

COMMUNIST REVIEW



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

No. 70.

JUNE, 1947.

Price 6d.

LIST OF CONTENTS

THE N.S.W. ELECTIONS	R. Dixon	547
THE METAL TRADES STRIKE	E. J. Rowe	549
GENERAL CRISIS OF CAPITALISM	E. Varga	551
QUEENSLAND 1947 STATE ELECTION	A. Robinson	557
POST-WAR ROLE OF THE SOCIALIST PARTIES	S. Ivanov	560
PALESTINE COMMUNISTS APPEAL TO U.N.O.		567
ON DISARMAMENT	V. M. Molotov	571
BOOK REVIEW	J.W.	573
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS	L. H. Gould	574
ATOM CANNOT BE MADE A WAR OFFICE SECRET	Prof. Joliot-Curie	575

ORGAN OF THEORY AND PRACTICE OF THE AUSTRALIAN
COMMUNIST PARTY

Editor L. L. Sharkey

N.S.W. ELECTIONS

R. DIXON

BY securing the return of the McGirr Government in N.S.W. the labor movement won an outstanding victory over reaction. Whereas in the old Parliament the Labor Party held 57 seats out of a total of 90, in the new Parliament they will have 52 seats, which gives them a substantial majority over the Liberal-Country Parties. They lost five seats to the Liberal and Country Parties.

A very bitter campaign was waged by the Tory forces to defeat the Labor Party and thereby repeat the South Australian and Western Australian results. But the swing away from the Labor Party was so slight that the aims of the reactionary parties were unrealised.

The main campaigning point of the Liberal Party was for "more production", which, unless the workers' standard of living was raised, merely meant more profits for the capitalist class which Messrs. Treatt and Bruxner represent. "More production" was to be achieved by imposing "secret ballots" on the Unions and attacking the Communist Party. Just how these measures were to cause production to rise the Liberal and Country Party leaders were unable to explain. Their policy was so patently transparent that the majority of the electors rejected it.

On the other hand, the policy of Labor Premier McGirr was constructive and progressive. It contrasted strongly with the policy of his predecessor Mr. McKell, which had brought the Labor Party into disrepute, caused serious division in the labor movement and threatened to bring the Labor Government down. It was markedly different from that being pursued by Mr. Chifley, which has resulted in lowering the purchasing power of wages and increasing the profits of the capitalists.

The 40-hour legislation and the election programme of Mr. McGirr, which provided for higher living standards, price control, an enlarged housing scheme and other measures to benefit workers, farmers and middle-class people, aroused a new interest in the Labor Government and created a greater degree of confidence and unity within the labor movement than we have seen for some time.

It was not surprising, therefore, that in the electorates where the working-class voters predominate, the labor candidates increased their majorities, mainly at the expense of the Lang Party, which received a severe setback.

The decline in Labor Party support took place in country and metropolitan electorates where farmers and middle-class voters predominate. The

fact that reaction is getting more support from these sections of the people in its attacks upon the labor movement must cause us serious concern. There is no doubt that the swing away from the Labor Party, shown in the Federal Elections last year, has been arrested, but we cannot be content with this.

Some spokesmen for the Labor Party, in dealing with the election results, said that Labor's big majority in the old Parliament was the result of a landslide to Labor and that it was to be expected that there would be some movement back to the Liberal and Country Parties. They are quite satisfied with the election results even though they lost a number of seats.

This very self-satisfied and consoling view, which is prevalent in the leading circles of the Labor Party, is dangerous for the working class. If farmers and middle-class people, after supporting the Labor Party, swing away again, it is because Labor's policy is not broad and progressive and does not aim to consolidate farmer and middle-class support on the basis of those interests they have in common with the working class.

Many farmers and middle-class people, who supported the Labor Party in the 1944 elections, voted for the Country Party and Liberals in 1947 because they resented Labor Party policy, and that is something in which no one in the Labor Movement should find cause for self-satisfaction.

The establishment of a firm alliance between the working class, the farmers and middle class is essential for the victory of Socialism.

The history of elections in Australia shows that big sections of farmers and middle-class people have, again and again, swung to the side of the labor movement only to be driven back into the arms of the Tory Parties by the policy of right-wing Labor leaders.

The viewpoint of the right-wing Labor leaders, who base themselves upon capitalism, is that working-class interests and principles must be sacrificed in order to win support from the farmers and middle-class people.

It is necessary only to point to the fact that the small farmers and middle classes are also exploited and oppressed by capitalism in order to show how much they have in common with the working class in the struggle against capital and how the policy of the Labor Party leaders divides the workers, farmers and middle classes, sets one against the other, instead of drawing them into the common fight against the capitalist class.

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

The labor movement must fight for a policy that is progressive and democratic, which takes as its starting point the interests and needs of the workers, farmers and middle-class in the struggle against capital, and which aims to win allies for the working class in the struggle against capitalism.

Another feature of the elections was the marked tendency to adhere to the traditional parties—the Labor, Liberal and Country Parties. Independents lost votes everywhere to the Liberal and Country Parties and their numbers in Parliament have been reduced from 3 to 1. The total vote of the Lang Party fell from 102,240 in 1944 to 58,201.

The political degeneration of the Lang Party is becoming clear even to the most hardened Langites. Mr. J. T. Lang has voted on no less than 19 occasions with the Liberals against the Labor Party in the last seven months, and in the State Elections the Lang candidates in a number of electorates gave their number two preference to the Liberal Party candidate instead of the Labor Party. Instead of Lang Labor, this Party has become known as the Lang-Liberal Party.

These facts, combined with the consistent exposure of Langism by the Communist Party and the progressive policy of the McGirr Government, account for the decline in the Lang Party vote.

There was also a decline in the vote for the Communist Party. Compared with the State Elections in 1944 our vote fell in Waratah (Deacon) from 5,102 to 2,690; in Lakemba (Ogston) from 4,668 to 1,785; in Balmain (Moran) from 5,186 to 1,662 and in Bulli (Martin) from 4,016 to 2,714.

On this occasion we contested many more seats than in 1944. Our 16 candidates received a total of 27,000 votes.

In 1944 conditions were much more favorable for the Communist Party. The Soviet Red Army was achieving big victories in the people's war against fascism, there was a powerful swing to the left on the part of the masses, and the Communist Party, because of the important part it was playing in the struggle for victory, attracted wide support.

In the more recent period the reaction has become stronger and a most vicious campaign has been waged against the Communist Party by capitalist newspapers, Liberal, right-wing Labor politicians and reformists.

In the first period after the end of the war the Communist Party was called upon to lead the great strikes of the Steelworkers, Miners and Sea-

men in N.S.W. and the Meatworkers in Queensland, strikes which were forced upon the workers by employer provocation. These struggles were essentially defensive in character and inevitably, because of the issues involved—victimisation—and the lying press campaign, created doubt in the minds of middle-class people and farmers as well as the less developed workers about the role of the Communist Party. On the other hand, the big and successful struggles of the Transport workers in Victoria and Steelworkers for wage increases, as experience shows, aroused enthusiasm among the workers and won support from the middle classes who could see the importance of these struggles for higher living standards.

In general, we can say that conditions in 1947 were much less favorable for the Communist Party to secure a big election vote than in 1944. This, combined with the progressive policy of the McGirr Government and the tendency to swing back to the traditional Parties, unquestionably affected the vote for the Communist Party.

Nevertheless, it is well to note that in electorates we contested that coincided with subdivisions of Federal electorates in which we ran candidates at the Federal Elections, our vote, in almost every instance, was higher than in the Federal Elections.

Our policy was well received and all reports indicate a growing interest in the Party.

In general we can say that while the vote for the Communist candidates was disappointing, the over-all result was very good.

The reaction has suffered a reverse. The slanderous campaign of the capitalist press against the labor movement and the Labor Government, which mounted in intensity as the elections approached, failed to achieve the results the ruling class wanted.

It is also significant that the leaders of the Labor team in N.S.W. did not join in the red-baiting campaign that the Liberal politicians and newspapers were trying to inveigle them into. They put forward a constructive and progressive policy and stuck to it and, as a result, won the respect and support of a majority of the electors.

The elections, and the McGirr Government's policy, have certainly promoted unity in the N.S.W. labor movement.

It is essential to strengthen this movement towards unity to overcome the division in the labor movement, which only helps reaction.

The Communist Party will play its part in the struggle for unity and we are convinced that the realisation of the policy of the McGirr Government, which must command general support in the labor movement, provides a real basis for united action by all sections of the labor movement.

THE METAL TRADES STRIKE

E. J. ROWE

WITH the return to work of the striking engineers, ironworkers, transport workers and F.E.D.F.A. members in Victoria, what will undoubtedly rank as one of the most powerful strike struggles ever waged by the Australian working class has been successfully concluded.

Waged most determinedly by 20,000 workers and extending over many months, the strike reached new levels in the offensive struggles that have marked the recent period. It was characterised by a powerful fighting unity and alliance among the Unions participating in the struggle and had the warm sympathy and support of the mass of the people, a fact exemplified in the dismal failure of the vicious press campaign aimed at turning public support from the strikers.

I have traversed in previous articles in the Review the genesis and early history of the dispute, how it grew from a lock-out of some 3,000 metal workers by the Chamber of Manufacturers in November, 1946, how the employers beneficently opened the factories again (on pre-lock-out conditions) in January, 1947, and how the A.E.U., rejecting any return to work under these conditions, reaffirmed the demand for £1 per week increase and decided to extend the dispute by withdrawing all members from shops affiliated to the Chamber of Manufacturers.

Considerable disagreement existed among the employers and in all some 124 shops agreed to pay the £1 and continued working.

This was in early February '47. The Metal Trades Federation endorsed the dispute and its conduct was taken over by the A.C.T.U., which set up a Disputes Committee consisting of the Emergency Committee of the A.C.T.U., plus one representative from each of the metal unions, plus the U.

On February 17 the employers referred the dispute into the Arbitration Court and the reference came before Conciliation Commissioner Mooney, who, after hearing a long legal argument on wage-pegging from the employers, handed down a judgment dividing the metal workers into three groups and offering marginal increases as follows:

1. All margins over 27/-, an increase of 9/- per week;
2. All margins from 20/- to 27/-, and certain foundry workers, an increase of 7/- per week;
3. All other marginal rates an increase of 5/- per week;

but declared it conditional upon the Unions returning to work, a proposition the striking unions emphatically rejected.

The Disputes Committee met also, and declared the Award unsatisfactory, but decided to arrange

a conference with the employers with a view to obtaining a better settlement.

The employers, sitting securely behind the Mooney judgment, refused to discuss wage increases. They were fortified, I am afraid, by a shrewd assessment of the complete lack of desire for struggle by the right-wing leaders of some metal unions—an accurate assessment as was later proved.

The Committee talked incessantly, but refused the demand of the striking Unions for an extension of the dispute involving their members who were working in the shops from which the strikers had been withdrawn.

On March 18 Mr. Mooney decided to make his offer a legal award and varied the necessary awards accordingly. The Melbourne District Committee of the A.E.U. then met and unanimously decided to extend the dispute to railways, tramways and certain power stations, this extension to take place on March 22.

This move of course involved the Victorian Labor Government and the Premier, Mr. Cain, joined in a powerful and very vicious Press campaign designed to stampee a mass meeting of A.E.U. members called by the District Committee for the 24th, to consider the extension. All the old, vulgar red-baiting arguments were used by the Press and the right-wing politicians, but the mass meeting of nearly 7,000 A.E.U. members gave a glorious, smashing reply to the bourgeoisie and their stooges.

After hearing a report from myself in which I explained the reason for the campaign, the huge meeting, with only 5 dissenters, carried a resolution endorsing the extension and pledging unity to continue the fight. It then went on to unanimously condemn the antics of Cain and Co. and demanded that "instead of linking up with the employers they assist us to win our wage demands."

This inspiring meeting shocked and dismayed the reaction and the Press campaign redoubled in violence. The A.E.U. was now "Communist-controlled" and holding the community to ransom, but obviously something more positive had to be done. A slow paralysis was developing over Victoria's transport system—tramway buses were off the streets—trams were going out of commission—the A.R.U. had made common cause with the engineers and withdrawn all men in similar classifications. Discussions were taking place.

Mr. Cain (not so volubly "red-baiting" now) and some of his Ministers flew to Canberra to consult the Prime Minister and acquaint him of Victoria's troubles. Up till now Mr. Chifley had been viewing events from his ivory castle at Canberra. Later he made a surprise flight to Melbourne and—the Press said—talked with some Arbitration Court judges. Later still some proposed amend-

ments to the wage-pegging regulations were announced and the striking Victorian workers had won a real victory for the whole of the workers—a first taste of their own.

The right wing were now busy assuring us that the road was opened for a return to work and a hearing by the Court—but the Unions were still demanding a conference and some reasonable guarantee of substantial wage increases.

The Federal Minister for Labor referred all the disputes under Regulation 9 (Industrial Peace Act) and the matter came before the Full Arbitration Court. The Court refused to hear the Unions until a return to work was undertaken and suggested a conference—the employers once more refused.

The A.E.U. District Committee again unanimously decided to withdraw all staff hands and apprentices from Newport Railway Power House. The A.R.U., and now the F.E.D.F.A., endorsed this and took parallel action. Melbourne's electric trains were stopped and a terrific strain imposed on the overtaxed trams.

Obviously the Unions were united and determined, and if they were to be defeated it had become necessary for the right wing allies of the reaction in the Unions to emerge more openly. So they did so.

The Disputes Committee met, condemned the extension and decided to call the A.C.T.U. Executive together to "control" the Unions concerned. At the same time the Press gleefully carried the story that the Commonwealth Council of the A.E.U. had recalled Cranwell and Rowe to Sydney and proposed to "take the conduct of the dispute from them."

Curiously enough this campaign coincided with a rush plane visit to Sydney by Mr. Kenneally—a member of the Cain Cabinet—who interviewed a member of the Commonwealth Council of the A.E.U. and "discussed the strike and a resumption of work." Present also was Mr. R. A. King, vice-President of the A.C.T.U.

The Commonwealth Council, defeating an attempt to send the men back to work, placed the future conduct of the dispute with Cranwell, Rowe and the Melbourne District Committee and we returned to Melbourne. The strike was still gaining momentum.

