

28 FEB 1935

# THE COMMUNIST REVIEW

October, 1934

---

## Principal Contents

---

The Federal Elections and  
The Future

---

Lenin on the Coming  
World War

---

Hitler's Coup d'Etat

---

**Price - - THREEPENCE**

---

ORGAN OF

THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE  
COMMUNIST PARTY OF AUSTRALIA  
605 GEORGE STREET, SYDNEY

---

---

# The Communist Review

---

Vol. 1, No. 7.

SYDNEY, N.S.W.

OCTOBER, 1934.

---

## *The Federal Elections and The Future*

(By R. DIXON)

The Federal elections have not revealed any marked swing away from the U.A.P.-U.C.P. group. The U.A.P. has lost seats, but only where they were won by a slender majority in 1931, seats which formerly were always considered as safe for the Labor Party. This means that the U.A.P. will no longer have an absolute majority in the House and will have to depend on the support of the Country Party to remain in office.

The Labor Party has improved its position, but it proved absolutely incapable of arousing the movement and enthusiasm which swept it into office in 1929 with the huge total of 47 members.

In New South Wales the Lang Party advanced, partly at the expense of the U.A.P.-U.C.P., but mainly at the expense of Federal Labor. Certainly, this sounds the death-knell of Federal Labor in New South Wales, although it may still have a few kicks left.

In Victoria, also, in the election of Blackburn and Drakeford the Lang forces showed an advance which portends ill for Federal Labor.

Lang's hand has been strengthened, and this, combined with Garden's influence in the Trade Union movement, will, no doubt, lead to further determined efforts on the part of the Langists to gain complete control of the Australian Labor Party.

The A.C.T.U. Congress will likely be the scene of attempts to bring about unity in the Labor Party in the interests of Lang.

It will be remembered that in 1921, when the Labor Party was out of step with the masses and fast losing prestige the reformist T.U. machine took a hand. Closer relations between the industrial movement and the Labor Party were brought about on the basis of the acceptance by the Labor Party of "socialisation of industry" as its objective.

What was accomplished then cannot be accomplished to-day.

---

### CONTENTS:

The Federal Elections and the Future .....	Page 1
Lenin on the Coming World War ("Madyar") .....	9
Hitler's Coup d'Etat—A Deed of Desperation (Wilhelm Pieck) .....	16
Organisational Questions (R. Cramm) .....	22
The 1917 Strike—Some Lessons for To-day (Nugafonos) .....	27
Lenin's Thesis on the Agrarian Question .....	30

---

Printed at 15 Dixon Street, Sydney, by R. W. Gray, clerk, of 99 Mitchell Street, Glebe, and H. Ross, printer, of 22 Renny Street, Paddington, for the publisher, H. Devanny, contractor, 18 Bramble Street, Sydney.

if only for the fact that the Communist Party is immeasurably stronger and also that the reformists no longer solely dominate the trade union machine.

The masses to-day are not only gravely suspicious of the Labor Party, but also of the reformist trade union officials. It is only the militants who can inspire confidence in the masses and enthuse them and the main attention of the working class will be riveted, not on the actions of the reformists at the A.C.T.U. Congress, but on the actions of the militants.

It is not outside the bounds of possibility that the labor parties, for the sake of appearances, will in the near future patch up and smooth over the differences, but this will not arrest disintegration which is taking place at increasing tempo.

From all sides the lack of interest in the election was commented upon. This does not mean, however, the passivity it might imply. What it does mean is that the working class, that section which has made past elections exciting, are coming to realise the bankruptcy of parliamentarism, and the futility of depending on politicians. There is a rapidly growing recognition that it is not the ballot, but the struggle, and only the struggle, which can put a stop to the capitalist offensive and advance the interests of the labor movement. It is significant that last May, on the eve of the elections, the N.S.W. Trade Union Conference declared against arbitration for industrial unionism and general strike. During the election campaign, in August, the Lysaght workers downed tools, repudiating arbitration and demanding a rectification of their conditions by direct negotiation.

This struggle, combined with the enthusiasm and support from trade unionists everywhere, is significant in that it indicates the direction in which the masses are turning as they lose confidence in parliamentarism.

The decline of the interest of the masses in parliamentarism is further evidence of the decline of the Labor Party, which is nothing more or less than a parliamentary machine.

This is particularly so in New South Wales where, under the influence of Lang's demagogy the interest of the masses in parliamentarism reached a higher level than in any other part of Australia.

The rapid decline of Lang's prestige commenced when he so meekly walked out at the invitation of Governor Game in May, 1932. Prior to this Lang never tired of talking fight. At the

Adelaide Conference, in 1931, he thundered forth, "If they force me far enough I will go the whole hog." No one could have been forced further than was Lang, yet apparently that was not "far enough." Instead of going the "whole hog," as he threatened, he ran squealing like a porker. The workers became extremely doubtful of this "strong man," whose legs served him in such good stead.

The events following the 1932 elections increased their doubt. The Labor Party had no policy for the masses but the Langist creed of retreat and capitulation. The masses, however, were not content to sit idly by whilst their living standards were being destroyed. The tendency was to struggle—to take up the offensive—and the further they went in this direction the greater became the rift with the Labor Party.

It was in these conditions that the elections took place on September 15. The Labor Party had no working class policy. Its programme of nationalisation of banking was obviously framed with a view to strengthening capitalism. But the tendency in the working class movement is to reject capitalism and turn towards socialism. Socialism is no longer to be regarded as something for the future generations to consider, but as something which the working class of to-day will have the task of establishing. This fact is becoming clearer to the working class, and as it does the policy of the Labor Party is more and more revealed as a capitalist policy.

The Communist Party, alone, brought forward a true working class policy, placing as its main slogan—"Soviet Power"—the struggle for socialism.

The advance in the communist vote is without doubt the most outstanding achievement of the election, from the standpoint of the working class. The figures show, with but one or two exceptions, an average increase of over 120 per cent. In some of the main industrial centres (Newcastle, Hunter, Warriwa, in N.S.W.) an increase of approximately 300 per cent. In less than three years the number of communist voters increased from a little more than 30,000 to approximately 70,000, a force which inevitably exercises considerable influence, since a vote for revolution, for the policy of struggle advanced by the Communist Party, must relatively carry much greater weight than a vote for the other parties, which demagogically propose to solve social problems by means other than struggle and revolution.

An important feature is the disposition of the communist vote.

In Victoria, where the party is weaker than in New South Wales, a much higher average vote was recorded. Similarly with Queensland. In New South Wales the strongest party vote was recorded in Hunter, Newcastle and Werriwa, centres where the party is much weaker than in Sydney.

The Victorian vote is connected with the fact that the Labor Party in that State is weaker, both politically and organisationally, than in New South Wales, it has not developed "Leftist" demagoguery on the same scale, and, finally, but most important, it does not possess a daily newspaper. The same applies, but to a lesser degree, to Queensland. There the Labor Party has a daily newspaper.

In New South Wales, concentrated in the Hunter, Newcastle and Werriwa electorates, are the main coal and metal industries of Australia. In these centres the communists have led a number of strike struggles, and in the Miners' Federation captured leading positions. The work of the communists, particularly in the Miners' Federation, has led to a considerable strengthening of the forces of the workers, and this demonstration of the effectiveness of revolutionary leadership accounts mainly for the significant advance made in the elections.

The vote for Douglas social credit also attains great importance.

Some communists believe that the Douglas social credit prevented us from attaining a much larger vote. This is fundamentally false. Douglas credit barely influenced our vote. The Douglas candidates advanced at the expense of the U.A.P. and Labor Party. Their greatest support came from the traditional strongholds of the U.A.P. (Kooyong, Warringah, Martin, North Sydney), whilst in the strong Labor centres they polled much smaller totals.

