocities, irresponsibility, "extremism," violence and the like. War there is in Java, varying in intensity particularly in the key cities, but Thompson proves that the precipitation and maintenance of this war is the responsibility of British and Dutch whose sole aim is to force the people of Indonesia back to slavery and savage exploitation by former Dutch masters.

"In the task of perfecting our social and administrative structure," states the Political Manifesto of the Government of the Republic of Indonesia, "we Indonesians see no necessity for the forcible measures. If, however, such force is ever used, it will be by the Dutch, because of their desire to impose themselves on us. We have no wish to impose our will on other races. All we want is recognition of our independence and the opportunity to perfect our system of government."

Climax and most significant section of the book is the account of the tour into the interior of Java made by the Republican leaders whom Thompson accompanied. On this remarkable journey the author was able to see for himself the manifestations of the new Java.

Purpose of the tour was to explain the Government's programme and policy, impress on the people the need for unity and discipline, to observe the extent of popular support, consult with local leaders and generally check on the situation and organisation throughout the country.

To those travelling, the journey seemed one continuous demonstration by the population of their confidence in their leaders and in the Java that these leaders represented. Strung out in their thousands along the railway tracks, grouped at level crossings, at villages and remote stations, at towns large and small, old and young, women and children turned out with banners and slogans and

cries of "Merdeka"—"Freedom," to welcome and pledge support for their leaders. "More and more the unanimity of Java was proving deeper and firmer . . . We had travelled through a land of hope and resolution, and for a week we had not heard a shot."

The people of Java not only have faith in their Government, but a faith, based now on experience, in themselves and their competence to run their own affairs. Government reports at this time, showed increasing control of food distribution, of agricultural production and of manufacture and distribution of a number of commodities—soap, gasoline, beer, iron, ice, petrol, coal in West Java. Food was not abundant for the masses, it never had been, but there was sufficient, and certainly no crisis. Public utilities—electricity, water supply, railroads ran smoothly in the war city areas as in the inland towns.

Against a background such as this, of a kindly industrious people peacefully and successfully running their own affairs, stands out most blatantly the infamous role of British Imperialism. By themselves the Dutch could not have caused embarrassment for long to the Indonesian Government and people once the Japanese were disarmed. But with the aid of British forces, bombers and bullets, supplemented by Japanese troops, not only have the Dutch been able to increase their military forces and equipment, they have been heartened and hardened in their insane course of trying to regain former control—a course which can only plunge the country into bloody warfare without hope of success for the aggressors and costing heavy loss in lives and treasure to the Indonesians. The

## GEOLOGISTS AND GENESIS

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

THE first geologists thought in terms of the accounts of the earth's origin given in the Bible. The world had been made, a few thousand years ago, in seven days. Since then there had been very minor changes due to erosion by water, to volcanoes, earthquakes, and so on, with the one exception of Noah's flood, which had covered the whole world. When great depths of mud and rock were found, containing bones and shells of extinct animals, these were supposed to have been caused by this one flood. So almost the whole of the geological record was explained by one single catastrophe.

More careful examination showed that many rocks must have been laid down very slowly in still water, and that there had not been one set, but hundreds of sets, of extinct animals. In fact a hundred years ago geologists generally thought that the rocks had been gradually laid down in an orderly way.

wiping out of Bekasi, a town of 20,000 inhabitants, "Lidice No. 2," as the Indonesian newspaper "Merdeka" called it, was an atrocity perpetrated by the British Command on a scale which even the Dutch had previously not attempted. Recent reports from Java are of renewed fighting and of the continued unholy alliance between British, Dutch and Japanese forces.

"It is a matter of absorbing interest," finally concludes Mr. Thompson, "to watch the pattern of the new world emerging and to speculate as to the manner in which our own comparatively independent nation will adapt and accommodate itself to changes occurring, not only in China, not only in India, but right next door in the islands of Indonesia."

One must add to this somewhat lame and impotent conclusion for so informative and potentially influential a book, that the independence of Indonesia, the defeat of Dutch Imperialism and consequently the deadly blow that such a defeat will inflict on world imperialism, is a matter not of mere academic interest but of vital concern to the people of this country. Recently the Communist Parties of the Netherlands and Britain have called jointly on the Dutch and British people "to demand vigorously and decisively that the Indonesian Republic, which is based on the will of the Indonesian people, is fully recognised and its sovereignty . . . respected."