The A.C.T.U. Interstate Executive was called together in Melbourne and had the Union representatives before it for "consultation." The striking Unions vigorously defended their viewpoint and the Executive, after an energetic debate, declared the Mooney Award unsatisfactory and urged a conference with the employers.

Meanwhile, the Full Court had called upon the A.E.U., F.I.A. and the Chamber of Manufacturers to show cause why they should not be de-registered. Not unnaturally it took the A.E.U. first and demanded a return to work "or else." Commonwealth Council, on a majority vote, again decided against

any return and the Court made an order for de-registration—operative in fourteen days. It then adjourned the other cases.

The Melbourne District Committee met, expressed its bitter resentment at the "partisan attitude" of the Court, rejected any return to work and proceeded to discuss further extensions. It then decided to call out its members from all country loco depots and workshops, thus crippling the country train services and threatening Melbourne with isolation from supplies, etc.

The Press, the reaction in Parliament raved and called upon the "responsible" leaders of the Trade Union Movement to "do something." The A.C.T.U. Executive was again called together—this time in Sydney, "far from the smoke of battle"—and after long consultations with members of the Commonwealth Council of the A.E.U. and a bitter debate on the Executive, decided to order the A.E.U. back to work under pain of disaffiliation from the A.C.T.U. One should record here the words of the Melbourne District Committee: "We extend our thanks to the Queensland and Tasmanian delegates for their adherence to Trade Union principles in such a situation."

Almost at the same hour as the infamous strike-breaking A.C.T.U. decision hit the headlines, Judge Drake-Brockman in the Court in Melbourne made a bitter attack upon the A.E.U., declaring he would never grant the £1 and again virtually ordering the Union back to work. The timing of course was purely coincidental. The Union, through a statement by Chairman J. A. Cranwell, attacked this "pre-judging" of its case and firmly rejected the attempt by the A.C.T.U. to "betray the struggle of our members."

The District Committee met and decided to withdraw all members from other metropolitan power houses and, if no conference resulted, to consider withdrawing members from Yallourn, thus "blacking out" Victoria or alternatively forcing the Government to let the stations "run on their reputation." A very risky alternative. The F.E.D.F.A. declared it would stand by, but if any staff men were used they would support the A.E.U. and withdraw.

The A.E.U. branches were meeting meanwhile and endorsing these proposals, the struggle was mounting even higher.

Then Mr. Cain wrote to Judge Drake-Brockman, and requested him to call a conference of all parties to see if a settlement could not be arrived at. His Honor acceded and a conference was held between the A.C.T.U., Melbourne Trades Hall Council and the striking Unions (the A.E.U. and F.I.A.) on the one hand and the Chamber of Manufacturers, the motor trade, and Government instrumentalities on the other. After many hours of discussion this conference unanimously accepted a formula as a basis for settlement under three headings:

- A return to work with the Mooney increases of 9/-, 7/-, 5/-.
- Both parties ask the Court to review the Mooney Award.
- Suggesting a method of fixed marginal rates for tradesmen on the 1921 ratio and relating other classifications to this, using the categories of the Mooney Award.

Since the kernel is in the latter portion, a short explanation will assist. Engineers regard the 1921 award by Justice Higgins as the first, and only, real attempt to assess a tradesman's rate. In 1921 on a base rate of 84/- the margin was 36/- or 3:7. Using this formula today a base rate of 107/- in Victoria gives a margin of 46/- or 16/- above the rate today, 30/-. Relate the other categories as in the Mooney Award and you get increases of 16/-, 14/-, 12/-.

One must emphasise, however, that the Acting Chief Judge has to consider whether these increases "imperil the safety of our national economy" and therefore has last say. We are confident, however, that the struggle will result in substantial increases.

Failure to do so would probably result in a second round, as the mass meeting which accepted the settlement averred that, if any hitch occurred, it would "start at the other end" and pull the power houses out first next time.

What conclusions can we draw?

1. The strike will give big economic gains to some 300,000 workers in the metal industries throughout Australia.

The main factor in this was undoubtedly the splendid, unshakable unity of the workers of all shades of opinion. I have pointed to the complete unanimity of Communist, A.L.P., Catholic and even normally right-wing delegates on the Melbourne District Committee, but this was in truth a reflection of the unity of the entire membership.

The rest of the workers were in active sympathy with us. Working-class unity has been strengthened. Trade Union unity has grown.

THE GENERAL CRISIS OF CAPITALISM

(Features of the Home and Foreign Policy of the Capitalist Countries during the Epoch of the General Crisis of Capitalism)

E. VARGA

THE home and foreign policy of the capitalist countries during the period of the general crisis of capitalism exhibits certain specific features which distinguish it from the policy of capitalism prior to this period. Stalin, in his speech of February 9, 1946, pointed out: "Marxists have more than once declared that the capitalist system of world economy conceals within itself elements of general crisis and war conflicts. . . . In point of fact, during the periods when capitalism was still developing along an ascending line, Marx founded the theory of the

2. The right wing in the A.C.T.U. and the Unions generally has been thoroughly discredited before big sections of the workers. They are in fact defending themselves.

3. The role of the Labor Government has been made clear to many workers, although here it must be said that in the concluding stages the Cain Government came "on side" and helped considerably in the final conference.

4. The "red-baiting" was largely ineffective and was rejected by the workers. Conversely a respect for our Party and its members has grown. Some recruiting success was achieved.

5. Picketing, publicity and relief committees were set up and co-ordinated with the other Unions. A daily bulletin and large numbers of leaflets were published. The pickets reached complete agreement with the Bus Proprietors' Association about where private buses were to run.

6. The A.E.U. kept 17-18,000 workers on strike for varying periods up to six months. As strike pay is 47/- per week, no union could have financed this unless the men found work elsewhere. Up to 12,000 of them did so, but kept in touch and supported their fellows. Nearly £6,000 was raised for extra relief.

7. The workers returned solidly organised, their fighting spirit completely unimpaired. Membership has in fact grown and many A.S.E. men have come over.

It was, however, difficult to draw in big numbers of strikers on the various committees. This is largely a hangover from craft tradition, where one deprives the boss of one's skill and awaits the effect. This was a real weakness.

Such a struggle in the future could be considerably shortened by the knowledge gained about key points, but even here certain factors contribute to a relatively long and severe struggle.

Overall, however, the strike is certainly the greatest struggle the A.E.U. has participated in and enriches the history of struggle of our Australian working class.

inevitable collapse of capitalism, showing that capitalism is a social order that is historically transitory and far from the final form of the organisation of human society, as all bourgeois economists and politicians at that time maintained.

Historical experience demonstrates that the transition from one social order to another everywhere in the world demands a fairly prolonged period of time. This period can be called that of the general crisis of the particular social order in question. Lenin, as is well known, called imperial-

ism—capitalism in decay; it is quite obvious that to say that a social order is in decay is the same thing as saying that it is in a state of crisis.

In order to characterise the foreign and home policy of the capitalist countries during the epoch of the general crisis of capitalism, it is necessary, first of all, to make clear when this crisis began. But on the basis of what Lenin has said of imperialism as capitalism in decay, the conclusion can be drawn that the general crisis of capitalism began when the transition from free capitalism to monopolistic capitalism was completed in the most important countries of the capitalist world, i.e., approximately at the beginning of the twentieth century.

As has been pointed out in the *Short History of the C.P.S.U. (B.)*, the first world war was already a reflection of the general crisis of capitalism. Although, however, the general crisis of capitalism existed already before the first world war, the existence of this crisis was not then a political factor such as could exercise a decisive influence on the foreign and home policy of the capitalist countries. Marxism teaches that with an alteration of the economic basis there is an alteration also of the political superstructure of society, of ideology, of the consciousness of the masses. But this process of change of the economic basis and of the political superstructure does not proceed simultaneously. The general phenomenon to which Marx, Lenin and Stalin pointed is the lag in the change of the political superstructure in relation to the change of economy. This, indeed, is understandable. Persons who experience the changes taking place in the economic basis do not immediately draw the corresponding political conclusions. The bourgeois revolutions constitute a forcible explosion, an adaptation of the political superstructure to an economic basis that has already long before undergone alteration.

As a matter of fact, prior to the first world war, apart from Lenin and the Bolsheviks in Russia, no one in the capitalist world saw the existence of the crisis of capitalism, or that the replacement of the capitalist system by a socialist system was a task that had become historically mature.

Besides the general tendency for political consciousness to lag behind the change in the economic basis, there existed also concrete historical causes why the fact of the existence of the general crisis of capitalism had still not penetrated into the consciousness of people. The half century which preceded the first world war was a period of the greatest progress of capitalism. In this half century capitalist production increased approximately fourfold; it was a period of great technical progress, a period when the capitalist countries took possession of numerous colonies and thereby extended the capitalist market. The bourgeoisie utilised colonial super-profits to buy the labor aristocracy. During this period reformism struck deep roots in the labor movement. It should also be remembered that during this half century there were no wars between the Great Powers. The last war between Great

Powers was the Franco-Prussian War; after it only a number of local and colonial wars took place.

The participants in the first world war were bourgeois countries of the same kind. There was, of course, a difference between Great Britain, France and America—countries in which the bourgeois revolution had been completed—and Germany, which still possessed strong relics of feudalism, and Tsarist Russia; but basically these were bourgeois countries of the same kind, the peoples of which were convinced that whatever the outcome of the war, all the countries participating in it would nevertheless remain bourgeois countries.

This "conception" was shattered by the October Revolution in Russia. It came with great unexpectedness for the bourgeoisie throughout the world (including the Russian bourgeoisie) and for the working-class outside Russia. The victory of the October Revolution at one stroke demonstrated to the whole world the existence of the general crisis of the capitalist system, which found its political reflection in the fact that the socialist country made its appearance alongside the capitalist countries. From that moment concern for the preservation of the capitalist system became the chief content of both the home and foreign policy of the bourgeoisie. The danger for capitalism was most real in the conquered countries, where the bourgeoisie that had lost the war was discredited and the governmental authority shattered, while the defeated army did not form a reliable bulwark of bourgeois rule. The bourgeois capitalist world was faced with a problem: how to preserve the capitalist system.

The bourgeoisie attempted to solve this problem, first and foremost by making an alliance with the reformist labor leaders. The chief method used by the bourgeoisie was the isolation of the still young Communist parties from the basic masses of the workers. With this aim in view the bourgeoisie made a number of political concessions to those demands of the working-class which were compatible with the preservation of bourgeois power. At the same time the basic factors of bourgeois power—private ownership of the means of production and governmental power—remained untouched. The bourgeoisie succeeded in isolating the Communist parties. Simultaneously it combined its political manoeuvres with the employment of the most savage terror, destroying part of the most revolutionary-inclined workers and left leaders of the working class.

This policy can be most vividly traced in the history of Germany after the first world war, the Soviet Union. This fight was waged by various means—ranging from various forms of ideological struggle to direct intervention, which, as is well known, proved unsuccessful.

Of course, the struggle against the Soviet Union does not exhaust the content of the foreign policy during that period; there continued to exist very

acute internal contradictions. The chief of these in Europe were the contradictions between Great Britain and France. Britain did not want France to become the strongest power on the Continent and therefore supported Germany against France. The chief contradictions on a world scale were those between Britain and the U.S.A.

In the period between the two world wars, the general crisis of capitalism was considerably deepened. This was reflected in the very profound and prolonged economic crisis of 1929-33. This crisis was succeeded by a depression of a special type, characterised by mass unemployment on a huge scale. The economic features of the general crisis became very clear and tangible for the working masses of the capitalist countries. A political consequence of this was that reformism found it more and more difficult to fulfil its role as the chief bulwark of the bourgeoisie. In some countries, reformism already proved to be incapable of fulfilling this role. In Germany, for example, the Communist Party won a majority of the workers in the decisive industrial centres—in Berlin and the Ruhr area.

Under such conditions the German, Italian and Hungarian bourgeoisie was compelled to look for a new party, a new lever, for holding the working class under its influence. Such a means was found in fascism, the fascist movement and the fascist party. Fascism is a political product of the general crisis of capitalism, and, as Stalin pointed out, the passing to fascism indicates not only the strength, but the weakness of the bourgeoisie. Especially characteristic of the fascist movement in connection with the general crisis of capitalism is the fact that, as a rule, the fascists did not come forward as open defenders of capitalism, they did not say they were backing capitalism, and that the capitalist order was the most perfect social order. On the contrary, they came forward everywhere with anti-capitalist demagoguery, because to come out with an open defence of capitalism in the conquered countries of Europe would have prevented them from acquiring influence among the toilers.

The circumstances confused, for a time, even some of the leading elements of the working class. The theory that fascism is the power of the petty-bourgeoisie, the power of declassed elements, that it is Bonapartism, a power above classes, etc., acquired a certain popularity. All these views, of course, were completely devoid of reality. We know now that Italian, German and Hungarian fascism was financed by monopoly capitalists in these countries.

Fascism, of course, has its specific features in the different countries, for it is everywhere connected with the old reactionary forces of the given country, but basically fascism is the political expression of the deepening of the general crisis of capitalism. Fascism was victorious and came to power first and foremost in those countries which were conquered in the first world war or which were virtually in the position of conquered countries

as, for example, Italy, despite the fact that she belonged to the camp of the victors. In those countries where the bourgeoisie achieved a new, forcible re-division of the world, the bourgeoisie helped the fascist forces because the fascists were not only anti-Marxists, but also chauvinists who undertake the task of defending the capitalist social order and preparing the people for a new war. It should not be forgotten that after the first world war, the majority of the people in all the conquered countries did not want a new war; social-democracy was pacifically inclined, which also lowered its value for the aggressive bourgeoisie of these countries.

This article does not aim at giving an analysis of the causes of the second world war. We shall limit ourselves merely to pointing out that the second world war, unlike the first, did not begin between countries of the same kind. On one side were the fascist aggressors, on the other—the democratic countries; moreover, in the camp of the latter were both the highly developed capitalist countries and the Soviet Union. It is obvious that this circumstance was bound to exert a strong influence on the entire home and foreign policy of the capitalist countries.