This clearly indicates that the Douglas candidates found support in the ranks of the middle classes and the more privileged sections of the working class.

Elections have shown that a basic strata of the working class always vote solidly for the Labor Party, whilst another strata of the population always votes solidly for the U.A.P.-U.C.P. Between these there is a large vacillating mass of voters, mainly middle class and more privileged workers, who are unstable and vacillate from the one party to the other in accordance with conditions.

It is to a large extent in this unstable and vacillating strata that the Douglas candidates found support. It is a quicksand basis and can disappear with the same rapidity as it appeared.

In contrast to this the Communist Party increase came from the Labor Party, at the expense of the most solid and basic strata of the Labor Party. It is significant that that cadre of election helpers which meant so much to the Labor Party in the past were in these elections, to a great extent, mobilised behind the Communist Party.

Despite the instability of the forces making up the Douglas vote it must be recognised that great significance attaches to the vote. It is indicative of the discontent with the present system which has accumulated in the ranks of the petty bourgeoisie and which Douglas social credit are diverting into harmless channels.

The general conclusion to be drawn from the elections are: Firstly, that the forces of revolution have grown, consolidated and become an important political force.

Secondly, that despite an increase in the Labor Party vote it is actually weaker than formerly and is disintegrating at a rapid pace.

Thirdly, that considerable discontent exists in the ranks of the petty bourgeoisie which the Douglas organisation, using extreme demagoguery, has been able to capitalise to a considerable degree.

The bourgeoisie greet the return of Lyons with great satisfaction and presage a more triumphal progress to "prosperity."

The whole tendency of economic development, however, points in a different direction. Twenty-five per cent. of Australian primary production goes for export. To-day the tendency towards what is termed "economic nationalism" has become very marked throughout the capitalist world, and is rapidly diminishing the markets, and possible markets, for the disposal of Australian production. The perspectives of Australian capitalism become increasingly black.

Dealing with these tendencies of development the "Sydney Morning Herald" leader of August 30 discusses two alternatives—firstly, "to subordinate foreign trade advantages to Imperial interests, to sacrifice if need be profitable markets in foreign countries in order to maintain a maximum trade between Britain and the Dominions." This is the position advanced by the Country Party. The "Herald" writer characterises this proposition as being "so comprehensively reactionary that it would find little support in any part of the Empire." After this strong rebuff to the programme of Dr. Page a second proposition is discussed, which is, no doubt, the considered opinion of the "Sydney Morning Herald." This provides for "the development of a high degree of self-sufficiency by all the units of the Empire, and exclusive Imperial preference in

respect of the relatively small amount of overseas trade then necessary."

Thus the "Sydney Morning Herald" joins the Labor Party as an advocate of economic nationalism. The "Herald" realises full well that the doctrine of self-sufficiency is a step in the dark, which is being forced upon Australian capitalism by the tendencies in world capitalist economy.

But self-sufficiency means restriction of production, and this is inevitably the path being taken by the Lyons Government.

The next few months will be of decisive importance. The Ottawa Agreement expires early in the new year, and British restrictions on imports of primary production will be strengthened. In addition to this the prices of wool are definitely declining and wheat prices are extremely unstable.

It was precisely because of this that Lyons precipitated the election six months early. Had it taken place in February or March, 1935, the lines of Government policy would have been clear and the U.A.P. would have had to fight the elections with the millstone of restriction around its neck. The policy of self-sufficiency also threatens the solvency of Australian capitalism, inasmuch as a favorable trade balance is "vital to meet national commitments." ("Sydney Morning Herald," August 30.)

But restriction brings in its train a further and more intense drive against the living standard of the working class and small farmers in order to more effectively struggle for markets and meet overseas commitments, and this whole process is intimately connected with the drive to fascism and war.

To-day the whole situation is overshadowed by the frenzied war preparations right throughout the capitalist world. Already in this last few months the world has been on the verge of war on a number of occasions. In Europe everything is in readiness to unleash a cataclysm at a moment's notice.

Fascism is stalking its ugly carcase over Europe, destroying working class organisations and enslaving the people. Britain, the "country of democracy," whose people "by their very nature are not given to dictatorship" (if we may believe the Philistines) is driving forward to fascism at an enormous rate. In the "Sedition Bill," just recently pushed through the House of Commons, the British ruling class have gone a long way on the path to fascism. The Sedition Bill was described by Dr. E. R. Walker, Lecturer on Economics at the Sydney University, as "the most daring encroachment yet made upon the liberty of British subjects." ("Sydney Morning Herald," September 19.)

In Australia the growth of fascism is no less marked and will receive a further impetus as a result of the elections, and particularly in the next few months, when it can be confidently expected that the economic position of Australian capitalism will worsen.

**Fascism means war, imperialist war, intervention in the Soviet Union, civil war against the masses.**

This is the perspective for the future and which must dictate the policy the working class movement must pursue.

The forces of reaction of war and fascism are growing at an enormous rate and this demands the more rapid mobilisation of the forces of the working class which, up to the present, are advancing extremely slowly.

The path to this more rapid mobilisation and the weapon to obtain it, is the organising on the widest possible scale the struggles of the workers on the basis of the united front from below.

**The ranks of the workers must be united and the slogan of Unity must be the clarion which sounds from one end of the country to the other calling the masses into the struggle to defend their democratic rights and economic demands.**

But unity is being organised only by the militants. The Labor Party and reformists stand in the way of unity.

Seventeen months ago the Communist Party proposed to the Labor Party the establishment of a unity committee to organise "joint united struggles of the workers against fascism, war and the capitalist offensive." The Labor Party executive rejected these proposals. To-day favorable conditions exist for the welding together of the forces of the working class. The urge towards unity in the workers' ranks was never greater. The growth of the Communist Party and its victories on a whole series of fronts makes it a much greater force than seventeen months ago. To-day the urgent duty of every Communist, of every revolutionary worker, is to drive forward more actively and unceasingly to establish the broadest united front of the workers from below, winning the masses of the workers for the struggle against fascism, war and the capitalist offensive.

Of decisive importance is the drive in the trade unions to unite and strengthen them. To-day the reformists and the Labor Party are pursuing the line of weakening the trade unions and splitting the forces of the workers. Nothing could more clearly reveal this than the attitude of Denford and the officials of the Ironworkers' Union, who were prepared to sacrifice the Lysaght workers in order to satisfy the demands of an Arbitration Court judge, who threatened

deregistration of the union. The reformists are wedded to arbitration and fight to maintain craft unionism. These people dare to charge the communists with disintegrative work within the trade unions. This is a slander of the first order. The communists are building and strengthening the trade unions. We recognise that craft unionism has tremendous shortcomings, and that the new unionism—militant industrial unionism—is vital and necessary. This does not mean that we advocate weakening the craft unions. We communists advocate and fight to strengthen the craft unions. We realise that the path to industrial unionism is through strengthening the crafts on the basis of introducing stimulating militant influence and leadership, together with the broadest workers' democracy, leading up to the point where the crafts can be amalgamated along the lines of industry.

**A great powerful united trade union machine must be constructed if the struggle against fascism, war and the capitalist offensive is to be successfully waged.**

The communists, the revolutionary workers, have set themselves the task of constructing this trade union machine.

The struggle against fascism and war must receive a tremendous impetus in the campaign for the national congress against fascism and war, which opens in Melbourne on November 10, and Anti-war Week, November 4-11.

The date of the congress coincides with the Melbourne Centenary celebrations, and the visit of the Duke of Gloucester. It will take place when the campaign of chauvinist incitement is at its zenith and the forces of militarism are whipping up a war fever.

