

1233
DEFEND DEMOCRATIC RIGHTS

Vol. 3, No. 4

APRIL, 1936



THE COMMUNIST REVIEW

PRINCIPAL CONTENTS

Unity of the Labor Movement
In Victoria—*L. Donald*

What Are the Imperialists Do-
ing?—*L. Sharkey*

Australia's Fights for Freedom,
Democracy, and Progress—*J. N.
Rawling*

A Farm Programme—*T. Ensfield*
George V and Edward VIII—*R.
Bishop*

APRIL, 1936 :: PRICE SIXPENCE



The Communist Review

A Magazine of the Theory and Practice of Marxism-Leninism

Vol. 3, No. 4 SYDNEY, N.S.W. April, 1936

For the Unity of the Labor Movement in Victoria

By L. DONALD

OVER the past few weeks the danger of the new world war has increased enormously. Japanese imperialism intensifies its provocative actions against Outer Mongolia and the Soviet Union. In Europe, German Fascism continues its mad career toward war by its provocative action in turning the demilitarised Rhineland into an armed camp. At the same time, British imperialism engages in a frantic armaments drive unprecedented in history. Australian imperialism does not lag behind the development of events in the rest of the world, but engages also in the piling up of armaments, speaks of compulsory military training, etc.

In this situation the united and decisive action of the working class and all friends of peace is essential if another world tragedy is to be averted. Never at any previous period was the question of unity of such paramount importance as it is to-day. This is not a very deep problem which requires a great deal of study and investigation to understand. It is an obvious and elementary truth which is impressing itself more and more upon the great masses of toilers as the dangers of war and Fascism grow more acute.

Surely we have the right to expect that those who claim the title of "Workers' Leaders" should accept such an obvious fact and act accordingly. Surely those who, as they claim, represent the workers' interests, should abide by the first and most important interest of all—that of working-class unity. On the eve of world war everything should be subservient to united working-class action against the threatened war.

But these simple truths are ignored by the leaders of the Labor Party and Trades Hall Council in Victoria. Instead of welcoming the growing desire for unity evidenced by the workers they reply to this growing desire by fighting with more bitterness and unscrupulousness against it. They strive to undermine the growing unity by steps to create further and more serious disunity. They either fail to understand, or choose to ignore, the facts of life—the tragic lessons of Germany and

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | PAGE |
|--|------|
| FOR THE UNITY OF THE LABOR MOVEMENT IN VICTORIA (L. Donald) | 1 |
| WHAT ARE THE IMPERIALISTS DOING? (L. Sharkey) | 7 |
| AUSTRALIA'S FIGHTS FOR FREEDOM, DEMOCRACY, AND PROGRESS (J. N. Rawling) | 15 |
| FROM THE CONCLUDING SPEECH OF COMRADE WOLF MICAL AT THE SIXTH CONGRESS OF THE YOUNG COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL | 27 |
| A FARM PROGRAMME (T. Ensfield) | 38 |
| THE PRESENT RULERS OF THE CAPITALIST WORLD ARE TEMPORARY POWERS — THE REAL RULER OF THE WORLD IS THE PROLETARIAT (G. Dimitrov) | 43 |
| GEORGE V AND EDWARD VIII (R. Bishop, London) | 53 |
| A GREAT CONGRESS OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF FRANCE (J. Berlioz, France) | 57 |
| LENIN'S METHOD OF WORK (N. Krupskaya) | 6 |

Austria and the glorious lessons of France and the recent Spanish elections.

With every step forward taken by the movement of the masses against war and Fascism, the executives of the A.L.P. and T.H.C. have taken action to split the workers' ranks. Although it had done nothing itself to develop action against war and Fascism, when the united front Australian Movement Against War and Fascism began to develop wide activities in Victoria and win the support of large numbers of workers and organisations, it created its "Labor Anti-War Committee" in order to split the anti-war forces.

However, the L.A.W.C. was weak and ineffective and the broad and energetic council against war and Fascism continued to receive widespread support from unions, A.L.P. branches and prominent workers in the A.L.P.

If the growing united front Movement Against War and Fascism was to be checked, it was realised that more decisive steps were necessary.

The steps taken did not have even the saving grace of originality—the V.C.A.W. & F. was branded a "Communist organisation" and placed on the banned list. At the same time branches and members were threatened with expulsion if they continued to associate with the V.C.A.W. & F. This threat was carried out with the expulsion of Maurice Blackburn, M.L.A., one of the staunchest fighters in the Labor Party, and other individuals, and at least one branch was dissolved.