The fact that the Soviet Union and the highly-developed capitalist countries were in the same camp of powers fighting against the fascist aggressors meant that the struggle between the two systems in the democratic camp was temporarily mitigated, suspended; but this, of course, did not signify the end of the struggle. At the same time, the struggle between the two systems assumed its most acute form when the fascist aggressors attacked the Soviet Union. The Allies assisted the Soviet Union, but it cannot be said that, in so doing, they forgot about the difference in social systems. The secrecy about the atom bomb is sufficient as an example of this. In the sphere of domestic policies, the Communist parties of the countries of the democratic camp—Great Britain, America, etc.—on the basis of the just nature of the war, helped their governments in the war against the fascists, urged them towards the opening of the Second Front, despite the efforts of reactionary circles in the Allied countries. They defended their people from the danger of German fascism.

It goes without saying that the Anglo-American contradictions—the decisive inter-imperialist contradictions—were also relegated to the background during the war, while the contradictions between the democratic countries and the fascist aggressors came into the foreground; but the Anglo-American contradictions did not disappear and the struggle between America and Britain continued even during the war years. Thus, during the war the Americans took good care that the commodities exported from England should not include more than 10 per cent of the materials which England received by lease-lend. During the war American capital endeavoured, not without success, to squeeze out British capital from its positions in Latin America, and to obtain markets in India and the

British Dominions. The Americans put on the black list of firms with which trade was forbidden, not only purely Argentine enterprises, but also those which had British capital. In the Near East, the struggle for oil continued also during the war.

When the second world war came to an end, the struggle for the preservation of the capitalist system once more became the chief problem in the domestic policy of the capitalist countries, just as it had been after the first world war. The bourgeoisie is scared by the general swing to the left in the working class movement throughout the world after the end of the war. The forms taken by this swing to the left, and its degree, differ in the different countries. It we take such first-ranking capitalist countries as the U.S.A. and Great Britain, it will be found that the swing to the left there was expressed above all in a strengthening of the reformist labor movement. As is known, the Labor Party in Britain won a victory in the Parliamentary elections. In the U.S.A. mass strikes are taking place and the trade union movement has grown stronger. In these countries, although a strengthening of the Communist parties has taken place, they are not yet an important factor in the domestic policy of these countries. The capitalist system in these countries has not been shaken in consequence of the war. This is understandable. In the countries which were victorious in the war, the bourgeoisie was not discredited, the State apparatus remained as before, while the army was even strengthened as compared with the pre-war period. One of the characteristic features of post-war policy is the strengthening of militarism in the Anglo-Saxon countries and especially in the U.S.A., which has become the most powerful military State of the capitalist world.

The situation is quite different in the countries of continental Europe. In these countries the bourgeoisie is discredited. In the life of one single generation, the population of the European countries has experienced two big wars. Now it is forced to starve and, moreover, it is, of course, the industrial workers, the intelligentsia and the urban population who are starving first and foremost, and not the bourgeoisie or the well-to-do peasantry. Under such circumstances, radicalisation, a swing leftward of the working masses and toilers in general, is inevitable. To this must be added, also, another factor, namely, the strong polarisation of capitalist society during the war. Millions of people from the middle strata — artisans, traders, middle bourgeoisie — lost their independence during the war and became workers. Inflation during and after the war reduces to nothing the savings of the middle strata. The tendency towards the polarisation of modern society, to the formation of two camps — the big bourgeoisie and its immediate environment on the one hand, and workers, office employees, intelligentsia, who do not own property, on the other — is extremely strong. This tendency found expression in the defeat of the typical parties of the middle bourgeoisie of town and village as, for example, the Radical-

Socialist Party in France or the Liberal Party in Britain.

The bourgeoisie of the countries which were subjected to German occupation became particularly discredited, because, in the main, the big bourgeoisie of France, Belgium, Holland, Czechoslovakia and Hungary collaborated with the occupying invaders. True, there were isolated exceptions: there were some capitalists in each country who took part in the resistance movement. In the main, however, the bourgeoisie collaborated with the occupiers and this, side by side with the military defeat, was the chief factor in its discrediting.

In addition, however, a number of new, important political factors distinguish the present situation from that after the first world war. One of these new factors is the changed role of the Communist parties of Europe.

As is known, the Communist parties of Europe won great popularity as a result of the leading role they played in organising the resistance movements in all the European countries.

'The growth of the influence of the Communists,' declared Stalin in his interview with a Pravda correspondent on Churchill's speech, 'cannot be regarded as an accident.'

It is sufficient merely to recall the figures of the latest post-war elections in the European countries to be convinced of the tremendous growth of influence of the Communist parties in Europe. In France the Communist Party is practically the largest political party in the country: at the elections on October 21, 1945, and June 2, 1946, it obtained more than five million votes. In Italy, the Communist Party has a membership of two million and is one of the leading political parties in the country. The influence of the Communists has grown considerably also in such countries as Holland, Belgium, Norway, Luxembourg. In Czechoslovakia the Communists obtained about 2.7 million votes and in Hungary about 800,000 people voted for the Communist Party. In almost all the countries of the European continent Communists are taking part in the government and are playing a leading role in restoring the economy of their countries. Finally, Communists have achieved outstanding success in Poland, Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia and Bulgaria, where they are the leading force in the Popular and Fatherland fronts.

In all the countries which were subjected to Hitlerite occupation and where the big bourgeoisie collaborated with the invaders, the resistance movement against the big bourgeoisie of the country as a result of the policy which their parties are now enacting in all countries on the basis of the experience of the first world war. The Communist parties defend the interests of all the working people — workers, office employees, peasants and intelligentsia. This policy makes impossible the old tactics

of reaction — the isolation of the Communists from the working people.

The second new factor distinguishing the present situation from that created after the first world war is the radical change in the position and role of the Soviet Union in world politics. The growth of the influence and prestige of the U.S.S.R. as a world power has had to be recognised even by the enemies of the Soviet Union.

After the end of the second world war the main line in the home and foreign policy of the capitalist countries is once more, as after the first world war, the defence of the capitalist system.

It should be mentioned that Great Britain followed this line during the war itself. Thus, for example, reactionary emigrant bourgeois governments found asylum in Britain. Preparations were carried on to ensure that after the liberation of the countries in question they would be able to return to their countries as the lawful bourgeois rulers.

After liberation of a number of Western European countries, the question was raised of disarming the guerrillas and of excluding, as far as possible, the leaders of the resistance movement from the newly-formed governments. Of course, it is far more difficult now than it was after the first world war to come forward in open defence of the capitalist system in the form in which it existed before the war. In America, it is true, there are influential persons and groups, like Johnson, Senator Vandenberg and the circles supporting them, who call for the return to pre-war capitalism. But these are exceptions. In the main, it is everywhere admitted that a profound reform of the capitalist system is necessary; everywhere ideological trends are to be found, such as the striving for a planned economy under capitalism, the introduction of social insurance, the strengthening of State capitalism, etc.

In Britain, as is known, certain important branches of industry are being nationalised. The fact that the bourgeoisie itself is compelled to nationalise the means of production is, in itself, an admission that the system of private ownership of the means of production is obsolete. There is, of course, a vast difference between nationalisation in Great Britain and nationalisation in those countries of Eastern Europe which may be called countries with a democracy of a new type. In these countries, feudal survivals in the form of large-scale land ownership have been abolished, a considerable part of the means of production has become State property and the State itself is not an apparatus of the rich for suppressing the working people, but operates in the interests of the latter.

In the countries of the old type of democracy, for example, in Great Britain, nationalisation does not alter the distribution of the national wealth and national income, because the owners receive compensation approximately equivalent to their former incomes. In the countries with a new type of democracy, on the other hand, nationalisation means a profound change in the distribution of the national

income at the expense of the former owners of the nationalised means of production.

By what methods is the struggle being waged now to preserve the capitalist system, in the first place in Europe?

First, attempts are being made to strengthen reformism in the labor movement, to convert once again the Social-Democratic Party and the reformist labor movement in Germany, Hungary, Italy and France into the main social bulwark of the bourgeoisie.

In the European countries, an intense struggle to win the Social-Democratic movement is developing between the progressive and reactionary forces. This constitutes the chief content of the domestic policy of the capitalist countries. At the same time, of course, this struggle goes on inside every social-democratic party, between the right and left wings, between the social-democratic working masses, who are much more inclined to march together with the Communists, and the reformist leaders of the Social-Democratic parties, who are endeavouring to revive Social-Democracy in its former, pre-war form.

This struggle can best be followed from the example of Germany. A considerable part of social-democracy has broken with the former policy of its party and called for unity with the Communists. On April 21-22, 1946, a unity congress of the Social-Democratic and Communist Parties of Germany took place, at which a united party of the working class was formed — the Socialist Unity Party of Germany. A large majority of the Social-Democrats in the Soviet-occupied zone were in favour of the amalgamation of the two workers' parties. Despite the counter efforts of the British and American occupation authorities, the union of the Social-Democrats and Communists in the Soviet-occupied zone met with a warm response also in Western Germany.

The emergence of a united party of the working class in Germany is a serious blow to the reformist movement. It is natural, therefore, that all the reactionary elements are up in arms against the new party. Ruling circles in Britain and the U.S.A. immediately came out against the unification of the Communists and Social-Democrats and are now giving decisive support to the group of reactionary social-democratic leaders headed by Schumacher, who are trying to revive the old reformist Social-Democracy in the Western zones of Germany for defence of the capitalist system of society.

It is characteristic that the Schumacher group has been joined by the majority of the old compromised leaders of Social-Democracy, such as Severing, Noske, Paul Loebe, etc., who are tried and tested defenders of the bourgeoisie. The British press openly calls for reliance on this wing of Social-Democracy.

Undoubtedly, the further internal political development of the capitalist countries to a considerable degree depends on the outcome of this

struggle to win over Social-Democracy and on the struggle within Social-Democracy.

The second line of defence of capitalism lies in increasing the influence of religion, of the church. The Catholic Church, headed by the Pope, is creating something in the nature of a "Catholic International." The Vatican recently appointed as Cardinals thirty-two prominent Catholics of various countries in order to increase its influence in those countries. The same effort is characteristic also of the Protestant Church. Definite attempts are made to use the Moslem Church as a means of political struggle. The clearest expression of this is seen in India.

Most peculiar tactics are adhered to by the bourgeoisie.

In those European countries where the extreme right-wing reactionary parties are prohibited, the bourgeoisie employs very special tactics. In those countries the bourgeoisie tries to influence the most right-wing of the permitted Left parties and to get into its hands the leadership of these parties and to obtain a majority for them in the country. A classic example of these tactics is the behaviour of reaction during the recent elections in Hungary. The closest to the Right of the Left parties in Hungary is the Smallholders Party. It was found, after the elections, that this party had obtained the majority of the votes in Budapest, in districts where there is not a single bit of land suitable for cultivation. The whole bourgeoisie and those elements which still follow the bourgeoisie voted for it.

Capitalism's third line of defence, which so far is manifested still in a very veiled form, is encouragement of the fascist movement. If it is true that fascism is the political expression of the deepening of the general crisis of capitalism, it is to be expected that fascism will be revived. Lenin pointed out that the domination of monopoly capitalism inevitably engenders reaction. In his article entitled "On a caricature of Marxism," he wrote: "The political superstructure of the new economy, of monopoly capitalism (imperialism is monopoly capitalism) is a swing from democracy to reaction. Free competition is accompanied by democracy. Monopoly is accompanied by political reaction."

In the capitalist countries at the present time a certain revival of political reaction and fascism is undoubtedly taking place. There are also fascist countries, such as Spain and Portugal. In addition, there is an illegal fascist movement in countries where fascism formerly ruled: Germany, Italy, Hungary, etc.

But there are undoubtedly signs of the revival of the fascist movement in the democratic countries also. Evidence of this is the activity of the fascist party in Britain, the Ku Klux Klan and other fascist groups in America, etc. In Greece, where the British virtually control policy, after dozens of changes of government Royalist reactionaries have finally been established in power; objectively and subjectively they differ little from fascists.

Of course, in the countries with a new type of democracy the revival of fascism is made very difficult because agrarian reform has done away with the landowning class and because nationalisation of the basic means of production has undermined the economic power of the big bourgeoisie. In these we add to this the fact that State power in these countries is in the hands of progressive forces, it becomes clear that the revival of fascism there is made extremely difficult.

As always, the domestic policy of the capitalist countries at the present stage is closely interwoven with the foreign policy.

The methods of struggle against the Soviet Union at the present time differ, of course, from those employed after the first World War. "Intervention" in the old sense is impossible. But the reactionary forces of the different countries are conducting an intensified campaign against the Soviet Union, and are endeavouring to isolate her and build up an anti-Soviet bloc.

In his statement on May 27, 1946, Molotov pointed to certain extremely characteristic tendencies in British and American post-war policy which had been shown during the preparation of the peace treaties. Molotov repulsed the attempts of the reactionary forces to belittle the importance of the Soviet Union and to minimise its role in the post-war world.

Very typical of the policy of the bourgeoisie is the way British reaction uses the right wing of Social-Democracy in Europe for the struggle against the U.S.S.R. Naturally, the Labor Party and the Labor Government are the most suitable for using this wing of Social-Democracy to achieve the foreign-political aims of the British bourgeoisie. In this respect, the existence of a Labor Government is more advantageous to the British bourgeoisie than a Conservative Government would be. To this must be added that, whereas supporters of the Labor Party sometimes came out against the foreign policy of the Conservative Government, and thus there existed a potential opposition to this policy, the Conservative Party has no grounds for opposing Bevin's foreign policy. Of course, the British workers do not approve of this reactionary policy of Bevin and the Labor Government. This dissatisfaction finds expression in the opposition to Bevin's policy within the Parliamentary Labor Party.

Today also, the struggle between two systems is not the sole expression of the foreign policy of the capitalist countries. Imperialist contradictions between the big capitalist countries, in the first place between Britain and America, are reviving, despite the fact that on a number of international issues these Powers form a common diplomatic bloc. The British-American contradictions, which were the basic contradictions of the capitalist world before the second World War, or, rather, before

German fascist aggression became a menace to both Britain and America, have since the defeat of Germany once again become the decisive contradictions within the capitalist world. American policy strives now first and foremost to smash the British colonial empire and to win equal conditions for American capital in the competitive struggle throughout the world. This is its chief aim.