The Melbourne Centenary celebrations are essentially military in character, and opposed to this must be mobilised a great anti-war and anti-fascist movement.

This demands that every avenue of publicity be exploited, radio, press, demonstrations, meetings, etc.—that particular efforts be made to win the youth and women.

Our party is faced with great and difficult tasks. Its responsibility has increased to an enormous degree with the growing confidence of the workers in our leadership. Now more than ever must the revolutionary vanguard obtain clarity on the great issues confronting the working class movement, and with more meticulous care bring clarity on the issues and give direction to the workers' struggle.

The struggle against fascism, war and the capitalist offensive is a struggle against capitalism—a struggle for Soviet power. The

Australian Labor movement is slowly but surely taking this path to socialism. For decades the Labor Party reformist trade union officials have been eminently successful in clouding and confusing the issues of socialism. But to-day the mists are lifting, not only because of the work of the Communist Party of Australia, but, above all, as a result of the outstanding achievements of socialist construction in the Soviet Union. The reactionary influence of the Labor Party and reformist officials must be destroyed, the workers' forces united, and the trade union movement strengthened.

The path to socialism is the path of struggle which commences with the defence of the daily needs of the workers and which must be extended and developed into a nation-wide avalanche, which will sweep aside and destroy the forces of fascism and war and establish the proletarian dictatorship.

## Lenin on the Coming World War

(By "MADYAR")

We are living in a pre-war period. The tempo of the transition to the new cycle of revolutions and wars is accelerating. History has not yet spoken its last word, and it is hard to predict whether in certain countries the revolution will not precede the imperialist war or intervention. As yet, history has not spoken its last word and the question whether the war in the imperialist camp will precede the intervention, or the intervention will precede the imperialist war has not yet been decided. It is obvious, however, that this decision approaches nearer and nearer.

We are living in a pre-war period.

When perusing the works of Lenin, one sees that only Leninism has foreseen and predicted the development of things, and that only Leninism has given the world proletariat a correct orientation.

During the first imperialist world war, the social chauvinists of the Second International and the petty-bourgeois pacifists prattled

a lot about a "democratic peace," about a "peace without annexations and reparations." During the world war Lenin already foresaw and predicted:—

(1) . . . "Thus also the peace ending the war can only be a registration of the shifting of power effected in the course of the war." (XII, 65\*.)

And Lenin also foresaw the effects of this imperialist robbery-peace on the situation of the working class:—

". . . consequently, irrespective of the result of the war, the conclusion of peace can only determine a worsening of the political and economic situation of the masses—since the capitalist society remains." (XIX, 65-66.)

And it is precisely in view of this that Lenin placed the world proletariat before the world historic dilemma:—

". . . Either one helps its 'own' national bourgeoisie to rob foreign countries, calling this support 'defence of the fatherland,' or 'saving the home country,' or one helps to prepare for the socialist revolution of the proletariat."

Lenin foresaw and predicted that the leading imperialist Powers did not prepare for a democratic peace without annexations or reparations, but for a new world war for resharing the world:—

"Two or three robbers (America, England, Japan) of world power, and armed to the teeth, are sharing the 'booty' and draw the whole world with them in their war for the division of their booty." (XIX.)

And Lenin has quite concretely predicted that the most bitter struggles between the imperialist robbers would flare up around the semi-colonies such as China and the countries of Central and South America.

"The struggle for the semi-dependent countries was obviously bound to acquire special acuteness in the epoch of banking capital, when the rest of the world had already been divided." (XIX, 161.)

The social-imperialists, the social-fascists-to-be, during the first world war and after the world war, with their slogan of disarmament, have deceived the working masses regarding the dangers of the coming war. Lenin has raised the question of disarmament also, and answered it as follows:—

"Disarmament is the ideal of socialism. In the socialist society there will be no wars, and consequently disarmament will be realised. But he who expects the realisation of

\*Russian edition.

socialism without a social revolution and dictatorship of the proletariat is not a socialist." (XIX, 397.)

And even during the first world war, at a time when the petty-bourgeois pacifists and the present social-fascists were chattering about "the last war" and "an organised peace," driving the masses into the trenches with this promise, Lenin warned the world proletariat that the first world war was a preparation for a second world butchery:—

"We will not ignore the tragic possibility that if the worst comes to the worst, mankind will even outlive a second imperialist war, should the revolution in spite of the repeated outbreaks of mass unrest and mass indignation, and in spite of our efforts, not yet be born out of the war." (XIX, 403.)

Moreover, Lenin has indicated quite specifically which imperialist antagonisms can and will lead to a new world disaster. As one of the decisive antagonisms in the camp of imperialism, Lenin indicated the struggle between Japan and the United States:—

"The second antagonism, which is the determining factor for the international situation for Russia, is the rivalry between Japan and America. The economic development of these countries has, for several decades of years, accumulated a tremendous mass of explosive matter which renders a desperate struggle for the domination of the Pacific and its shores unavoidable. The whole diplomatic and economic history of the Far East leaves no room for doubt that on the basis of capitalism the sharp conflict ripening between Japan and America cannot be prevented." (XXIII, page 5.)

As the second contradiction which can and will lead to a new world butchery, Lenin indicated the antagonism between England and the United States:—

"England and France have won, but they are up to their ears in debt to America, who, ignoring the victor pose of the French and the English, is determined to skim the cream and to collect the interest and compound interest for the support granted during the war. To ensure this is the purpose of the American fleet at present under construction, which exceeds the English in size." (XXIV, page 546.)

"There are deeper causes for this, which are connected with the development of the interests of English imperialism which rules over an incredible number of colonies. In this

respect a deeper antagonism exists between American and English imperialism, and it is our absolute duty to base ourselves upon this antagonism. . . ." (XVI, 10.)

And as the third main antagonism in the camp of imperialism, Lenin indicated the struggle of Germany against Versailles:—

"And the third conflict flares up between the Entente Powers and Germany. Germany is defeated, it has been fettered by the Versailles Treaty, but Germany has gigantic economic possibilities at her disposal. As far as economic development is concerned, Germany is the second country in the world, if the United States is considered the first country. And such a country was forced to accept the Versailles Treaty and within the scope of this treaty, Germany cannot live. Germany is one of the strongest and most progressive imperialist Powers, and it cannot tolerate the Versailles Treaty." (XXV, page 507.)

And Lenin has foreseen and predicted which role French imperialism will play in this:—

"The new war which is being prepared between America and Japan (or England) and which in view of the shrinking of capitalism is inevitable, will unavoidably draw France in with it, France being involved in all imperialist crimes and barbarian felonies of our imperialist epoch. Either a new war, or a number of wars for the 'defence' of French imperialism or socialist revolution—the workers and peasants of France have no other alternative." (XXVII, page 103.)

And besides the struggle of Germany against Versailles, Lenin sees the development of imperialist antagonism along the following lines:—

"We witness the ever-accentuating enmity over the sharing of the booty obtained, between Italy and France, between France and England, between England and America, between America and Japan." (XXIII, page 495.)

And Lenin also predicted how, on this basis, the chauvinism and nationalism of the petty-bourgeois masses will be fanned:—

"Whoever may win, Europe is threatened with a sharpening of 'revenge chauvinism,' German or English militarism fans counter-chauvinism." (These lines were written by Lenin in September, 1917.) (XXX, page 223.)

Lenin defined the Versailles peace as "the greatest blow which capitalism could give itself." But at the same time, he foresaw that the prattle about a peaceful revision of the Versailles Treaty is only

a comedy, "peaceful revision is a comedy," Lenin wrote:—

"The victory of the Entente and the Versailles peace has thrust back the great majority of German nations and put them into a position in which it is impossible to exist. The Versailles Treaty has created a situation in which Germany cannot dream of a breathing space, in which it cannot dream for a moment that it will not be robbed, that it will not be deprived of the means necessary to live, that its population will not be doomed to starvation and extinction." (XXVI, page 14.)