This action only served to crystallise the movement towards the united front developing inside the A.L.P., roused a storm of protest throughout the unions and A.L.P., and resulted in the affiliation of further unions to the V.C.A.W. & F. A conference of unions affiliated with the V.C.A.W. & F. was called by the T.H.C. executive, but the intimidatory tactics of the executive representatives produced no effect on the union representatives and the unions retained their affiliation.

Throughout the trade unions and A.L.P. those measures were resented, and the demand for unity was raised more and more insistently. This demand was strengthened when the V.C.A.W. and F. put forward proposals for the formation of one united anti-war organisation which, if accepted, would have overcome the split and at the same time guaranteed that the leadership of such an organisation would be in the hands of the labor movement.

The preparations for the annual conference of the A.L.P. reflected clearly the feeling existing in the ranks of the Labor Party. From trade unions and A.L.P. branches came resolu-

tions for the agenda paper demanding the reinstatement of Maurice Blackburn and the other expelled members, the removal of the ban placed upon the V.C.A.W. & F., and the formation of one united anti-war organisation. Amongst those who forwarded such resolutions were powerful unions such as the A.R.U.

The opponents of unity were considerably alarmed. There were indications that the supporters of unity would have considerable success at the annual conference. Such a possibility had to be averted at all costs. In desperation, the A.L.P. Executive took the drastic step of delivering an ultimatum to the unions concerned that unless they disaffiliated from the V.C.A.W. & F. they would be denied representation at the A.L.P. conference. The reason for this move is, of course, obvious. If the unions concerned remain affiliated with the V.C.A.W. & F. there will be 30 less delegates to the A.L.P. conference, the majority of whom would support proposals at the conference for uniting the two anti-war organisations and the other unity demands.

This ultimatum was replied to in vigorous terms by the secretaries of several unions. There was open talk in the trade unions of disaffiliation from the Labor Party. Mr. Richards, secretary of the powerful Boot Trades Union, said that it was certain that a move would be made in his union for withdrawal from the A.L.P. if this threat were persisted in.

It was recognised that this threat alone was insufficient to force unions to obey the dictatorial demands of the A.L.P. Executive. An even more drastic and far-reaching step was necessary, and it is characteristic that in deciding upon such a step the two executives should seize upon one which had as its object the further splitting of the labor movement.

This step was an ultimatum from the T.H.C. Executive to all unions concerned, that unless they severed their affiliation with the V.C.A.W. & F. by March 31 they would be denied representation on the T.H.C., and unless the affiliation was severed by May, they would be disaffiliated from the Trades Hall Council.

This ultimatum was delivered to the A.R.U., A.F.U.L.E., Boot Trades, Carters and Drivers, Tanners, Ironworkers, Bricklayers and Teachers' Industrial Union, unions with an aggregate membership of over 26,000. In their struggle against unity of the working masses in opposition to war and Fascism the two executives are prepared to split this body of unionists away from the A.L.P. and the rest of the trade union movement.

These decisions are of tremendous importance, not only for the Victorian labor movement, but for the labor movement

throughout Australia. They threaten not only the growing unity of the working class as a whole, but they threaten also the unity which has just been reached in the ranks of the Labor Party itself.

The conclusions of the Communists on the occasion of the achievement of unity within the Labor Party are being borne out by the recent developments. The Political Bureau published a letter at the time of the unity conference in which it welcomed the achievement of unity as being a step toward "the wider unity of the whole labor movement." However, at the same time it pointed out that in 1915 the Labor Party split because many of its leaders supported conscription, in 1931 it split again because its leaders supported the Premiers' Plan, and it drew the conclusions that "Lasting unity, unity which will unite the Labor Party, unity which will bring the whole labor movement, the Labor Party and the Communist Party, together, can only succeed if it is based on a definite agreement for action in defence of the people against the wealthy exploiters." And further it states, "To achieve this aim, unity must be based firmly on a programme of action to which all sections of the labor movement subscribe."

It is precisely because the unity achieved within the Labor Party is not based on a common programme and common action in defence of the conditions of the working people, and against war and Fascism, that it shows already the tendency to disintegrate. A powerful section of the Labor Party desire unity in the struggle, whilst the leadership oppose unity and do everything possible to prevent the development of real working class unity. In such a situation the Labor Party cannot be a really united Party. Only when the Labor Party leaders accept this fact and assist in the development of united action by all sections of workers—Labor Party, Communist, and non-party—will real and lasting unity be achieved within the Labor Party. But the present policy of the Victorian Executive of the A.L.P. is leading directly away from such an objective—is leading to further disunity, not only in the ranks of the labor movement as a whole, but also within the ranks of the Labor Party itself.