The striving to put an end to the British, French and Dutch Empires shows itself in a great variety of forms. During the war one manifestation of this was the draft British-American Alliance, the proposal for joint tutelage over colonies, etc. Sometimes this striving even assumes ludicrous forms. For example, an American publicist recently wrote a book in which he sharply criticised British, French and Dutch colonial policy. After such a criticism, one might have thought that he would propose that the colonial peoples should be given their independence. Instead, however, the author declares that the colonial peoples are not yet ripe for independence and proposed that all of them should themselves select their guardians, but should not have the right to select as their guardian the imperialist Power which rules them at the present time, i.e., the British colonies may not select Britain as their guardian. The author assumes that they will all most certainly choose the Americans, because the latter, he thinks, behave so well towards colonies and can ensure their prosperity.

The movement against the colonial regime has become stronger. An important factor in this is that the British, French and Dutch have lost their prestige in the colonial countries; the colonial peoples no longer feel their former fear of them. The colonial peoples took part in armed struggle side by side with the troops of some imperialist countries against other countries; they witnessed

the defeat and capture of American, British and Dutch soldiers.

Economic causes also exert an influence in strengthening the anti-imperialist movement. During the war some of the colonies grew very strong economically; some colonial countries became financially independent of Britain and themselves became creditors of her. It goes without saying that public opinion in the Soviet Union is in favour of satisfying the just demands of the colonial peoples.

The plan for a Western bloc is also connected with the colonial problem. A Western bloc which would unite Britain, France, Belgium, Holland, Portugal and perhaps some of the Scandinavian countries in one political alliance is directed first and foremost against the Soviet Union and represents an attempt to revive the notorious cordon sanitaire, only not now on the frontiers of the Soviet Union, where it is politically impossible, owing to the existence of friendly neighbouring countries, but in Western Europe.

But another aspect of this Western bloc should be borne in mind. A Western bloc comprising Britain, France, Belgium, Holland and Portugal would unite 95 per cent. of the colonies of the world. Its creation would be an attempt to defend the colonies against the endeavour of the U.S.A. to smash the old colonial regime and assimilate these territories economically, and also an attempt to strengthen resistance to the national liberation movement in the colonies.

Naturally, within the limits of this article it is only possible to state the most fundamental lines of domestic and foreign policy during the epoch of the general crisis of capitalism. A full elaboration of this theme, and especially of the political consequences of the second World War, is a task requiring a series of special studies.

QUEENSLAND 1947 STATE ELECTION

A. ROBINSON

THE Queensland State Election, following closely upon the Labor Party defeats in South Australia and West Australia, was hailed by the leaders of reaction as a golden opportunity to win control of the Queensland Government. They were disappointed. The reaction of the labor movement to the W.A. and S.A. results was to build a greater degree of unity against the parties of reaction, resulting in the return of the Labor Government.

Five parties entered the field, the Australian Labor Party, the Queensland People's Party, the Country Party, the Australian Communist Party and the "Frank Barnes Labor Party". Every seat was contested for the first time since 1918. In all but two seats, Murrumba and Stanley, there was a Labor Party candidate.

The Country Party and the Q.P.P. reached agreement on allocation of seats long before the election and contested every seat. They had agreed to establish a Coalition Government if their combined parties won a majority.

Mr. Barnes, M.L.A., the self-styled "Bundaberg Bombshell", assembled a team of 12 candidates whom he termed the "Frank Barnes Labor Party". These candidates were drawn mainly from the remnants of the former Social Credit Party, still surviving in some areas as the "Monetary Reform League".

The seats on which the Barnes group concentrated were in areas which in pre-war years were the strongest bases of the Social Credit Party, and where the organised labor movement is particularly

THE ROLE OF THE SOCIALIST PARTIES AFTER THE SECOND WORLD WAR

(First published in "The Bolshevik," No. 17-18, September, 1946. Retranslated from "Cahiers du Communisme," December, 1946.)

THE second world war, which ended in the defeat of the main centres of Fascism and world aggression, Germany and Japan, brought about profound changes in the international situation and in the economic, social and political life of the various countries. Like a spring flood, a broad, democratic mass movement has broken over Europe, recreating and renewing the life of these masses from the point of view of their economy, culture and form of State.

"Taught by the example of the war, the mass of the people have understood that the fate of States must not be entrusted to reactionary politicians, who are pursuing narrow, class aims, completely opposed to the will of the people. That is precisely the reason why the peoples, no longer wishing to live in the old way, are taking the fate of their States into their own hands, setting up democratic regimes and carrying on an active struggle against the forces of reaction, against the instigators of a new war." (Stalin.)

This mighty movement of the people gave birth at the same time to mass organs of democratic action: People's Committees, Committees of the Fatherland Front, National Liberation Committees. In the countries of Eastern and South-Eastern Europe liberated by the Red Army, these Committees gather around them all the healthy popular forces and have become the basis and lever of a State with a new structure.

It is on the basis of these Committees that the co-operation of the democratic, anti-fascist parties and organisations was accomplished which everywhere made possible the isolation of the reactionary, anti-popular elements and groups.

The simultaneous participation of several democratic parties in the work of the new State apparatus does not constitute a mere coalition of parties; it is one of the expressions of the mighty alliance of workers, peasants, artisans and intellectuals.

In the countries of Western Europe, and for different reasons (particularly as a result of the presence of English and American troops in these countries), the organisations of the Resistance Movement have been cast out of the political arena. However, here too the democratic movement of the masses has become broader than ever before.

In the mobilisation and unification of the masses, the decisive role was and is played by the mass organisations of the working class. In all the countries of Europe, free, mass Trade Unions have grown. In France the General Confederation of Labor, which has more than six million members, has become the pillar of French democracy and of the economical revival of the country.

In Italy the Confederation of Labor (which unites more than 5,700,000 workers of all shades of opinion: Communists, Socialists, Catholics, non-party workers) is one of the most important factors in the democratisation of the country. In Poland the mass-sided activity of the single trade union organisation, which has nearly two million members, is the guarantee that the task of the social, economic and political rebirth of the country will be carried through to its conclusion. In Czechoslovakia, the united trade union movement (over two million members) marches in the vanguard of the democratic forces and struggles vigorously for the fulfilment of the State Two-Year Plan for the revival and reconstruction of the economy. Similar activity is shown by the trade unions of Yugoslavia (800,000 members), Bulgaria (almost 500,000 members), Roumania (1,500,000 members), Hungary (nearly a million members). The trade union bodies of Belgium, Holland and the Scandinavian countries have likewise shown a great development.

The creation of the World Federation of Trade Unions, bringing together almost seventy million organised workers, is immensely important, above all through its inclusion of the Soviet trade unions, which comprise several million members and play a large part in its activity.

The extraordinary recrudescence of activity of the Communist Parties in the European countries, likewise the strengthening of their political influence, is an important characteristic of the post-war situation.

Before the second world war, the Communist Parties were banned in many European countries. But even where they were able to carry on legally, sufficient influence on State policy. A completely different situation arose after the war. The French Communist Party (over a million members) won and is represented in the elections of June 2, 1946, 153 deputies. In Belgium, the Communist Party, which had not even 10,000 members before the war, the Communist Party was formed of illegal totalled more than four thousand members. Today its total strength is far more than two million and in-Parties of Denmark, Holland, Norway, Sweden, Communist Parties have likewise grown considerably. The countries like Czechoslovakia (1,300,000 members), Poland (310,000), Bulgaria (over 600,000), Greece, Roumania, Greece, Rou-

In France, Italy, Belgium, Finland and in all the countries of Eastern and South-Eastern Europe, the Communist Parties are directly represented in the governments. The moral authority of the Communists and their representation in the leadership of trade unions and other mass organisations of the workers have increased.

Why has the influence of the Communist Parties developed to such an extent? It is because, in the heroic struggle against the fascist occupation forces and their collaborators, the Communists showed their loyalty to the interests of the people, to the cause of the liberty and independence of their countries. Life itself showed the correctness of the policy of the Communist Parties.

In all the countries of Europe which underwent the bloody horrors of the fascist yoke, the old ruling classes and their parties, with the exception of a few isolated elements, betrayed the peoples of their countries, went over to the side of the invaders. The conduct of the Communists was quite different. The main body of those who initiated, inspired and were active fighters in the resistance movement and the struggle for national liberation was made up of Communists and trade union militants.

And the masses, to whom bitter experience has taught shrewdness, learned to judge the leaders of parties and governments not by their declarations and their promises, but by their actions, and they began to express their confidence in the Communists, all the more so because, since the end of the war, Communists everywhere are showing the only correct way to a real revival of their countries. Basing themselves on several years' experience of the struggle against fascism, and particularly on the practice of the resistance movement, the Communists centre their attention on the achievement of a firm unity of action, on political and trade union unity of the working-class organisations, on the mustering of all the healthy democratic forces of the country in a single camp, as the primary condition for the real revival and democratisation of each country.

The movement for unity of the workers and the grouping together of the democratic forces is a characteristic of all the countries of Europe. It is a sign of the people's desire to follow a new road.

In an interview with the "Pravda" correspondent on Churchill's speech, Comrade Stalin pointed out that the growing influence of the Communists in the countries of Europe could not be considered as an accident, but that it was an absolutely regular phenomenon.

"The influence of the Communists has developed because, during the hard years of fascist domination in Europe, the Communists were staunch, bold and self-sacrificing fighters against the fascist regime and for the liberty of the people."

But the most remarkable characteristic of the post-war situation, which shows how profound are

the changes that have come about, is undoubtedly the tremendous development of the Soviet Union's authority on the international scale. The growing authority of our Soviet State in the international arena encourages the forces of progress and democracy in the whole world, increases their confidence in the possibility of carrying the war against Fascism and reaction through to its conclusion.

This sudden change in the outlook and frame of mind of the masses towards the Soviet Union is not at all accidental. The toiling masses in other countries know that in their emancipation, in the defeat of Hitler Germany and its satellites, the leading role was played by the Soviet Union under the supreme leadership of the great Stalin, was played by the Socialist State.

The example of martial exploits and labor heroism set by millions of Soviet people during the patriotic war, the example of the might of the popular economy of Soviet democracy, played a great part in convincing the workers, the toiling peasantry, the representatives of the best strata of intellectuals of Europe and the other continents. They recognised with more conviction the superiority of the Socialist system over capitalism. They understood more clearly too the great historic mission of that system in the solution of the gigantic post-war tasks.

Business men, the men of the trusts, imperialist circles in the different capitalist countries, very frightened by the breadth of the popular democratic movement, fearing also for their wealth and seized with senseless desire for profits, have raised their heads again. They are not particular about the means used to assist in the regrouping and gathering together of the reactionary elements, including the Fascists who have been left unharmed, so long as the old reactionary regime is re-established in the European countries.

The Vatican, which controls great private resources and enjoys the "liberality" and support of imperialist circles, does a great service for reaction in Europe. It is no accident that in France, Belgium, Italy, Austria, the Catholic parties, which have more or less patched up their programmes and declare themselves to be on the side of "socialism" and "anti-capitalism" are now playing the role of the "classic" right-wing bourgeois parties of pre-war days, becoming the centre of attraction of the whole of bourgeois and capitalist reaction. In a whole number of countries, including the Anglo-American occupation zones of Germany and Austria, as in Italy and France, parties and organisations of a Fascist or neo-Fascist type have already made their appearance and are acting with impunity.

The dark forces of reaction conceal their entry into the political arena beneath deafening shouts of "Liberty," "Democracy," and "Respect for human personality." At the same time, reactionaries of every colour are undertaking with fresh energy an unbridled campaign against the Soviet Union, against the policy of peace that she is con-

sistently and energetically carrying out. All this with the aim of preventing the setting up of a just and sound peace and of stifling the democratic movement of the masses.

Thus, all along, the masses, and above all the working class and the democrats in all countries, are confronted with the necessity of defending their democratic gains, of being on guard to forestall in time new imperialist adventures and acts of aggression, and that means that the democratic left-wing parties, and above all the working-class (Socialist and Communist) parties, are set this task: to display constant vigilance, resist the offensive of reaction, uncover and denounce the reactionary nature of the internal and foreign policy of the imperialist bourgeoisie and its servants, draw together and organise the masses around the working class, and struggle against the creation of aggressor imperialist blocs, in the interests of peace, liberty and the independence of the nations.

How are the Socialist Parties carrying out these tasks? That is undoubtedly the only correct criterion by which to estimate their post-war role!

Let us consider the position of the main Socialist parties in the basic problems of international, and in particular European, life.

We must remember that there is a difference between the viewpoints, the tactics and the practical activity of the Socialist parties taken separately. The leaders of certain parties are trying to restore to life the dead body of the Second International, which passed away ingloriously at the first rumblings of war. Today, the organisational and ideological link between the socialist parties is assured by the British Labor Party, or, more correctly, by the International Section of its Executive Committee, which is headed by the most prominent Labor leaders. However, this link, relatively strong and constant with some Socialist parties, has only a symbolic character with the others.

In fact, two groups of Socialist parties exist, which hold different positions on the cardinal questions of internal and international policy. One of these groups, led by the English Laborites, is composed of the Socialists and Social-Democrats of Western Europe, including those of the Western zones of Germany, the Scandinavian countries, Finland, Austria, and the extreme right wing of the Spanish Socialists (followers of Prieto). In the second group are the Social-Democratic Parties of Eastern and South-Eastern Europe: Polish, Czechoslovakian, Hungarian, Roumanian, Bulgarian, and the Social-Democratic Party of the Soviet occupation zone of Germany, which has amalgamated with the Communists to form the United Socialist Party of Germany. The Italian Socialist Party has a place of its own: its practical activity and tactical positions separate it from the Western parties and bring it closer to the parties of the second group. To appreciate the positions and roles of the Socialist parties, particularly those of Western Europe, we must bear in mind the existence in these parties

of quite a serious rift between the objectives and policy of the official leadership on one hand, and the aspirations of the workers who form the mass of their supporters, together with a considerable part of the young cadres, on the other.