The revision, the real revision, which will not substitute one forcible peace for another, Lenin expects from the proletarian revolution:—

"... Like the Brest peace for Germany, the Versailles peace will end for France and England with a defeat for the capitalists and victory of the proletariat." (XXIV, page 401.)

And he expects the real revision from the strengthening of the Soviet Union:—

"The Soviet Union is a power which destroys the Versailles Treaty. If Soviet Russia is strengthened the Versailles Treaty will collapse, as was nearly the case in July, 1920, following the first blow by the Red Army." (XXV, page 524.)

And it is characteristic of the amazing foresightedness of Lenin that he has foreseen and predicted the role and significance of the so-called Polish Corridor.

"One of the suppositions of this monstrous peace is that Poland cuts Germany in two parts, because Poland needs a way out to the sea. The relations between Germany and Poland are very strained at present." (XXV, 498.)

It is but natural that Lenin does not only indicate the imperialist contradictions, which must lead to a new world butchery in the camp of imperialism, if this is not prevented by the revolution, but points out at the same time the new cycle of interventions against the Soviet Union:—

"We do not only live in one State, but in a system of States, and the existence of the Soviet Republic side by side with the imperialist states is inconceivable for any considerable length of time. Eventually, one or the other must win." (XXIV, page 122.)

Lenin always emphasised the inevitability of the attempt on the part of the imperialist Powers to organise ever fresh acts of



intervention against the land of Soviets. He wrote:—

"The development of capitalism takes place, to the highest degree, unequally in different countries. It could not be otherwise, under conditions of commodity production. Hence, the irrefutable conclusion: Socialism cannot conquer simultaneously in all countries. It conquers first of all in one or in a group of countries, but the remainder for some time remain bourgeois or pre-bourgeois countries. This is bound to evoke not merely a tendency but the direct endeavor of the bourgeoisie of other countries to crush the victorious proletariat of the Socialist State. In such cases, war on our part would be a lawful and just act. It would be a war for socialism, for the liberation of other peoples from the bourgeoisie."

And Lenin also returned, time and again, to the question whether an alliance of all imperialists against the Soviet Union is possible, and whether such an alliance could last for any length of time. He answered this question by pointing to the two world historical tendencies:—

"Two tendencies exist: One which renders the alliance of all imperialists unavoidable, a second which drives one group of imperialists against the other. Two tendencies neither of which rests on a firm basis." (XXIII, page 6.)

And Lenin was of the opinion that the antagonisms in the camp of the imperialists made a steady durable alliance extremely difficult, if they do not make it even quite impossible.

"Up to now, we only succeeded in winning, thanks to the profound disagreement between the imperialist Powers and thanks to the circumstance that this disagreement was not an accidental, internal party disagreement, but an extremely essential, irremovable discord of the economic interests of the imperialist countries which, being based on private property of land and capital, cannot dispense with that robber policy in respect of land and capital, cannot dispense with that robber policy in which their efforts towards uniting their forces against the Soviet Government prove vain." (XXVI, page 7.)

And Lenin predicted the failure of the interventionist bloc

against the Soviet Union:—

"The experience of world policy proves that an alliance against Soviet Russia is inevitably doomed to failure because it would be an imperialist alliance, an alliance of robbers who do not agree among each other, and who have no really lasting interests uniting them." (XXV, page 519.)

And the task of the policy of the Soviet Union Lenin considers to be to strengthen the forces of the Soviet Union and the world revolution, and to take advantage of the antagonisms in the camp of world imperialism.

". . . Hence our policy—to take advantage of the discord among the imperialist Powers, to render more difficult agreement between them, or if possible to render such agreement temporarily impossible." (XXVI, page 8.)

". . . We have deprived the Entente of the support of its workers and the peasants, secondly, we have achieved the neutrality of those small peoples who are their slaves, and thirdly, we have started to deprive the Entente in its own countries of the support of the petty-bourgeoisie and the intellectual middle class who were quite biased against us." (XXIV, page 599.)

The Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Communist International, under the leadership of Comrade Stalin, have worked untiringly for the realisation of this bequest. To win over the workers and peasants of the imperialist powers, to win the confidence of the small oppressed countries and the oppressed nations and countries, to obtain the sympathy of the petty-bourgeoisie and the intellectual middle class, to utilise the imperialist antagonisms in the interest of socialist construction and the extension of peace, of the breathing space—this has been, and still is, the meaning of the policy of the Soviet Union. Up to now, she has been able to carry out this policy, because she was strong and powerful, because socialist industrialisation and the socialist reorganisation of agriculture have tremendously increased the power and force of the Soviet Union, because the peace policy of the Soviet Union was linked up with the realisation and carrying out of the First Five-Year Plan, and the beginning of the realisation and carrying out of the Second Five-Year Plan.

## Hitler's Coup-d'Etat—A Deed of Desperation

(By WILHELM PIECK)

Nothing is more typical of the extreme seriousness of the situation in Germany and of the tremendous difficulty in which German imperialism finds itself, difficulties which have been greatly increased since the establishment of the national socialist dictatorship, than the sudden proclamation of Hitler as President of the Reich, or Reich's leader, and the attempt to restore some shine to his halo by a jerrymandered "people's referendum." It is a clear indication that latent crises are about to burst into the open.

Home and foreign policy, economic and finance policy, all fields of public life, are so cluttered up with an immense accumulation of difficulties that desperation will encourage new adventurist undertakings on all fields. In the camp of the bourgeoisie there is such uncertainty and hopelessness with regard to economic affairs, coupled with a desperate search for new solutions, all of which have to be abandoned even before they are formulated, that even the enthusiastic supporters of the fascist dictatorship no longer dare to talk of the "economic boom."

The seriousness of the situation is also indicated by the rapid pace at which "the leading cadres" are being used up. The "moral" dilapidation of the "leading cadres" is tremendous on all fields, and only in rare cases does it become publicly known. This is true, above all, of the economic field. Feder was the first victim, but he was quickly followed by Kessler, one of the intimate confidants of Hitler. Schmitt, the economic dictator, was provided with full powers on his field of operations, but they have not helped him to weather the storm. He, too, has retired into the background. The retirement of Schmitt was undoubtedly a victory for the Krupp-Thyssen monopolist group. It represented the continuation of the political "course," which began on June 30, this time on the economic field. The continuation of this policy undermines Hitler's position to an increasing extent, and it is intended to open up a line of retreat for German finance capital when it is no longer able to

hide itself behind the worn-out shield of national socialism.

The differences of opinion inside the various capitalist groups, inside the various branches of industry, between the various monopolies, and between the monopolist and non-monopolist capitalists have reached such a tremendous volume that, for instance, a common policy in foreign trading can be obtained only by the exercise of dictatorial powers. This is the reason why Schacht has been appointed Economic Minister. The conduct of Germany's economic and financial policies is now united in one hand, and naturally that hand is guided by the monopolist Krupp-Thyssen group.

Everyone is in favor of encouraging Germany's foreign trade, the captains of industry themselves, the leaders of fascism, and the economic and trade journals of Hitler Germany. But when it comes to a question of how to encourage it, then the differences of opinion are so great and so violent that an agreement is impossible. Everyone is in favor of lowering the costs of production, in other words, a new and general cut in wages in order to increase the competitive capacity of German industries on the world market, but the difficulties which are connected with such an open and all-round cut in wages are also recognized. In the past these difficulties were so great that the bourgeoisie did not dare to force through an open depression of wage standards, and now, with the increasing disillusionment of the masses and the increasing strength of the working-class front, they have become still greater.