The cause of peace and progress demands from peace-desiring people everywhere organised action on behalf of Indonesian independence; demands emulation of that splendid practical assistance given by our own waterside workers.

This theory works pretty well for most of England. If we find one deposit above another, for example, the London clay above the chalk, we can be sure enough that the lower one was formed first. It does not work for the great whin sill in Northumberland, which is due to an underground flow of lava which has baked the sedimentary rocks above and below it. Of course, a surface flow only bakes the rocks below it, as there is nothing above to bake.

But where great mountain ranges are investigated we find old rocks pushed over newer ones, and sometimes whole strata turned upside down. This was first detected in the Alps, but later in Scotland and Belgium, where the remnants of mountain ranges much older than the Alps, and almost completely worn away, were discovered. We now know that it is pretty general.

Modern geologists think in terms of revolutions. The word is not mine, but theirs. There have been



about three of these revolutions in the last five hundred million years, and about eight in the history of the earth. Each revolution built a number of mountain chains in different parts of the world.

The last one produced the Himalayas in Asia, the Alps in Europe, and the Cordilleras in America. Some geologists would divide it into two stages. A little mountain building is still going on, but we seem to be past its climax, and we may expect that during the next hundred million years or so mountains will be worn down rather than built up.

The most violent revolutionary changes are to be looked for in the building of the highest mountain chain, the Himalayas, and Sir E. B. Bailey, the Director of the British Geological Survey, has recently interpreted the findings on this range of two Swiss geologists, Heim and Gansser, and the Indian geologist, Wadia.

Little is known of the geology of the Himalayas, since the Tibetan and Nepalese governments do not want their countries to be developed by capitalist imperialism, as they might well be if valuable minerals were found in them.

The most interesting area which has been fully studied is that around Kiohar, between the upper courses of the Ganges and Sutlej. Where valleys are several miles deep, the opportunities for working the structure of the mountains are of course very good.

It becomes fairly clear that Tibetan mesozoic rocks with fossils like some found in Bavaria were pushed bodily over younger rocks formed a long way farther south. In between them there are volcanic rocks, but telling a very queer story. The lower layers consist of lava with the characteristics only found when it has flowed out under the sea, interspersed with the skeletons of one-celled animals which only accumulate in deep ocean. But above these are volcanic rocks of a terrestrial type, pushing up through the sediments above them in narrow veins, like the quartz veins which are so common in Cornwall and many parts of Scotland.

In fact, Tibet has been pushed over India, which has slipped below it and lifted it up. In the

early stages there was a deep and narrow sea in front of the advancing edge of Tibet, studded with underwater volcanoes, such as are not rare in the Pacific. Later, these were overrun.

From a geological point of view the Himalayas at Kiohar are in an almost indescribable mess. Huge blocks of rock several miles long have been torn away, perhaps by landslips, and embedded in younger strata.

Dr. Bailey has not yet accepted the theory which is today the great geological heresy, but may be generally accepted in another generation, the theory that the continents have drifted for thousands of miles over melted matter below them like slag on the top of a mass of molten metal. Its strongest adherent today is probably the South African geologist du Toit. On this theory Africa, South America, India, Australia and Antarctica were once joined together. They have drifted apart, and the pressure of Africa against Europe made the Alps and Pyrenees, while the northern tip of India went bodily under Tibet.

This theory certainly explains a lot of facts. For example, the world's main deposits of diamonds are in South Africa, and in the part of Brazil which once fitted on to it. The ice-formed rocks in India, Africa and Australia which are now in hot regions were laid down by glaciers near the South Pole, and so on.

Geologists are becoming more and more ready to believe in very large changes in the earth's surface in the remote past. Much the same changes have taken place in anthropological theory. We no longer ascribe all our evils to a woman eating an apple in a garden six thousand years ago.

But we can attribute many of them to the origin of class society first in one part of the earth and then in another, during the last ten thousand years. This meant division of labor and greater production, but it also meant a huge growth of oppression and selfishness.

We can no more accept the details of the Garden of Eden than of Noah's flood; but we can agree that there have been rapid and world-wide changes in geography, and, at a very much later date, in human society.

(World Copyright Reserved)