The Socialist parties of the West, as far as their leaders are concerned, have had and continue to have a suspicious, negative and hostile attitude towards the peoples who are struggling to find a new way of development. Following the example of the bourgeois parties, they shiver in their shoes at any demonstration of a real democratic spirit among the masses, at their independent creative activity. The leaders of these Socialist parties were among those who demanded and won the very rapid liquidation of the organs created by the masses at the time of the resistance and the very rapid passage to a "legal order." It was above all in the countries of Eastern and South-Eastern Europe that the Socialist leaders put forward this kind of demand with particular insistence. The popular democratic regime set up in Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Poland and other countries arouses fury and indignation not only among the reactionaries and rank imperialists, which is quite natural, but also among the leaders of the Western Socialists, extraordinary as this may seem on the part of men who call themselves Socialists and democrats.

Churchill, when he expressed the views of the conservative and imperialist circles of England and the United States, branded the regime of popular democracy as "totalitarianism." Yet this same word "totalitarianism" had been used by Bevin, Foreign Minister in the Labor Government (in his speech of August 20, 1945, in the House of Commons) when he spoke of the regimes of Eastern and South-Eastern Europe and when he expressed his approval of the Greek "order."

Two days later, on August 22, 1945, "Populaire," central organ of the French Socialist Party, in a special article devoted to Bevin's speech, rated the terrorist totalitarian regime of Hitlerism higher than that of the popular democracies set up in the East and South-East of Europe. The "Populaire" is disturbed above all over what is being suffered by the financial and industrial magnates. "Populaire" prefers these traitors to the people and thinks the well-deserved punishment of these traitors or their elimination from the leadership of the State is "oppression of the people."

Nationalisation of the banks and trusts, radical agrarian reform, active participation of the masses in the life of the State, control over government officials and employees: all these achievements of the lands of popular democracy disturb the Western "Socialists." The heads of the Western Socialists have a negative attitude towards the Western United Front or towards a bloc of democratic forces led by the working class. In fact, the negative attitude towards the United Front leads objectively

to denial of the need to isolate reaction and consequently assists reaction.

The attitude of the leaders of the Western Socialist parties towards unity of action between Communists and Socialists and towards the creation of united working-class parties is particularly characteristic. For the working class and democracy, these are questions of vital importance. But the leaders of the Socialist parties of Western Europe try with all their strength and by every means to prevent the realisation of this unity. It costs them nothing in words to declare themselves on the side of unity of action and the single working-class party. They are afraid, by openly pronouncing themselves against it to drive away from them the rank and file workers who are insistently seeking for unity. But in fact the Socialist leaders are trying by every possible means to prevent the achievement of unity by bringing forward numerous "arguments" against it. According to them, conditions are not yet ripe, Communist discipline is too strict, its cadres too homogeneous, its forms of propaganda too flexible, and they bring up many other objections.

Their first argument "on principle" is the assertion that the creation of a single party would be contrary to democracy, would shake it to its foundations, would open the way to "totalitarianism" and the "dictatorship" of one party. According to the leaders of the Socialist parties the political and organisational dispersion of the working class or else a split within it constitute one of the principles of democracy, whereas the grouping of the workers in a single party would lead to "totalitarianism." If that is so, would it not seem that totalitarianism rules in England, where at the present time there is only one party in power? If that is not correct, by what logic can one explain the content of Professor Harold Laski's article, written while he still occupied the post of President of the Executive Committee of the Labor Party, which was published in the Roman daily, "Nuova Europa," of September 1, 1945?

In this article, which appeared under the heading "My Advice to Mr. Nenni," Laski deprecates the fact that:

"Mr. Nenni has convinced the majority of the National Council of the Italian Socialist Party of the necessity to achieve unity with the Communists."

Laski cannot believe in such things.

"I hope with all my heart," he says, "that this information is incorrect."

Why did the possibility of unity of the Socialists and Communists of Italy alarm Laski so?

It seems, according to Laski, that Nenni:

"By achieving the United Party, would by that very fact set up a dictatorship. . . . He will come up against the resistance of a series of powerful economic, military and ecclesiastical circles, which he will suppress fiercely."

Thus, the Labor leader Laski does not worry about the Italian working class or people, but "powerful economic, military and ecclesiastical circles." Nenni vigorously rejected this unsolicited sermon. However, the press of the boulevards and that of right-wing reaction in Italy headlined Laski's article and his "arguments" against unity of the workers.

In France, the reactionary parties struggled to have the proposed democratic constitution rejected at the referendum of May 5, 1946, and their main watchword in the course of this electoral campaign was "Save France from the danger of totalitarianism." As if that danger came from the Communists, who persistently seek for the creation of a United Workers' Party! And at the Congress of the Socialist Party which was held recently, the leaders of the right-wing had a resolution passed on the dissolution of the Joint Committee of the Socialist and Communist Parties, and thus dealt a blow to the unity of the working class of France.

Their second argument "on principle" against unity was the slanderous assertion that the Communist Parties are not national parties, but serve the interests of the Soviet Union, acting as a "foreign agency." Leon Blum developed this conception in his book *A l'Echelle humaine* and a series of articles in the "Populaire" which appeared in pamphlet form in October, 1945, under the title *The Problem of Unity*. Blum's formula is taken up today by the leaders and the press of the Western Socialist parties. And not only by them. The extreme right-wing reactionary press in France, in the Scandinavian countries, the Franco press in Spain, that of Yatchin in Turkey and the newspapers of the Brazilian fasciendos (landowners) take up this formula untriflingly and in every key. In November, 1945, it was with this same argument of Blum's that General de Gaulle justified his refusal to grant one of the three ministries of the Interior, Foreign Affairs or War to a representative of the French Communist Party.

(It was through the strange irony of fate that Blum himself was the one to offer the French Communist Party the portfolio of National Defence during the recent Governmental crisis. It was an implicit recognition of the incorrectness of the allegations made by him in the book referred to above—Editor, "Cahiers du Communisme.")

One of the preliminary conditions for unity put forward by Blum to the Communists was that they should break with Marxism-Leninism and take up an anti-Soviet position.

Leon Blum and his supporters try by every means to prevent the achievement of constant united action between Communists and Socialists, which benefits only reaction.

Here is a curious phenomenon: the press of the reactionary circles reacts by launching attacks each time there is a rapprochement between the Socialists and Communists, accusing the Socialists of treason, and prophesying that they will crash (although, in such

cases, we habitually see a recrudescence of the authority of the Socialist Parties and rush of new members). On the other hand, each worsening of relations between the two parties delights the reactionaries and under those circumstances they heap praise upon the Socialist Parties.

Now this is what characterises the position of the Social-Democratic leaders in Western Europe on foreign policy.

In the official programmes of the Socialist parties, it is nearly always emphasised that capitalism means "a policy of force in relations between States" or that "the competition of powerful financial and industrial combinations, trusts and banks in the struggle for markets, the sources of raw materials and colonial territories stirs up conflicts and leads to war . . . etc."

Declarations of this kind are as a rule accompanied by the formal recognition that only Socialism, a Socialist regime, is in a position consistently to apply a policy of enduring peace, co-operation, solidarity and friendship between peoples and States.

But all these are only general phrases. And when the Socialist parties of Western Europe are brought to the point of taking up a practical stand on the most important international problems—above all when it is a matter of contentious questions, differences, contradictions between the Soviet Union and any capitalist State or group of States—the heads of the Socialists of Western Europe, as a general rule, come out against the Soviet Union, defend the stand of its opponents, that of Great Britain for preference. Their solidarity with regard to the external policy of the Labor Government takes on such forms that one is justified in calling these Socialist parties willing or unwilling servants of the British Labor Party. There has been no instance, no question on which the press of the Western European Socialist Parties has not intervened to defend any action of British foreign policy.

Within the Labor Party itself, there are men who often criticise the foreign policy of the Labor Government. According to the press, 67 Labor members intervened on the Greek question, 72 over Spain and 60 over Indonesia, against the stand of the Labor Government. Wilkes, Ziliacus and other members of Parliament strongly criticised the Labor Government's foreign policy, denouncing its reactionary and imperialist nature. However, we find nothing of this kind in the Socialist press of Belgium, France, Norway, Austria, Sweden or Holland. One single line invariably runs through the press of the Western European Socialist Parties: servility, noisy approval of Great Britain's position on all questions of foreign policy.

Hundreds of examples could be quoted for what is stated above. Let us just refer to what was said by the "Populaire," central organ of the French Socialist Party. Commenting on Bevin's speech in August, 1945, on England's foreign

policy, the "Populaire" of 22nd August wrote feelingly:

"Whether it is a question of Poland or Yugoslavia, Bulgaria or Greece, Bevin has said what every Socialist ought to say. And he has said it with authority, for he cannot be suspected of imperialist motives."

The leading role of the Labor Party among the Socialist Parties has, without any doubt, taken on a new meaning with Labor's coming to power. On this point the opinion of the "Journal de Geneve," organ of the Swiss bourgeoisie, of 24th April, 1946, is interesting. In an article headed "Socialist Europe," this paper wrote, to describe the Attlee Government's policy:

"In spite of all their declarations on principle, by the fact that they take their direction from London, the Socialist parties are obliged to defend the interests of the British Empire."

As we know, the leaders of the Western European Socialists were ardent supporters of the Western Bloc. Evidently the idea of such a bloc, including even, in the opinion of some of its members, Germany and Italy (and in the opinion of some others all Europe "up to the Russian frontier"), roused great alarm among the broad masses of the people, who understood instinctively that such an idea would threaten the vital interests of the workers, and have a definitely anti-Soviet character.

Then the Socialists seemed to give up the idea of the Bloc. Yet they in effect continued the same campaign, but with more flexibility, under the banner of "Socialism," under the slogans of "Socialist United States of Europe," "Federation of European States," "Pan-European Socialist Front." This campaign is based on the incorrect and ridiculous argument that Socialism has already triumphed in Europe because Socialists are either in power or included in the Governments in most of the European States. As early as May, 1945, Daniel Mayer, former General Secretary of the French Socialist Party, had announced "the hour of international Socialism" and had grown enthusiastic at the perspective that would soon be realised, "the dream of the Socialist United States of Europe." At the end of October, 1945, at the Congress of Austrian Social-Democracy, Karl Renner, arguing from the fact that Socialists were in the governments of the European countries, declared:

"Socialism is triumphant; today in all the countries of the world."

If we wish to describe the position of the Western Socialist parties, we must particularly consider the Italian Socialist Party, which, so far as most of its members are concerned, holds a special, relatively independent position on the most important internal and international questions.

The Italian Socialists do not stand aside from democracy and the activity of the masses, they took part in the activity of the National Liberation Committees and held that these Committees should be carried on in the future, as important factors in

the democratisation of the country. Rudolf Morandi, Secretary of the Socialist Party, is President of the Central Leadership of the National Liberation Committees.

The Italian Socialists stand for unity of action with the Communists.

"This unity of action is for us," said Pietro Nenni on 1st January, 1945, "the result of the experience of the democratic workers of Western Europe and the experience of the heroic Soviet people."

Some months ago, in August, 1945, the National Council of the Socialist Party, discussing the proposal for unity with the Communists, adopted by a majority of votes (340,000 to 156,000) a resolution in which it declared itself in favor of the rapid creation of the United Workers Party, and expressed the hope that the Party Congress would carry out this fundamental task when favourable objective circumstances were reached. It was precisely this resolution and Nenni's speech which worried Professor Laski and led to his intervention in the internal affairs of the Italian Socialist Party.

At we know, the desire expressed in the resolution was not realised at the Socialist Party Congress which was held at Florence in April, 1946. As Nenni declared, a virulent campaign was let loose, with the help of the bourgeoisie, against the supporters of unity, and it succeeded in isolating the Communists and bringing the Socialists into the centrist bloc.

"In order to terrify and corrupt," Nenni pointed out, "they went so far as to make use of international circles which look on our country as a field for colonisation."

Unlike other European Socialists, the Italian Socialists are against the creation of the Western Bloc. Finally, unlike many Western Socialists, the Italian Socialist Party, as far as the majority of its members are concerned, has a friendly attitude towards the Soviet Union.

A characteristic of many Socialist Parties of Western Europe is their political connection, as far as their right-wing leaders are concerned, with the bourgeois and clerical parties: parallel with this, an ideological connection is being realised between them. This process has a unilateral character, in the sense that the clericals and bourgeois leaders demagogically resorting to an extravagantly "anti-demagogical" social phraseology strongly reminiscent of that used by the Nazis, stick to their conservative positions and defend reactionary ideology, whereas the leaders of the Western Socialists break with Marxism, falsify its content and openly go over to the camp of those who support this bourgeois ideology.

The leaders of Western Social-Democracy dress up the ideas of scientific Socialism with vulgarly sentimental formulae of the petty-bourgeois semi-

intellectuals, scraps of papal encyclicals and philosophical theses of Kant and Pascal, aphorisms of Nietzsche and compilations by De Man, Deat and others. Many workers in the French Socialist Party, in particular those who belong to groups of a Trotskyist type like the U.D.S.R., "O.C.M." and others, propagate the "ideas" of "humanitarian," "enlightened," "Western," "Labor" and "individualist" "Socialism," which resemble everything but Marxist Socialism.

In the book quoted above, Blum bitterly reproaches the Socialists because, in their daily propaganda, they do not pay enough attention to the diffusion of "idealism" and "high-mindedness."

"Explaining" why the French workers did not take power into their hands in June and July, 1940, and on this point referring as an "authority" to the reactionary German philosopher Nietzsche, one of the ideological forerunners of Hitlerism, Blum writes:

"To carry the nation along, nobility, high-mindedness, an ideal presence, proof of disinterestedness and sacrifice to the collective interest, all that Nietzsche somewhere calls 'the lofty style in morality,' all that by which morality is akin to religion and propaganda to apostleship—
—all this was lacking."

One often comes across this kind of reasoning in Blum's book quoted above. The task of raising moral standards is one which must be undertaken immediately.

According to him, one raises moral standards by preaching "humility," "submission." In his old age, Leon Blum has slipped into the morass of reaction and has begun to preach "humility" and "submission" to the workers. It is not hard to understand what classes and whose political calculations profit by sermons of this kind.

Blum's political arguments amount to this, as he sets out himself in his book: in its early days, the Socialist movement was obliged to criticise, to enter into controversies, to struggle, but today controversy and struggle bring no results and are senseless, the time has come for apostleship and the spiritual conquest of men for the triumph of Socialism. And as a proof he gives the existence of "a parallelism of leadership, a possible concentration of effort, and, at the least, a compatibility between the relations and activity of the Roman Church and the Socialist Parties."