However, the German bourgeoisie is in a desperate situation, and when its own existence is at stake it is prepared to risk much, so that here also it will be compelled to take the necessary measures. June 30 and July 25 showed clearly that the German bourgeoisie is prepared to stick at nothing. Can Schacht save the economic situation? The antagonism between the export capitalists and the big trading undertakings, between the industrial capitalists and the trading capitalists is so great that quite apart from the dangers and difficulties of all-round wage-cuts any solution must seriously affect one group or the other, even assuming that devaluation is carried out. In this connection the fascist press remains silent, but the export capitalists are shouting louder than ever for devaluation. Only recently the association of engineering firms sent a questionnaire on the subject out to its members and almost all of them demanded devaluation up to 40 per cent. However, on this question also there exist such intense differences of opinion in the camp of the bourgeoisie that the government is postponing any decision on the point

again and again. The bourgeoisie is well aware that although Schacht is in a position to determine the beginning of devaluation, he will hardly be able to control the end, and that the development of devaluation into inflation at home would no longer depend on the will of the leading monopolist capitalist groups.

But even devaluation would not restore Germany's lost trade positions on the world market. All that remains is an increased dumping campaign by means of the blocked and registered marks, etc., and supported by certain tax revenues which have been allotted for the purpose, in the same way as is being done already to a certain extent with the funds of the unemployment support scheme and the social insurance scheme. However, even then the limits to such operations are so clearly defined and narrow that they could afford nothing more than a temporary manoeuvre.

The foreign trade situation, and thus the currency situation at home, is thus pretty hopeless, and no matter what measures the German bourgeoisie may take, they must lead to an exacerbation of the political situation at home. In addition, the home market itself is threatened with a new economic reverse. This reverse is caused above all by the artificial measures which have been taken by the government to bring about economic recovery.

The work provision schemes and the financial measures taken by the state to support them have now reached the utmost possible limit without inflation. Even the governmental armament drive is threatened with paralysis unless the inflation comes to the rescue. So-called state measures are already being stopped, for instance, the much advertised building of motor roads. The banks and the individual trusts have already reached saturation point with work provision bills of exchange, and for this reason these bills are accumulating to an increasing extent in the hands of the Reichsbank. The total sum represented by these bills is probably already in excess of two milliard marks. Despite all its careful manoeuvring the Reichsbank has not been able to prevent an increase in the volume of means of payment in circulation. Certainly, the increase has not reached any very great proportions as yet, but that is not the main point. The danger signal is the permanent tendency which has manifested itself since the beginning of the year for the volume of the means of payment in circulation to increase. In a situation like this all that is necessary is some sudden and unexpected dislocation, even a dislocation which in itself is not great, and the Reichsbank will then no longer be able to stem the avalanche.

In the meantime industry is carrying on with its production.

However, as new investments are not being made, and as the purchasing power of the broad masses is not increasing despite the taking on of additional labor power in the factories, a considerable dislocation of consumption is taking place, and the disposal of the supplies of industrial commodities, which are greater to-day than they were in 1928, is becoming increasingly difficult. The existing supplies of industrial commodities have been produced on credit, and in this respect also the limits of the possible have now been reached.

Either these accumulated supplies of industrial goods must be disposed of on the world market by means of inflation or they will cause a catastrophic drop in prices. As a result of the shortage of raw materials further production is also meeting with difficulties. The statistics of the fascist authorities declare that raw materials supplies for three or four months are still available, but the fascist economic plans have nothing in common with planned economy, which is possible only on the basis of a socialist mode of production and distribution. Although they are distributed under State control these supplies of raw materials are private property. The result is that some of the big undertakings have sufficient supplies of raw materials to last them for a very long time, whilst, on the other hand, many undertakings have not enough to last more than a week or two. This lack of proportion in the distribution of raw materials must produce new hostility between the various capitalist undertakings. Already some undertakings, not only in the textile industry, have reached the end of their tether with regard to raw materials, and they are being compelled to refuse orders for this reason.

Certain groups of finance capitalists still hope that they will be able to find a way out of Germany's desperate situation by means of a foreign loan. The fiasco suffered by the inland loan floated at the beginning of June is already well known. The fascist State was compelled to pay out more in cash than it obtained as a result of the loan. The prospects of obtaining foreign loans for Germany are nothing if not hopeless. Although the fascist government was compelled to retreat after it had proclaimed its moratorium and make concessions to its foreign creditors, neither the United States nor Great Britain dreams of advancing the German imperialist fascist bankrupts even one brass farthing. True, these countries might do what they have done before, namely, attempt to rescue their old loans by advancing new ones, but in the present situation that would be so obviously throwing good money after bad that it is extremely unlikely that they will do anything of the sort. Loans

of this nature are therefore conceivable only under the most onerous conditions. In such circumstances the concessions which the fascist dictatorship would have to make would be so severe and so far-reaching that they would represent the abandonment of all foreign political, foreign trading, and armament independence for a very long time.

Further, any such concessions would lead to the greatest possible internal political difficulties and would greatly strengthen those forces which threaten the fascist dictatorship from within. This explains Schacht's public declaration to the effect that Germany is not considering taking up such loans. However, the hard-pressed mariner will put into any port in a storm, and the unseaworthy vessel of German imperialism is being buffeted by great waves from outside whilst its beams are groaning and cracking within its hull. Even according to the official fascist statistics unemployment is on the increase. The wave of "land helpers" who are abandoning the villages and returning to their old homes in the towns is increasing and becoming more and more dangerous. In addition, the process of social differentiation in the villages is intensifying rapidly. The discontent and dissatisfaction of the poor and middle peasants was already great enough owing to the intense economic difficulties, but now the drought has intensified it greatly. Demagogic phrases are no longer sufficient to pacify them. In this situation the urban "land-helpers" work like revolutionary yeast amongst the peasantry.

The working masses in the towns are threatened by a new rise of prices. Not a week passes but that the price of some article of daily necessity rises. One day it is meat and the next day it is vegetables, and this goes on week after week. In addition, the employers are urging the government on to agree to new all-round wage-cuts, whilst in the coming weeks there will be a new wave of dismissals which will result in a further intensification of the mass impoverishment of the German working class, particularly in view of the tremendous cuts which have been made in the unemployment support rates.

However, this new wave of misery will sweep over a working class whose spirit and whose consciousness have been tremendously awakened by the untiring work of the Communist Party and by the steady and fruitful work for the establishment of unity of action amongst the social democratic, communist, and Catholic workers against the oppressive policy of fascism. Even large sections of the lower middle classes are already convinced that things cannot go on

as they have been going. When the moment of great social conflicts again arises these masses will no longer be actively opposed to the working class, but will rather sympathise with it and support it. This does not mean that they will go over on their own initiative to the revolutionary fighting front of the proletariat, but that in its tireless struggle against fascism the proletariat itself will create the preliminary conditions for winning over these masses as allies in a great fighting front of the German people.

On the foreign political field the events of July 25 and the subsequent days in Austria demonstrate clearly that Hitler and the clique of adventurists behind him are thoroughly prepared to plunge the world into a new slaughter. There is no doubt that had Hitler's plan in Austria been successful it would have been followed up a few weeks later by a similar coup in the Saar. Everything was prepared for this coup, but as the "Popolo d'Italia" of July 27 pointed out, that would have meant war. That is the state to which the national socialists have brought Germany.

In view of the violent antagonisms in its own camp, and in view of the catastrophic economic situation and the approach of new great class struggles, the German imperialist bourgeoisie is no longer capable of agreeing on a permanent and settled foreign policy. At home its only solution is to intensify the fascist terror. The policy of adventurism must therefore inevitably come more and more to the fore. This adventurist policy has been underlined by the German bourgeoisie in that it has now placed Hitler at the head of the German Reich. On July 25 it was Austria that was chosen for the scene of an adventurous drive to provide German fascism with a foreign political breathing space even at the risk of European war. To-morrow it may be the Saar, the Danish frontier, or the Polish corridor.