The influence of the reactionary clergy is increasing in many Labor Parties.

For its part, the Vatican press frequently expresses its sympathies with the British Labor Party.

The Swedish Social-Democratic Party offers a no less eloquent example of the bourgeois ideological degeneration of Social-Democracy. The 18th Congress of this Party, held in May, 1944, revised the Party's former programme, in spite of the oppos-

tion of George Branting and other left-wing fighters, and excluded the words "exploitation," "class struggle," together with everything that could call to mind the struggle against Nazism and Fascism.

The doctor of philosophy, Torsten Gørlund, editor of the theoretical organ of the Swedish Social-Democratic Party ("Tyden") has become so cynical that he wrote bluntly in 1941:

"We must no longer deceive ourselves; there was a time when we worked on the principle that the task of socialism is the reorganisation of society, but that we cannot carry out this plan of reconstruction because the 'bourgeois' groups oppose it. Speaking frankly, we had no plan of this kind and we cannot tell what our ideas may result in in the future."

And further on, Gørlund explained his idea with more frankness:

"Can the Socialists continue to believe that the aim of Marxist Socialism is a classless society with socialist relations of production? An aim which one is not certain of reaching is absolutely lacking in interest."

This same Gørlund stated his position in 1945 in a book in which he expressed his joy because the Swedish Social-Democratic Party had definitely abandoned Marxism which, according to him:

"Cramped the spiritual life of Social-Democracy in the period when it still held to this teaching."

In Holland, the Social-Democratic Workers' Party, as we know, dissolved of its own accord in February of this year [1946—Ed.] and founded, with four other bourgeois parties and groups (among which were Catholic and Protestant groups) the new organisation, the Party of Labor.

The Swiss newspaper "Journal de Geneve" noted on this point that the Dutch Social-Democrats too had set up their Labor Party after the example of the British Laborites. The President of the Party of Labor, Professor Schermergon, is at the same time the ideological inspirer of Koos Forinka, who led the Dutch Social-Democratic Party before its dissolution and has now become Vice-President of the Party of Labor. Schermergon is known as a propagator of "individualist Socialism." The essence of this "Socialism" lies in the denial of the class struggle, which in fact means the desire to establish capitalism for ever.

Koos Forinka himself, in a declaration relating to the Party of Labor made on the radio in February of this year, noted that Social Democracy had departed from the ideas of Socialism. He admitted that the link between the Social-Democratic Party and the bourgeois parties had been facilitated by the fact that:

"Even before the war, the Social-Democratic leaders, who have collaborated for years with

the representatives of the bourgeoisie in different committees, had learnt to overcome the contradictions."

The Social-Democratic Party of the Western zones of Germany, led by the clique of Schumacher and Co., occupies the same position as a flunkey of military reaction. The German Social-Democrats came out against the democratic reform carried out in the Soviet occupation zone and they tried, together with reaction, to prevent the achievement of the labor movement. They are directly connected with Churchill when they uphold the plans which he puts forward for a United States of Europe with the participation of a "strong" Germany. It is not surprising that splitters of the Schumacher type enjoy the fullest support of the Anglo-American occupation authorities.

It must be noted that the leaders of the Socialist parties of Western Europe do not miss any opportunity to pose as "champions" of the independence and sovereignty of the small States.

The position of the leaders of Austrian Social-Democracy on this subject is characteristic. While they are carrying on open propaganda for pan-Germanism, they pose as "fighters" for the independence and sovereignty of the small nations. Who are these knights who do battle for the "independence of the small States"? They are the same Austrian Social-Democratic leaders who, in their day, have defended "theoretically" and in practice the Anschluss, the idea of annexation of Austria to the German Empire, and who hailed Hitler's realisation of the Anschluss as a great historical advance. Among them Oscar Pollak, Democratic Party of Austria, "Arbeiter Zeitung," held and still holds a prominent position.

This "champion" of the independence of the small States published in London, shortly before the end of the war, a book entitled *Underground Europe Calling*, in which he wrote openly:

"The time of the small national States is over, for their economic independence has become absolutely impossible and re-establishment of their political sovereignty would be a step backward in history."

Borrowing his conclusions from the arsenal of "imperialist economism," Pollak in this book defined the principle of maintaining the "new order" created by Hitler in Europe, perpetuating the enslavement and oppression of the small nations. Quite obviously, at the time when the author wrote this book, he was still, like many reactionaries, cherishing the hope that the war might end in a compromise between Hitler and the Western Powers. The Red Army overthrew his hopes.

(To be concluded in next issue)

PALESTINE COMMUNISTS APPEAL TO U.N.O.

(Memorandum submitted to U.N.O. by the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Palestine, 7th February, 1947.)

ACCORDING to the Charter of the United Nations Organisation, the former Mandated Territories of the League of Nations have to be placed under the trusteeship of the United Nations and to be administered by the Trusteeship Council to be set up by U.N.O.

The principles governing these territories should, therefore, be applied also to Palestine;

"to encourage respect for human rights and for fundamental freedom for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion . . ."

and to promote the progressive development of the inhabitants of Palestine.

"towards self-government or independence, as may be appropriate to the particular circumstances . . . and the freely expressed wishes of the peoples concerned."

The British Government as Mandatory Power has failed to submit a trusteeship agreement in regard to Palestine.

This default is not only a violation of the U.N.O. Charter. The continuation of British rule in Palestine endangers peace and is contrary to the interests of the inhabitants of Palestine.

A. DANGER TO PEACE.

1. Danger to Peace in Palestine.

The situation in Palestine, resulting from the colonial regime and policy of the British Government, is characterised by successive phases of bloodshed and disturbances of the peace. According to the Survey of Palestine, submitted by Government to the Anglo-American Commission of Enquiry, "since the British occupation there have been but few intervals when the problem of internal security has not been a major preoccupation of the Administration."

British police and military rule in Palestine has not been instrumental in preserving peace, but on the contrary has produced a state of tension between Arabs and Jews and the constant danger of bloody disturbances.

Military and police forces in Palestine have been increased to such an extent that there is now one soldier or policeman to every 18 civilians; yet with the increase of "security measures" insecurity has increased.

Far from serving the peace of Palestine, military and police forces have inaugurated a regime of terror in the country (vide: Memorandum of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Palestine on "Outrages Committed by the British Army and Police against the Population of Palestine", submitted to the United Nations Organisation on the 26th November, 1946).

The Budget of the Government of Palestine for the financial year 1946-47 provides for an expenditure of \$P6.4 million, i.e., over 30 per cent. of the total budget, on Police and Prisons. According to official Government figures, expenditure on the "maintenance of law and order" for the period 1920 to 1945 amounted to £P43,352,000, while expenditure on all other services totalled £P96,268,000, including £P22,252,000 expenditure on special measures arising out of the war.

The police and military rule in Palestine is expressed not only by the magnitude of police and prison establishments, but also by the orders and regulations giving every policeman and soldier nearly unlimited power over every citizen. The Defence (Emergency) Regulations, 1945, published in the Supplement to the Official Gazette of 27.9.1945, have abolished the last remnants of personal freedom, freedom of conscience, speech, press and assembly.

Any person may be placed under police supervision, banished to a certain residence, detained or deported from the country. Youths may be whipped, in addition to or without imposing any other punishment.

Requests for Habeas Corpus have been rejected by the Palestine judiciary stating "that the District Commissioner's powers under the Regulations are absolute and that he is not obliged to give any reasons when he acts under the Regulations."

In order to facilitate its rule of oppression, the British Government has applied its well-known policy of "Divide and Rule," producing antagonism between Arabs and Jews by encouraging and assisting reactionary elements among Arabs on the one hand, and reactionary Jewish elements on the other. In order to divert the attention of the Arab and Jewish masses from their common national and social struggle, the British Government places the most chauvinistic demands of Arab and Jewish reactionaries into the centre of agitation and disunion.

Government reaps its political fruits from the policy of Divide and Rule and its support of the reactionary forces among both Arabs and Jews in that it has not to face a united struggle of the Arabs and Jews in Palestine for the abolition of colonial rule, independence and democratisation of the country; instead, Government has succeeded in fomenting hostilities on national lines around such problems as immigration, fear of national domination, purchase of land, employment in Government service and public works, import policy, industrial and agricultural development, taxation, education and health services. Govern-

ment has succeeded in making the reciprocal boycott propaganda of the Jewish and Arab reactionary leadership a characteristic feature of the political and economic life in Palestine, thereby furthering not only its own political ends, but also the sale of British products to the detriment of local production.

Every national, economic and social problem is exploited by Government to stir up one community against the other. For instance, in the Municipality of Jerusalem Government worked up antagonistic demands until it could finally dismiss the Municipal Council and set up municipal rule by British officials.

The present situation in Palestine created by British policy is fraught with grave danger. The Arab and Jewish masses have gained considerable political maturity from the bitter experience of the past. They have so far resisted all attempts at provoking communal disturbances. But British policy in Palestine is continuing its provocations to break down restraint and foment communal riots as in other colonial countries under British rule.

2. Danger to Peace in the Middle East.

Though Palestine is but a small country in the geographic sense, it is of sufficient strategic and economic importance for British imperialism to have made it into a formidable military base. This base is directed not only against the inhabitants of Palestine, but against all the colonial and semi-colonial countries of the Middle East. Egypt or Syria cannot be fully independent while a large imperialist army is stationed at their frontiers.

In addition to using Palestine as a military base against the countries of the Middle East, British policy exploits the Arab-Jewish antagonism of its own making in Palestine for imperialist purposes in all Arab countries. This antagonism is built up into a major problem in Egypt, Arabia, Syria, the Lebanon and Iraq, distorting the peoples' struggle for independence and side-tracking it, as for instance in the promotion of economic boycott, thereby facilitating imperialist domination and exploitation.

3. Danger to World Peace.

The huge military base which the British Government has been building up in Palestine greatly surpasses any needs even of a colonial army of oppression directed against the people of Palestine and the colonial and semi-colonial countries of the Middle East.

The British manoeuvres recently held in the desert adjoining Palestine, where troops were made to fight an imaginary Red Army that had invaded the Middle East, give a clear indication against whom British reactionary circles intend to direct these military preparations in Palestine.

B. OPPRESSION AND EXPLOITATION OF THE PEOPLE OF PALESTINE.

The Covenant of the former League of Nations stipulates the wellbeing and development of the colonial peoples as a sacred task of civilisation. Accordingly, the Mandate for Palestine and Transjordan charges the Administration of Palestine to take all necessary measures to safeguard the interests of the community in connection with the development of the country. It is submitted that the British Government has grossly violated the interests of the population of Palestine.

1. The Political Bondage of Palestine.

Palestine is ruled by Great Britain on the lines of a Crown Colony. The political life of Palestine, after 29 years of British rule, is characterised by the absence of all democratic legislative or executive institutions. British rule has prevented the democratisation of the country, sabotaging even the most elementary initial measures.

Even the Advisory Council established in 1936 is comprised exclusively of British officials.

All power is vested in the High Commissioner. The system introduced by the British military administration after the conquest of Palestine is still in force today.

The executive is composed entirely of colonial officials. Likewise, all higher Government posts in the central as well as the district administrations are filled by officers of the Colonial Administrative Service. Palestinians are excluded from all higher administrative posts.

Nor are the municipal and local council areas governed democratically. The franchise is subject to various qualifications, including rate-paying requirements, in the majority of municipal and local council areas, the right to vote in the election of councillors is vested solely in the propertied classes (at the last Jerusalem elections held in 1935 only approximately 7,000 out of 70,000 adults had the right to vote). In Jerusalem, Haifa, Jaffa and in almost all smaller towns and villages, women are disfranchised.

The High Commissioner may appoint mayors and deputy mayors from among the councillors against the majority vote of the Municipal Council—as has been done in Tel-Aviv. The High Commissioner is free to dismiss a mayor, a deputy mayor or a whole elected municipal council—as has been done in the case of Jerusalem and nine other municipalities.

Existing municipal, local and village councils have very limited powers. They are not allowed to expend even the smallest item without the written consent of the British District Commissioner.

Elections to municipal councils are postponed by Government time and again, in order to keep reactionary majorities in power; in most munic-

ipalities, no elections have taken place for the last twelve years.

Only recently, a further retrogressive measure in the administration of Arab rural communities was introduced by the Village Administration Ordinance of 1944, abolishing council elections.

2. The Economic Bondage of Palestine.

By means of the political bondage, the economic bondage of Palestine is enforced. As in any colonial country within the Empire, the British Government uses the people and resources of Palestine as objects of the grossest exploitation.

Monopoly Capital.

The principal economic positions of the country are in British hands, such as the Dead Sea and electricity concessions, oil refineries and pipe lines, insurance companies, large banks.

The mineral wealth of the Dead Sea—the most important raw material of Palestine—instead of being used to finance the improvement of the conditions of the people of Palestine, their health, education and standard of living, is extracted solely for the benefit of the British shareholders of the Palestine Potash Company. No tax is levied on the company, nor has the company to pay custom duties on imports.

The oil refinery at Haifa (The Consolidated Refineries Limited) is a foreign concern exempted from all payment of custom duties.

Monopoly concessions have been granted to the Iraq Petroleum Company and to the Trans-Arabian Oil Company. These concessions include the right—free of royalties, taxes, import duties or other payments, charges or compensations—to lay pipelines through any part of the country, to expropriate land, to seize any wood, stone, water and other local materials required, to import cheap labor regardless of existing immigration laws, to pass freely the border of Palestine, to build and use their own harbours, railroads, aerodromes and wireless stations, to exact port taxes for harbouring and loading, and to keep their own police force. The population of Palestine does not derive even cheaper oil and petrol from these concessions, granted by Government without any consultation of the people.

Monopolistic concessions have been granted to two foreign concerns for the supply of electricity in Palestine. The concessionaries have the right—without payment of any royalties and taxes—to exploit the water power of Palestine and to fix exorbitant rates. They have to pay no import duties on machinery, nor any other import duties until a tax-free dividend of eight per cent. is secured to their shareholders. No steps are taken by Government against them, when failing in their obligations to supply the public with electricity (Jerusalem).