The danger which threatens the German working class and the workers of the world from German fascism is tremendous. The appointment of Hitler as "Reich's Leader" makes this danger still more obvious to the broad masses. The German working class thoroughly understands the insolent and provocative attitude of the German bourgeoisie, which is capable of nothing but intensified terror at home and foreign political adventures abroad. The German working class will not be deceived by the latest manoeuvre of the German bourgeoisie, the "People's Referendum," which will be conducted under terror and intimidation in order to provide Hitler's coup d'etat with a legal cloak. The German working class, the social-democratic, communist and Catholic workers, will give their

answer in joint action. Any attempt to cut wages, to reduce social benefits and to cut down production will meet with the joint resistance of the workers as a whole. All such attempts will produce counter-actions on the part of the workers, and the great struggles which the coming months will produce will demonstrate that the Communist Party, thanks to its heroic struggle, has created the necessary conditions for the decisive defeat of the fascist dictatorship. The prelude to these struggles will be opened when the "People's Referendum" is held. Despite all the fascist terrorist measures the Communist Party will mobilise the masses in order to expose the fascist swindle with a great mass of negative votes. The proletarian revolution must triumph in Germany before the marauder Hitler succeeds in plunging the world into a new imperialist slaughter.

## Organisational Questions

(By R. CRAMM)

Experience in the Australian Party over a long period has proved, in the majority of cases, that efficient individual concentration work under the direct leadership of the local Party committee (district or section committee) can achieve far more results than the so-called concentration units or "shock" groups. There are, no doubt, isolated instances where concentration groups have achieved important results, but, generally speaking, the appointment of one or, at most, two capable comrades under the leadership of the party committee will be found best suited to the work of penetrating the average factory in Australia.

In dealing with big enterprises that cover many acres of ground, e.g., Eveleigh Workshops, and which are broken up into separate sections, a form of concentration group will be necessary. Nevertheless, such a group must be modelled on entirely different lines to those set up in the past. The organisational forms necessary for such a group, and which will be found to give the best results, are simple and can be easily understood by almost every party member. For example, if there are six separate sections in a given enterprise the section or district committee, whichever the case may

be, will select an efficient comrade of good appearance and approach for the purpose of concentrating on *one* section. This procedure will be followed in regard to the other five sections also. Having procured six comrades for the work in hand the party committee will work out concretely and in detail with each comrade the tasks he has to perform on the basis of the situation obtaining in the given section of the enterprise to which he has been allotted. The best way for the party committee to give concrete personal leadership to such a group of comrades is to appoint one of their best forces to the job of spending almost full-time planning, studying the situation in the enterprise, allotting concrete tasks to the group, and above all checking up on their fulfilment. The comrade appointed by the party committee will be responsible for establishing a system of quick connections with all the members of the group, for calling the group together from time to time to exchange experiences and for checking up on tasks planned and allotted, for making reports on the work done and proposed to the party committee, for bringing forward for discussion in the party committee all matters appertaining to the enterprise that need collective discussion, and any other matters he may deem necessary. Such a form of personal responsibility does not absolve in any way the responsibility of the party committee as a whole to check up on the fulfilment of the work planned.

As most factories in Australia are relatively small when compared with the giant enterprises in Europe and America, it will be found that most of our work will be carried out by single comrades acting under the leadership of the party committee. First, the responsible party committee should select a comrade who is neat in appearance, responsible in his actions, and of good approach. Such comrades do not enter the party already made, and here the party committees will need to select those members showing the most promise and train them in the process of the work.

Having made the selection the comrade must not be given a general directive and then left to his own devices. On the contrary, the responsible party organ must work out in the minutest detail with him just what is to be done and how to do it, even to the point of indicating just how to speak to a contact and what to do in relation to different types of workers.

The party committee can also give personal and concrete leadership to these individual members by means of appointing a responsible comrade (not necessarily a member of the committee)

to lead the work in relation to not more than three medium-sized factories. The comrade appointed to lead the work would have the same responsibilities to the party committee as the comrade mentioned earlier in relation to the concentration group, only in this case meetings of the three comrades under his leadership would be much more infrequent than those of the group and then would only be called for the purpose of exchanging experiences in the practical contact work.

Space will not permit of further detail in relation to the organizational forms for concentration work, as we wish to give a few practical illustrations of just how to set about the task of gaining contact.

### HOW TO MAKE CONTACT

The Agit-Prop. report to the 1931 District 1 Plenum included the following: "We have been concentrating on Bond's Hosiery Mills for two years, issuing an 'M.M.' bulletin more or less regularly during that period and conducting on an average three factory-gate meetings a week, and we have not made a contact yet!"

The above statement seems incredible, but when you study the matter closely there is no room for mystery in connection with it.

Let us take the question of the "M.M. Bulletin." The issuing of such a bulletin by a few party members outside the factory was in itself extreme sectarianism when no M.M. existed. The matter contained in the paper could not be other than abstract, as it had no connection with the daily life of the workers in the factory. The contents were mostly long articles on war, fascism and criticisms of the Labor Party, badly written, in the main, and sectarian in the extreme. Coupled with these factors was the poor technical make-up of the bulletin. It will be seen that such a publication would never appeal to a mass of backward workers if it was published for five years. This sort of thing must be strictly avoided in all our future concentration work. If a bulletin is to be issued it should be a party bulletin, and even then it must contain material about the industry to which it is being issued, despite our lack of contact in the factory. A perusal of awards, an inquiry at the union office, etc., would probably furnish a considerable amount of material for such articles. The question of the factory-gate meetings: No one will deny that factory-gate meetings are very important, even if attended by only small groups of workers. At the same time, as a means of making personal contact with possible recruits they are

not only almost useless but extremely dangerous. First we must consider the worker's point of view. He has his job to consider. It means his family's bread and butter. Naturally, he does not want to lose it. We tell him the party will protect him, then we attempt to approach him or expect him to approach us in front of the boss and his pimps. Such a situation is impossible. Therefore, we must avoid the mistakes made in the past in connection with approaching workers at factory-gate meetings. There is no mystery in the running of factory-gate meetings for two years and getting no contacts; the workers just did not wish to commit industrial suicide.

Experience has furnished us with many lessons and we should use them to the fullest advantage. To take a couple of examples: A great bulk of the workers that work in a given factory generally live in close proximity to their work, i.e., in the immediate neighborhood. Taking this as our point of departure we should procure a copy of the electoral roll covering the area or peruse one at the local post office. If the factory is a rubber factory we should look down the lists in the roll for all rubber workers, if it is an iron works, ironworkers, and so on. True, some of the workers may work in rubber factories, etc., in other areas, but this does not matter, because if they are recruited they can quite easily be passed on to another party committee governing the area in which they work. This interchange of names is very important.

Having procured a list of names from the roll the comrade selected to do the concentration work should then proceed to sound the various workers regarding their political and other opinions. This can be done best on Sunday mornings, when the majority will be found at home. The medium of approach can be the "Red Leader," "W.W.," anti-war magazines, etc. Then, if the comrade doing the canvassing knows how to talk and interest a worker, he will in all probability get him to buy a paper or will hear his views regarding the militant press and so on. You should on no account give the impression that you are concentrating on him in particular. If the housewife and children are about when you are talking to the worker, pass a cheery good morning, make appropriate remarks concerning the children, etc. In other words, be real and friendly. Remember, a good first impression counts for a great deal, and that in the majority of cases the wife influences the husband.

Having made a few contacts by this method it will be necessary to personally visit them every week to deliver their paper. Don't be too precipitate in asking them to join as you might, by premature action, spoil an excellent recruit and drive him away from the party for a long time. Use your judgment, and when you think the time is ripe to approach him to join the M.M. or the party, whichever he is prepared to do. Be very flexible, avoid sectarianism, and never lose your temper if a worker asks awkward questions. If you cannot answer them tell him you don't know, but will find out and let him know next week.

As you bring him nearer the revolutionary movement, it is a good practice to lend him elementary literature to read without charge. The point at which this is done will have to be one for your own personal judgment.

Another method of making contact with workers in given factories is through the trade union branch or centre to which they belong.

Party fractions or individual members in the given union, or if we lack these factors, sympathisers should be approached and asked to find out from the union roll the names and addresses of workers in the factory that we are interested in. If we succeed in this the same general methods of approach as outlined above will be found applicable.

Sports teams and organisations are also a very good means of getting contact with factory workers. Most of us have played some sort of sport at one time or another, or we know sympathisers and friends who do. It is quite easy to find out who is playing in certain teams in our locality, where they work and live and so on. In this way contact can be made with the workers in different industries. Also many factories run their own teams, and any Y.C.L. or party members playing in opposing teams should use their positions to find out where the workers in the factory team live and pass the information on to the party committee.

The above remarks briefly touch the question of concentration from its practical aspect and if followed correctly will be found to obtain results in quite a short time.

(Next month: "How to Form the Factory Unit, and How It Operates")

## The 1917 Strike—Some Lessons For To-Day

(By "NUGAFONOS")

(Continued from last issue)

The strike was, therefore, an important political struggle and the crushing of it an aim which the Government saw it must by all and any means achieve. It was necessary to curb the strike wave which, as we have seen, was mounting. On the economic side the strike was also a part of a rationalising process—a process of speeding up which, however, also had its political aspect because it had, as part of its aim, to drive more and more men to the trenches. Let us consider this economic side of the strike for a few minutes.

The strike in the railway workshops broke out because of the introduction of the Taylor Card System. These cards were to show the exact time taken over each job by each worker. The proposal had been first brought up by the Labor Government in 1916. [The Holman Labor Government split over the conscription issue in November, 1916, and the Holman Nationalist Government took its place—November 15.] Under pressure from the unions the Labor Government had been forced to withdraw the cards. Now, after over twelve months, this was the second attempt at their introduction. On the previous occasion an undertaking had been given that there would thereafter be no interference with labor conditions while the war lasted. According to Fuller (statement August 27, 1917), the "undertaking" was only "an implied understanding," and therefore, evidently, according to his reasoning, could be broken! In any case, again according to Fuller, the introduction of the card system was simply "a slight administrative change"!

Now what was this card system? According to a statement issued by the Unions' Defence Committee, August 11, 1917, the Taylor Card System had first been introduced in 1905, in the Midvale Steel Works, in Pennsylvania. These works were a part of the American Steel Trust. The superintendent of the works, Taylor, made experiments with men of the best physique, under the age of 35. The motions of these men at work were analyzed and timed.

Then these men were allotted each to a gang and became pace-makers for the rest. The work that the gang did under these conditions in an hour became a standard which all had to attain. The system, first applied to the shovelling of coal, was then adapted to all other forms of work. Such was the system of speed-up that Fuller and the Commissioners were intent upon introducing into the railway workshops.

The devastating nature of the system may be gauged by the increase in the number of accidents. During the first six months of 1917 (that is, before the introduction of the system) the percentage of the staff injured at Randwick workshops was 2.28. In the six months following the introduction of the Card System, the percentage rose to over 4! When a witness said to Judge Curlewis: "There is more work done, and the accidents may not be greater in proportion," even the judge was impelled to remark: "That is what might be, and what the men object to. **You are doing more work at the expense of the men's safety!**"

Nor was this all. After the defeat of the men the injured were treated less generously. Out of the 53 injured in the first two months of 1917, 13 received full pay while away from work. Out of the 87 injured in the first two months of 1918, only 10 received full pay! The effect of the defeat of the men and the human cost of the introduction of the card system, which has been universally adopted since, were measured in the suffering as the result of more frequent accidents and in the premature aging of men forced to keep up with a quickened pace.

When the men had been defeated the Government took advantage of the broken ranks to make the men suffer for daring to oppose the Government. One of the terms of the capitulation had been that employment was to be offered "**without vindictiveness.**" There was to be no victimisation. But there was widespread victimisation, and victimisation was admittedly the policy of the Government. At the Recruiting Conference called by the Governor-General in April, 1918, Senator Gardiner (Labor) brought up the question of victimisation which, he said, was retarding recruiting. He referred to numerous cases of victimisation and gave one as an illustration. The case was that of a man who had been a leading porter at Orange. He was dismissed with the rest of the strikers in 1917. He was then re-employed, but after a few months was victimised—he was dismissed upon instructions from headquarters in a memo which said that "he should not have been given employ-

ment." Another case was that of the secretary of the Locomotive Drivers' Union. He had a large family and his father had been killed in France. Because of his position as secretary he was not taken back at the end of the strike. An interesting commentary upon both the mind of a "Labor" leader and the vindictiveness and callousness of Holman is furnished by the interchange between Gardiner and Holman.

"GARDINER: I think that when men who had no black marks against them while in the employ of the State, but who, **because of want of judgment** went out—

"HOLMAN: Want of judgment?"

"GARDINER: My friends opposite have described their action as a blunder.

"HOLMAN: A blunder on the part of the leaders.

"GARDINER: And the wives and children of these men are suffering because of what you say was a blunder. I quite understand the Government's position, but I am certain that harmony will not be secured while victimisation of this kind obtains.

"HOLMAN: You might as well say that we shall not get harmony until we release all the burglars and criminals from our gaols. **Men who strike against the State are, surely, not in the same position as those who strike against capitalist employers?**

"GARDINER: I am glad I mentioned this matter. We want to know whether victimisation is to be a fixed policy of the Government. . . . **He had no right, of course, to strike against the State!**

"HOLMAN: He knew what the position would be when he went out.

"GARDINER: Of course, he did.

"HOLMAN: **Then what is he screaming about?**"

Another case of victimisation was that of a returned soldier, who had lost an eye at the front. He was not on strike because he was in attendance at the hospital at the time, but he was victimised because he had "made no endeavor to demonstrate that he did not leave his job on strike"! In Parliament, Mr. Dooley (October 23, 1917) gave another example. This man was a returned soldier and had a good discharge—having returned wounded. His father had been a soldier in the British Army for 47 years, and his brother was then fighting at the front. He had been employed in the parcels office for two years. On September 20 he was dismissed without any reason being given. He then sought employment with a private



firm, but although his qualifications were satisfactory he was not engaged. His name was on a black list!

And it was thus that the process went on: weeding out of militants and active strikers—then men too old for the pace set, men with long service, but getting too old—and, finally, men young enough to be in the trenches. The defeat of the men in the strike brought victimisation, misery, poverty in its train. The Government was given a free hand to starve men, women and children at home and to send thousands of young men to their death in the trenches. It was a Roman holiday for Government and employers.

(To be continued.)

## Lenin's Thesis On The Agrarian Question

Much unclarity exists in the revolutionary movement of Australia on the agrarian question. For this reason we publish herewith the thesis on the agrarian question submitted to the Second Congress of the Communist International by N. Lenin.

This document, which will be concluded in the next issue of the "Review," is the most fundamental statement of the C.I. on the agrarian question and is the basis for the whole approach of the revolutionary movement in all countries to the movement of the toiling masses of the countryside.—Editor.