The power of foreign monopoly capital can be gauged from the fact that in 1943 two companies,

the Palestine Electric Corporation and the Palestine Potash Company, owned over 40 per cent. of the total industrial capital investments in Palestine.

By agency of the Palestine Government, British monopoly capital has succeeded in securing majority holdings and cartel rights with regard to purchase areas and prices for raw materials and sales areas and prices for manufactured goods in numerous secondary industries which have been made subservient to British monopoly interests.

The British Government has exploited the war against Fascism in order to extend the hold of British monopoly capital over additional fields of the economy of Palestine. The British monopoly concern, Steel Brothers, deprived in the course of the war of their dividends from Burma, were made sole Government Agents, with a transport monopoly as well as a trade monopoly in all important foodstuffs consumed by the people of Palestine, resulting in an enormous increase in the cost of living and exorbitant profits to the monopoly concern.

The British Government uses Palestine as a market for British goods and, in the interest of British trade, hinders the development of competitive local industries.

War conditions compelled Government to permit an expansion of certain local industries within the limits of war requirements. But since the end of the war, Government does everything in its power to strangle industrial development through an import and control policy maintaining inflationary conditions in this country which heavily burden the masses of the consumers and render local industries non-competitive with British industry. The means employed towards this end are:

- (1) Restrictions on the import of modern machinery.
- (2) Restrictions on the import of raw materials, combined with a licensing policy directing the purchase of raw materials for Palestinian industries towards the most expensive sources.
- (3) Maintenance of a high cost of living by a policy restricting imports of cheap foodstuffs from so-called hard currency areas, closing of cheap empire sources of foodstuffs to Palestine consumers, maintaining a purchase monopoly for certain foodstuffs from countries with inflationary price levels; restricting the import of cheap building materials with the purpose of creating a high level of rents for workers' flats and industrial premises; and enforcing a large number of unsocial measures burdening the masses of the population.

Local Agriculture.

The importance of the agrarian problem in Palestine is indicated by the fact that the majority of its inhabitants live on and from the land.

As in other colonial and semi-colonial countries under British rule, the British Government in Palestine does not support the development of a well-balanced agricultural economy, supplying the requirements of the local market, but directs its policy towards an excessive expansion of a monocultural product—citrus—which renders the country dependent on the metropolitan market, and the large planters subservient to British interests. The complete neglect of general agriculture is illustrated by the allocation for agriculture of a mere 3 per cent. of the total budgetary expenditure.

Government has done hardly anything to provide farmers and tenants with cheap credit for the purchase of seeds, fertilisers, livestock, machinery, or for land amelioration. The large banks—Barclay's, Anglo-Palestine and other institutes representing foreign banking interests—heavily burden local agriculture with exorbitant interest rates. Through this policy, Government has strengthened the position of usurers in their dealings with tenants and small farmers, and has forced tenants to abandon their land, and small peasants to sell their land to large owners and large land purchasing companies.

Government does not support any irrigation schemes. The import of modern agriculture machinery is restricted by an unsympathetic import policy. During the war, the import of fodder was handed over to a private monopolist (Cegla) who drew huge profits from poultry and dairy farmers. There are no Government laboratories for undertaking research in agriculture problems. After more than a quarter of a century of British occupation, the land survey is still far from complete.

The Government Budget.

The budget, dictated by Government without consultation of the population, is characteristic of the colonial policy of exploitation and oppression—as regards both revenue and expenditure.

Revenue.

More than 50 per cent. of the revenue is obtained by indirect taxation, such as customs duties for imported articles and excise duties on local products. From year to year, indirect taxes are growing relatively and absolutely, burdening the masses of the population. Only a quarter of the total revenue is derived from direct taxation.

Capital taxation or death duties to be borne by the propertied classes do not exist, while on the other hand such archaic taxes as tithes and animal tax are still in force.

Income tax—only recently introduced—burdens particularly the small taxpayer, since inflation of prices has drawn a large number of workers and employees into the orbit of income tax payment, while the large incomes are relatively little affected. The huge incomes of the foreign concessionaries, extracted from the resources of the country, are not subject to income or other taxes and duties.

Local companies pay a flat rate of 25% on declared profits.

From the much advertised British Colonial Development Fund, Palestine has received in 11 financial years (1933-34 to 44-45) the meagre pittance of £P133,094.

Expenditure.

Of the huge sums extorted from the masses of the people of Palestine, hardly anything is spent towards their economic, social, educational, or hygienic improvement. Over £P6 million per annum, i.e., over 30% of the total expenditure is used to finance the oppression of the people—police and prisons.

In 1945-46, nearly £P8 million were expended by the Control Departments, not in the interests of the masses, but for the benefit of a small section of milling interests, cattle dealers, butchers, Government agents and blackmarketeers, as well as on political bribes paid to large exporting interests in neighbouring countries in the form of grain export monopoly to Palestine.

On education, health and other social services, the Government spends about eight per cent of the total budget. The disgraceful state of education in Palestine illustrates this side of colonial policy.

Among the Arab population in towns, 60% of boys and 45% of girls of school-going age attend school; in villages 40% and 5% respectively; 23,000 Bedouin children do not receive any schooling at all. After 29 years of British rule in Palestine, 70 per cent. of the Arab population are completely illiterate.

Even among the Jewish community, which contributes towards its own educational system, about 10,000 children do not receive any school education; 30% of children at the age of 10 years, 40% at the age of 11 years, 55% at the age of 12 years and 65% at the age of 13 years do not attend school.

The small number of professional schools and agricultural institutions existing in Palestine have been established by private means without Government assistance.

The Question of Displaced Jews.

The linking, in promotion of the various Imperialist as well as Zionist political aspirations in Palestine, of two entirely different problems, i.e. the Palestine problem and the problem of displaced Jews in certain parts of Europe and of the Jewish masses in countries where they are subject to persecution or discrimination, adds to the difficulties in Palestine, without striking at the roots of anti-Semitism.

The eradication of anti-Semitism and racial and religious persecution can be achieved only by the complete destruction of the political, economic and social roots of Fascism and reaction, the implementation of the principles laid down in the charter

of the United Nations Organisation, and by the victory of genuine democracy.

The rehabilitation of displaced Jews is one of the most urgent postwar problems. Palestine cannot solve the problem of the large number of Jews displaced by Fascism and war. The resettlement of homeless Jews in their countries of origin should be facilitated. For this purpose, the governments and Jewish communities of the new Eastern and Central European democracies should be assisted in establishing close contacts with displaced Jews in the camps of Germany, Austria and Italy.

Displaced Jews unwilling to return to their countries of origin should be given immediate opportunities to emigrate and settle in democratic countries overseas or in Europe, whereby individual requests should be given the fullest possible consideration.

The question of immigration of displaced Jews into Palestine must be solved by Arab-Jewish agreement within the framework of a general democratic agreement on the Palestine problem and

within the framework of the international agreement on the future of displaced Jews.

SUMMARY.

Since the basic problem of Palestine is the consequence of British colonial rule, which endangers peace and violates the political, social and economic interests of the inhabitants of our country, the Communist Party of Palestine herewith appeals to the United Nations Organisation to apply the terms of its Charter to Palestine, to declare Palestine free and independent and to order the evacuation of the British Army of occupation. Any other plan forced on the peoples of Palestine by an Imperialist power can only aggravate the problem. We appeal to the United Nations Organisation to assist the peoples of Palestine in setting up a democratic Arab-Jewish state, based on an internationally guaranteed democratic constitution which provides complete equality of national rights for both Arabs and Jews, and secures full civic rights to all inhabitants of Palestine, irrespective of race, sex, creed or nationality.

MOLOTOV ON DISARMAMENT

Speech by V. M. Molotov at UNO General Assembly Session on December 13, 1946.

Mr. Chairman, Messrs. Delegates!

I have already had occasion to outline from this platform the viewpoint of the Soviet government on the question of general disarmament. We have heard with great interest the viewpoints of other governments on this question both in the committee which discussed this matter and in the General Assembly.

The international situation today differs in many respects from that obtaining after the first world war. We know, for example, that the Germany after the second world war is not the Germany after the first world war. Japan too after the second world war is not the Japan after the first world war. If we do not forget that Germany and Japan, the two main aggressive powers, one in the West, the other in the East, set the tone for the aggressive forces before the second world war and that it was these countries which unleashed the last war and involved in it all countries, great and small, then this radical change in the position of Germany and Japan is highly important for understanding the international situation.

This also presupposes that in our policy towards the former aggressive states we pursue to the end a policy and uphold principles which correspond to the interests of universal peace. We must carry through to the end the demilitarisation of the former enemy states, their actual disarmament, and establish strong control so that they cannot again become an aggressive force. We must prosecute to the end the struggle against fascism, the struggle for the democratisation of these states — as the allies recognised while the war was still in progress.

So, as regards the forces of aggression, we now have conditions which favor action in line with the tasks of forestalling fresh aggression.

An important circumstance also is the fact that today, after the second world war, there are no countries holding aloof from the newly established world organisation for the consolidation of peace and security.

The situation in this respect too is very different from that obtaining after the first world war. Today all countries, great and small, which deserve the name of democratic states, belong to the United Nations organisation. The exceptions to this rule are very negligible. And this constitutes a very important prerequisite for settling the problem of which we are speaking today, the problem of general disarmament.

It must be admitted that today much depends upon ourselves, upon our common efforts, upon our desire to co-operate with one another in the interests of universal peace, without counterposing one country to another, without forming blocs of some states against other peace-loving states and, at the same time, without indulging in a policy expressive of a desire to subordinate other states to the dominant influence of some strong country. It is by working in the spirit of the purposes and aims that form the basis of the United Nations organisation that we can and should strive to safeguard general peace and the security of the nations.

Now permit me to turn directly to the resolution which has been put before us for consideration.

Two ideas were laid at the foundation of the Soviet draft for a general reduction of armaments when it was submitted to the General Assembly.

In the first place, we deemed it important for the United Nations organisation to state its firm opinion that general disarmament was needed; in the second place, we considered it necessary for the United Nations organisation to voice the need for banning the production and utilisation of atomic energy for military purposes. The draft resolution submitted embodies both these ideas. I do not conceal the fact that the Soviet delegation wanted to have the basic proposals which it had put before the General Assembly expressed more definitely. However, the resolution submitted embodies in another form the fundamental ideas both of a general armaments reduction and of banning the production of atomic energy for military ends. That is why the Soviet delegation is satisfied with the results of the committee's work and with this resolution which has been submitted to the General Assembly for endorsement.

Today, especially much has been said here about utilising atomic energy for military purposes. And that is quite understandable, since that weapon deserves particular attention at this time. That was why the Soviet draft pointed out that banning the utilisation of atomic energy for military ends was a primary task. The draft resolution correctly indicates the need for accelerating both the work of the atomic commission and the mapping of a convention banning the utilisation of atomic energy for military ends. The latter is particularly important. Everyone understands that the atom bomb is not a defence weapon. Therefore, when we are told there is need for the defence or protection of one's state, it should be clear to us, naturally, that such tasks are not tasks to be accomplished with the atom bomb. The atom bomb, as is known, is designed for foreign territories, not for the defence of one's own territory.

The resolution that has been put before us will become, we are certain, a decision of the General Assembly, which will constitute the first step in carrying out the idea of general disarmament. This decision of the General Assembly will have to be followed by other steps, by further measures, which the Security Council will have to work out. That is an extremely important task of the Security Council. And it remains for us to wish it success in working out and effecting these further measures. For the present, the Soviet delegation expresses its satisfaction with the initial results of the work on this point of a general armaments reduction and with the co-operation we have achieved in the preparatory work in this matter.

We still hear today that the question of general armaments reduction arouses certain apprehensions among representatives of some states. Some speak for an armaments reduction but in a sort of uncertain voice. It goes without saying that this is such an important and involved question that haste in

this matter is not advised by any one. At any rate, we should assume a confident tone about the fact that this problem has become a serious, urgent task which all of us should tackle today. We must not think that the more troops we have on the territories of other states, the more military, naval and air bases we have on territories near to us and far beyond the frontiers of our states, the better will security and peace be guaranteed.

Certain information has already been given here about a question concerning which not a little has been said lately, that is, information about troops on foreign territories. But, naturally, this information at such a meeting could not be given in complete form, it could not be exhaustive. The Soviet delegation would wish that the proposal to which we have given special consideration, that is, the question of troops on foreign territories, might likewise suffer no delay and might also find its solution. Then we shall all know exactly where and what troops of our states are disposed outside our countries, where and what military bases the various states have. And at this particular time, while we are taking a decision on a general armaments reduction and the banning of the manufacture of atomic energy for military ends, such information would be especially useful.

The adoption of a decision for a general armaments reduction would also have its effect in the economic sphere, for one thing on the budgets of the states. Indeed, it is no secret that the military budgets of certain states today are very swollen. The population will highly approve a decision for a general armaments reduction and for the curtailing of military budgets, incidentally, because that will make it possible really to ease its tax burden and counteract an inflation of prices on goods. All this seriously affects the most vital, material interests of every toiler. Therefore it should be hoped that one of the immediate practical conclusions to be drawn from our decision today will be a curtailing of swollen military budgets, bringing them to a more normal state, and an easing of the burden of the military budgets for the population. This will meet with great approval in all countries.

I should also like to remind you that in taking a decision for a general armaments reduction we should not forget that in certain cases even today, the second year after the termination of the second world war, frenzied propaganda for a new war is being conducted. It should be clear to us that the encouragement of such propaganda does not accord with the interests of a general armaments reduction. When freedom of the press and other fine things are mentioned to us in connection with that, one would like to say — why should freedom of the press be utilised first and foremost by the propagandists of a new war, and why cannot we, the opponents of this harmful propaganda, make use of freedom of the press to administer a concerted rebuff to moulders of the press and moulders of public opinion of this sort?

The present General Assembly has already taken and will still take a number of decisions. Decisions of varying significance will be adopted; some of greater significance, some of lesser. It seems to me that none of us can have any doubts that the decision for a general armaments reduction will be one of the most important decisions of the General Assembly.

It has been adopted unanimously in a committee representing all our countries. That shows again that this decision is being taken in good time. A unanimous decision on so important and involved a problem as a general armaments reduction has been

possible only because we have all acknowledged the matter to be timely and urgent. Moreover, this decision accords with the fundamental interests of all nations, great and small. We adopt it unanimously, cognizant of the fact that this decision is in the interests of our peoples, whom we serve, and in the interests of universal peace.

That is why the Soviet delegation is confident that the unanimity reached in preparing this decision will also be displayed when the Assembly votes on the decision for a general armaments reduction. (Applause.)



BOOK REVIEW

J. W.

LUDWIG FEUERBACH (F. Engels)

THE MATERIALIST CONCEPTION OF HISTORY (G. V. Plekhanov)

THE philosophers have only interpreted the world in various ways; the point however is to change it," wrote Marx in his famous theses on Feuerbach.

Dialectical materialism gives the key by which we can begin to understand the world and, by understanding, to change it. That is why a study of philosophy is held to be of importance by Communists.

In 1845 Marx and Engels had arrived at the theory of dialectical materialism. In that year Marx jotted down the eleven theses on Feuerbach — short concise statements of the essential bases of the world outlook which were later developed in detail by himself and by Engels, Lenin and others.

The eleven theses are printed as an appendix to Engels' Ludwig Feuerbach. In his preface Engels describes them as "the first document in which is described the brilliant germ of the new world outlook."

Ludwig Feuerbach himself was not written until 1886 and it is one of Engels' last philosophical works. It was originally written as a critical discussion of a book on Feuerbach's philosophy. But, in fact, it is much more than this. It still remains, though brief, one of the most clear and concise statements of all the basic principles of dialectical materialism.

Marx and Engels were profoundly influenced by Hegel and by Feuerbach. Hegel's philosophy was dialectical. That is, he studied things in their relations one to another and in process of development and change. But Hegel was an idealist; he viewed thought as primary and matter as secondary.

Feuerbach broke through post-Hegelian idealism and reaffirmed the materialist philosophy which holds that matter is primary—that the material world exists outside and independent of man's thought.

Engels of course supports Feuerbach's materialism in this regard. But whereas Feuerbach's materialism was a mechanical materialism in which there was no conception of development, no understanding of the way in which man's thought itself enters into and affects the development of history, Engels shows that what is needed is not only a materialist outlook, but the study of processes in their development—a dialectical materialism.

"Matter is not a product of mind, but mind itself is merely the highest product of matter. This is, of course, pure materialism. But having got so far, Feuerbach stops short."

He stops short, writes Engels, of "the great basic thought that the world is not to be comprehended as a complex of ready-made things, but as a complex of processes, in which the things apparently stable no less than their mind images in our heads, the concepts, go through an uninterrupted change of coming into being and passing away, in which, in spite of all seeming accidentality and of all temporary retrogression, a progressive development asserts itself in the end."

Plekhanov's Materialist Conception of History elaborates that section of Feuerbach dealing with the Marxist view of the development of history. It was written eleven years after Ludwig Feuerbach and the two essays can very well be read in conjunction.

Plekhanov was one of the most brilliant writers on Marxist philosophy. His style is extremely lucid and readable. Lenin insisted on Plekhanov's works being included in a "series of obligatory text books on Communism."

Plekhanov criticises in particular the common accusation made by bourgeois intellectuals that Marxism attempts to explain everything as depend-

ent on the 'economic factor.' All the various 'factors' in society—law, religion, race, and so on—which are individually used by one or the other philosopher to explain historical movement, are shown by him to be interconnected parts of one universal history and dependent basically on the state of the productive forces.

While his analysis of the way in which systems of philosophy, law, etc., are determined by the mode of production is essentially sound and in full accord with Engels' statement of the problem, Plekhanov does not show clearly how development is determined by the 'unity and conflict of opposites' which, to Lenin, was the 'essence of dialectic.' The basic 'opposites' in class society are the forces of production and the relations of production.

Perhaps it is too much to ask that in a short essay he should have dealt fully with this aspect too. Nevertheless it is as well to bear in mind that

the failure to understand this principle was Plekhanov's chief philosophical weakness. It was largely this which led him to an incorrect view of the revolutionary movement in Russia and which brought him in the end to the ranks of the Mensheviks.

At the same time this does not destroy the value of his **Materialist Conception of History**. It remains an excellent statement of a basic part of dialectical materialism and one which, because of its vivid presentation, is invaluable for those who wish to understand Marxism.

Both pamphlets are published by the Foreign Languages Publishing House, Moscow. A translation of Ludwig Feuerbach was previously available to English readers, published by Charles H. Kerr and Co., Chicago. If anyone has a copy of that translation he should scrap it. It is full of mistranslations and distortions.

? Questions & Answers

conducted by
L. H. GOULD

With reference to **Socialism, Utopian and Scientific**—what was its central teaching, and what are the main practical lessons for us today?—C.L.

THE central teaching of **Socialism, Utopian and Scientific** is the Materialist Conception of History. Marx's great original contribution to science. This new conception provides the only authentic, the only proven method of analysis of all the important questions in the domain of philosophy, natural science and social phenomena. The application of this conception, or method, disclosed for the first time the essential factors in mankind's evolution from primitive times to the present, revealed the class struggle as the immediate driving force of history, and elucidated the role of the modern proletariat as the creator of the new classless Socialist society.

"The Materialist Conception of History," writes Engels, "starts from the proposition that the production of the means to support human life and, next to production, the exchange of the things produced, is the basis of all social structure; that in every society that has appeared in history, the manner in which wealth is distributed and society divided into classes or orders, is dependent upon what is produced, how it is produced, and how the products are exchanged. From this point of view the final causes of all social changes and political revolutions are to be sought, not in men's brains, not in man's better insight into eternal truth and

justice, but in changes in the modes of production and exchange. They are to be sought, not in the philosophy, but in the economics of each particular epoch."

The particular purpose of **Socialism, Utopian and Scientific** (which, by the way, is only a part of his much larger work, **Anti-Duhring**) was to explain how early 19th century Socialism, which was unscientific or "utopian", became scientific with the discovery by Marx of the Materialist Conception of History and his revelation of the secret of capitalistic production through surplus value.

Why was pre-Marxian Socialism utopian? Those early Socialist movements were led by great thinkers and humanitarians (Owen, Fourier, St. Simon) who, in brilliant fashion, exposed the corruption and injustices of capitalism, but who sought a solution in "men's brains," in imaginary good intentions of some contemporary rulers, in non-existent "eternal" truths and principles. They produced all sorts of plans and schemes, instead of seeking the answer in "the stubborn facts of the existing system of production" (Engels). These Utopian Socialists lived at a time when the contradictions of capitalism had not yet become fully revealed; when history had not yet finally demonstrated the bourgeoisie to be a superfluous class; when the workers were not sufficiently organised as a class "to seize the public power", and transform

the privately-owned means of production into public property.

Thus, Engels shows why it was that the Utopians could only criticise the capitalist mode of production and its consequences. Utopian Socialism 'could not explain them, and therefore, could not get the mastery of them. It could only simply reject them as bad'. With Marx's discoveries, Socialism became a science. And Engels adds: "The next thing was to work out all its details and relations."

The main practical lesson today is again, just as Engels taught 60 years ago, to base theory and practice on "stubborn facts," and avoid the subjectivism and one-sidedness of the utopian, the reformist, the anarchist and phillistine. The most important "stubborn facts" in world politics today are as follows:—

First, the capitalists have demonstrated a hundred times over since Engels' day their 'superfluity' as a class. Consider the German monopoly-capitalists (or imperialists) who massacred and enslaved tens of millions to preserve their profit-making, and "justified" their monstrous crimes with fascist "race" theories. Today, the direst menace to mankind comes from power-drunk American billionaires—maniacs armed with atom bombs, who are propagating the "American century" and like fascist-militarist doctrines. They are superfluous as a class if viewed only from the standpoint of ensuring the very existence of the human race!

Second, and in complete contrast, the toiling masses everywhere have revealed their wonderful

capacity for organisation, for "historic initiative," for social vision and cultural progress. These capacities are most brilliantly exemplified in the Socialist Sixth of the earth. The struggle for our own emancipation will be all the more rapidly advanced to the degree that we render practical assistance to the new democracies of Europe and to the colonial peoples "storming heaven" against tremendous odds. The more rapid the strengthening of international solidarity, the sooner will be realised the "amalgamation of the toilers of all countries into a single world economic system" (Stalin).

Finally, the "stubborn facts" of history have demonstrated beyond all doubt that the Communist Party is the vanguard of the working class, the true leadership of all the democratic masses. In Australia, as in all other lands, the Party becomes the leadership of the nation (i.e., all the people except, of course, the exploiters). In guiding the movement towards the ultimate Socialist objective, the Australian Communists defend and advance the working and living standards of the Australian people. The Communists will concern themselves in the next period with two particular tasks, the preservation of peace and the fight against the effects of the coming depression.

By so doing we shall bring "the science of society . . . into harmony with the materialist foundation, and reconstruct it thereupon" (Engels).

(References: Engels, **Anti-Duhring**, Feuerbach, Marx and Engels, **Manifesto of the Communist Party**.)

ATOM CANNOT BE MADE A WAR OFFICE SECRET

PROFESSOR JOLIOT-CURIE

Director of the French Government Atomic Energy Commission

SCIENTIFIC discoveries are the raw material of human progress. Since modern times, scientific research has been a common patrimony at the disposal of scholars and technicians.

This common property created a solidarity throughout the world and kept going a spirit of international mutual help. Each seeker after knowledge, whatever his particularity may be, constantly benefits from discoveries made in every part of the world.

If 30 people of the highest intelligence working together on one problem are suddenly separated, each one is reduced to a thirtieth of his former efficiency.

For myself, I realise that I have only been able to achieve certain results, thanks, for instance, to Rutherford, Niels Bohr or Hahn, not to mention my French colleagues, to English, American and Italian scientists, and so on.

I acknowledge my debt of gratitude to them, and am only too happy if my work has enabled cer-

tain English or American research workers to progress along a path which I was lucky enough to open to them.

I consider as very dangerous the position taken up by the United States during recent talks regarding the maintenance of secrecy over atomic research, because keeping the secrets of the atomic bomb appears as a means of pressure.

What is serious is that it should be claimed by certain people that it is possible to keep secret results obtained by scientific research in the field of Nuclear Science.

It would thereafter be impossible to visit laboratories of our speciality, to keep going normal relations with colleagues who are friends and with whom we have for so long collaborated over distances and frontiers.

It is true that for a long time we have been accustomed to industrialists keeping to themselves their technical secrets and methods of manufacture, but this is the first time that the free diffusion of

the results of pure science has been forbidden by Governments.

This principle of secrecy once accepted, there is no reason why it should not be extended to all fields of science.

Chemistry, electricity, medicine, biology, even astronomy, lead to discoveries which affect the condition of man and can be applied to a decisive manner to economics or war. If secrecy is extended to these sciences the progress of civilisation will be slowed down, and may even be halted.

We count on the union of scientists in every country to struggle against the maintenance of secrecy and to obtain the widest publicity for all discoveries.

For he who says civilisation, says communication. If our species has become the human species, it is doubtless because we have a fairly large brain and hands, and above all because we have been able to create language, which enables men to communicate with one another other than by gestures and grimaces.

The stagnation of civilisation at certain periods seems to me due to the isolation of men in small groups.

It is significant that in the Middle Ages the best spreaders of civilisation were the Troubadours, who gave the different groups contact with one another.

The Renaissance is particularly the establishment of a vast circulation of thought among men.

Is it desirable now to stop this circulation, this universal language, by decree? This would take us back to Merovingian times, to the years before Charlemagne.

The result would be a race for scientific armaments. Each nation would think that its rival was outdistancing it and would want to catch up.

Nuclear energy would no longer be the servant of civilisation but only its destroyer.

If the impossible happened, and two great Powers found themselves to be the sole possessors of the monopoly of this secret arm, other countries, in self defence, would hasten to discover and use arms more secret, more terrible, and, above all, more treacherous.

With the development of these great arms, war could become so secret that men would know nothing of its start.

But in the future, a country feeling secure through having in its possession a hundred atomic bombs would one day be warned by its statisticians: "For five years now," they would say, "the number of abortions in the central districts has grown to such proportions that there is not one normal birth in six; in the coastal parts fires destroying our stocks have gone up tenfold; invasion by unknown parasites has destroyed the harvests; the drought in the North has deprived the country of its electrical energy."

Official headquarters and parliamentarians would pore over these figures, make graphs and

find one explanation only of these multiple catastrophes — for several years war has been waged against their country with immense destruction and a considerable number of victims.

The enemy at that moment might already have obtained decisive victories and the country be conquered without having fought. All that would be left to it would be to capitulate, to destroy the stock of atomic bombs on which it had blindly relied for its security and which had proved as much an illusion as a line of concrete in 1940.

When the world realises the possibilities of secret war of this kind people will start living in a perpetual stage of siege.

As far as we French scientists are concerned, in spite of this regrettable secrecy, it is possible for us to construct machines for the purpose of producing new radio-active elements and to liberate atomic energy for beneficial purposes, for France is the country which gave birth to and developed nuclear physics. And that is our aim.

The atomic bomb represents but one of the applications of nuclear energy. Let us hope it becomes the least important to mankind.

These machines supplying energy will enable important quantities of radio-active elements to be made, the application of which will be of the greatest use for industry, and will open the way to certain successes in biology and medicine.

One can even foresee pacific applications of the atomic bomb itself. It could doubtless be used to transform the surface of large portions of the earth, or to make clouds and bring down rain over huge areas.

Or it could, under suitable conditions — for example, in coal-seams placed between hard, heat-resistant rock layers—turn quantities of coal into industrial diamonds, to the benefit of engineering.

We know even now that one day we shall be able to modify contour and climate; it may be that before too many years have gone by we shall be able to do this; at least we are glimpsing hitherto unthinkable possibilities.

New radio-active elements are going to permit of chemistry at a very high temperature, approaching that of the solar surface.

We will work as much as is necessary to bring, within the scope of our country, our contribution to the international industrial and scientific development which will enable men to progress.

If secrecy is maintained, that will not prevent us from pushing forward with our work and arriving at results which will be both honorable and profitable.

But a nation can only justify its independence by exporting its achievements and by the blossoming of its thought. We are working to this end, and France will bring to the world its share.

We are optimists. We are certain that men will not allow progress to be shackled by a monopoly in thought.