1. No one but the city industrial proletariat, led by the Communist Party, can save the laboring masses in the country from the pressure of capital and landlordism, from dissolution and from imperialistic wars, ever inevitable as long as the capitalist regime endures. There is no salvation for the peasants except to join the communist proletariat, to support with heart and soul its revolutionary struggle to throw off the yoke of the landlords and the bourgeoisie.

On the other hand, the industrial workers will be unable to carry out their universal mission, and to liberate humanity from the bondage of capital and war, if they shut themselves within their separate guilds, their narrow trade interests, and restrict themselves self-sufficiently to a desire for the improvement of their sometimes

tolerable bourgeois conditions of life. That is what happens in most advanced countries possessing a "labor aristocracy," which forms the basis of the would-be parties of the Second International, who are, in fact, the worst enemies of socialism, traitors to it, bourgeois jingoes, agents of the bourgeoisie in their labor movement. The proletariat becomes a truly revolutionary class, truly socialist in its actions, only by acting as the vanguard of all those who work and are being exploited as their leader in the struggle for the overthrow of the oppressors; and this cannot be achieved without carrying the class struggle into the agricultural districts, without making the laboring masses of the country all gather around the Communist Party of the town proletariat, without the peasants being educated by the town proletariat.

2. The laboring and exploited masses in the country, which the town proletariat must lead on to the fight, or at least win over to its side, are represented in all capitalist countries by the following groups:—

In the first place, the agricultural proletariat, the hired laborers (by the year, by the day, by the job), making their living by labor in capitalist, agricultural, or industrial establishments; the independent organisation of this class, separated from the other groups of the country population (in a political, military, trade, co-operative, educational sense), and an energetic propaganda among it, in order to win it over to the side of the Soviet Power and of the dictatorship of the proletariat, must be the fundamental task of the Communist Parties in all countries.

In the second place, the semi-proletariat or small peasants, those who make their living partly by working for wages in agricultural and industrial capitalist establishments, partly by toiling on their own or a rented parcel of land yielding but a part of the necessary food produce for their families, this class of the rural population is rather numerous in all capitalist countries, but its existence and its peculiar position are hushed up by the representatives of the bourgeoisie and the yellow "socialists" affiliated to the Second International. Some of these people intentionally cheat the workers, but others follow blindly the average views of the public and are of this special class with the whole mass of the "peasantry." Such a method of bourgeois deception of the workers is used more particularly in Germany and France, and then in America and other countries. Provided that the work of the Communist Party is well organised, this group is sure to side with the Communists, the con-

ditions of life of these half-proletarians being very hard, the advantage the Soviet Power and the dictatorship of the proletariat would bring them being enormous and immediate. In some countries there is no clear-cut distinction between these two groups; it is, therefore, permissible under certain conditions to form them into separate organisations.

In the third place, the little proprietors, the small farmers who possess by right of ownership or on rent small portions of land which satisfy the needs of their family and of their farming, without requiring any additional wage labor; this part of the population as a class gains everything by the victory of the proletariat, which brings with it: (a) Liberation from the payment of rent or of a part of the crops (for instance, the Metayers in France, the same arrangements in Italy, etc.) to the owners of large estates; (b) abolition of all mortgages; (c) abolition of many forms of pressure and of dependence on the owners of large estates (forests and their use, etc.); (d) immediate help from the proletarian state for farm work (permitting use by peasants of the agricultural implements and in part of the buildings on the big capitalist estates expropriated by the proletariat, the immediate transformation by the proletarian state power of all rural co-operatives and agricultural companies, which under the capitalist rule were chiefly supporting the wealthy and middle peasantry into institutions primarily for the support of the poor peasantry, that is to say, the proletarians, semi-proletarians, small farmers, etc.).

At the same time the Communist Party should be thoroughly aware that during the dictatorship of the proletariat, at least some partial hesitations are inevitable in this class, in favor of unrestricted free trade and free use of the rights of private property. For this class, being a seller of commodities (although on a small scale), is necessarily demoralised by profit-hunting and habits of proprietorship. And yet, provided there is a consistent proletarian policy—and the victorious proletariat deals relentlessly with the owners of large estates and the landed peasants—the hesitations of the class in question will not be considerable, and cannot change the fact that on the whole this class will side with the proletarian revolution.

3. All these three groups taken together constitute the majority of the agrarian population in all capitalist countries. This guarantees in full the success of the proletarian revolution, not only in the towns but in the country as well. The opposite view is very widely

spread, but it persists only because of a systematic deception on the part of bourgeois science and statistics. They hush up by every means any mention of the deep chasm which divides the rural classes we have indicated, from the exploiters, the landowners and capitalists on the one hand, from the landed peasants on the other. It holds further because of the incapacity and the failure of the "heroes" affiliated to the yellow Second International and the "labor aristocracy," demoralised by imperialistic privileges, to do genuine propaganda work among the poor in the country. All the attention of the opportunists was given and is being given now to the arrangements of theoretical and practical agreements with the bourgeoisie, including the landed and the middle peasantry (see paragraph concerning these classes) and not to the revolutionary overthrow of the bourgeois government and the bourgeois class by the proletariat. In the third place, this view persists because of the force of inveterate prejudice possessing already a great stability (and connected with all bourgeois-democratic and parliamentary prejudices), the incapacity to grasp a simple truth fully proved by the Marxian theory and confirmed by the practice of the proletarian revolution in Russia. This truth consists in the fact that the peasant population of the three classes we have mentioned above, being extremely oppressed, scattered, and doomed to live in half-civilised conditions in all countries, even in the most advanced, is economically, socially, and morally interested in the victory of socialism; but that it will finally support the revolutionary proletariat only after the proletariat has taken the political power, after it has done away with the owners of the large estates and the capitalists, after the oppressed masses are able to see in practice that they have an organised leader and helper sufficiently powerful and firm to support and to guide, to show the right way.

The "middle peasantry," in the economic sense, consists of small landowners who possess, according to the right of ownership or rent, portions of land, which, although small, nevertheless may: (1) usually yield under capitalist rule not only scanty provision for the needs of the farming and for the family, but also the possibility of accumulating a certain surplus, which, at least in the best

years, could be transformed into capital; and (2) necessitate the employment of (for instance, in a family of two or three members) wage labor. As a concrete example of the middle peasantry in an advanced capitalist country, we may take the situation in Germany, where, according to the registration of 1917, there was a group tilling farms from five to ten acres, and in these farms the number of hired agricultural laborers made up about a third of the whole number of farms in this group. In France, the country of a greater development of special cultures, for instance, the vineyards, requiring special treatment and care, the corresponding group employs wage labor probably in a somewhat larger proportion.

The revolutionary proletariat probably cannot make it its aim, at least for the nearest future and for the beginning of the period of the proletarian dictatorship, to win this class over to its side. The proletariat will have to content itself with neutralising this class, i.e., with making it take a neutral position in the struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie. The vacillation of this class is unavoidable, and in the beginning of the new epoch its predominating tendency in the advanced capitalist countries will be in favor of the bourgeoisie, for the ideas and sentiments of private property are characteristic of the possessors. The victorious proletariat will immediately improve the lot of this class by abolishing the system of rent and mortgage, by the introduction of machinery and electrical appliances into agriculture. The proletarian state power cannot at once abolish private property in most of the capitalist countries, but must do away with all duties and levies imposed upon this class of people by the landlords; it will also secure the small and middle peasantry the ownership of their land holdings and enlarge them, putting the peasants in possession of the land they used to rent (abolition of rents).

The combination of such measures with a relentless struggle against the bourgeoisie, guarantees the full success of the neutralisation policy. The transition to collective agriculture must be managed with much circumspection and step by step, and the proletarian state power must proceed by the force of example without any violence toward the middle peasantry.

(To be continued.)