The carrying out of the ultimatum of the T.H.C. would have a disastrous effect on the trade union movement. Not only would a number of powerful unions be separated from the T.H.C. but these unions would be supported and possibly joined by other powerful unions. At the same time the disaffiliation of these unions would make the T.H.C. as the centre of Victorian unionism a travesty.

Such a step, particularly in a period when the unity of the

trade union movement is of such paramount importance, condemns its perpetrators as enemies of the vital interests of the working class.

But it is clear that the people who would take such action do not fear the consequence—the tragic disunity and weakening of the forces of the working class—nearly so much as they fear the growing unity of the working class, a unity becoming welded in everyday struggles against capitalism.

What has been the reaction of the Victorian workers to these splitting ultimatums? The greatest resentment has spread throughout the labor movement, and it is being made abundantly clear that in their opposition to unity the two executives are not supported by the main bodies of Victorian workers. If the splitters had the idea that these actions would stampede the unions into blind, unquestioning obedience they have been sadly mistaken.

The A.R.U. Executive sees no reason why it should disaffiliate from the V.C.A.W. & F.; the Boot Trades Union has postponed consideration of the matter until after the ultimatum expires on March 31; Mr. Turner, assistant secretary of the Carters and Drivers, has roundly condemned the decision. The Tanners' Union carried the following resolution at its last meeting:—

"That this union strongly resents the attitude of the A.L.P. Executive in attempting to debar fully financial unions from the right of representation at the Annual Conference, and also resents the T.H.C. Executive's action in threatening to disaffiliate unions which have been associated with the V.C.A.W. and F., as we believe such action will destroy unity in the trades union movement."

The Coburg branch of the A.E.U. and Coburg A.L.P. have also strongly protested. Similar expressions will undoubtedly be made by other unions when they meet, whilst a number of unions have already declared themselves for complete unity in the fight against war.

Typical of the feeling amongst important sections of workers is the action of the Tramwaymen. Some time ago they wrote to the A.L.P. Executive asking it to receive a deputation from the Tramways, A.R.U. and T.H.C. to discuss the formation of one united anti-war movement. To this request they received the reply that the A.L.P. Executive could see no good purpose in such a discussion. Arising from this reply a strong resolution was adopted by the executive of the union criticising the failure of the A.L.P. Executive to avail itself of the trammies' proposal,

and protesting against the action threatened to unions affiliated with the V.C.A.W. & F.

At the same time a movement has developed within the A.L.P. against the splitting policy of the executive and for unity. This movement initiated by the Essendon branch of the A.L.P. is gaining support from A.L.P. branches and trade unions. At its last meeting the following resolution, moved and seconded by the representatives of two powerful unions was carried:

"That the attitude of the executive is inimical to the best interests of liberty and freedom and declares its belief in the necessity for a call to action and invites all members of the A.L.P. unions to meet in mass conference in Unity Hall on Sunday evening, March 22."

In this situation the fight for unity of the Labor Movement in Victoria enters a new phase. And in spite of the efforts of the two executives the developments over the past period have shown that the forces fighting for unity grow stronger day by day. The answer of the supporters of unity to the splitting activities of the opponents of unity is to fight more stubbornly and with even more persistence and determination for the maintenance of unity within the A.L.P. and the trade union movement and to extend this unity to embrace all sections of the working class.

The V.C.A.W. & F. has issued a statement in which it not only reiterates its proposal for the formation of one united anti-war organisation, but also indicates that it is prepared to consider other alternative proposals for overcoming the present crisis and bringing about unity.

The District Committee of the Party, in a statement on the position, regrets the blow against unity which has been made, but again raises its appeal for overcoming the present breach and preventing further breaches. The statement concludes: "The Communist Party declares that, so far as its own relations with the A.L.P. are concerned, its invitation to the latter to join in united front activity against war, still stands. The door is open for the Labor Party, and for Labor Party members to cooperate with the Communists in non-Party peace movements. The challenge of war was never so grave as now. Let it not be said that the working class failed to answer the challenge at the critical moment on account of internal divisions. Let us unite for peace now!"

What Are the Imperialists Doing?

By L. SHARKEY

A FEW days after Comrade Stalin's interview with the United Press, in which he declared that the centre of gravity in regard to threatened world peace would shift to Europe or on the Manchurian frontier, causing an international crisis alongside of which the Italo-Abyssinian War would be a mere incident, his prediction received dramatic confirmation by the reoccupation of the Rhineland by Fascist Germany.

This has created a grave international crisis, which has not fully clarified itself at the moment of writing, and out of which very rapidly may grow the world war.

The occupation of the Rhineland, whatever may be the immediate results, is very definitely a part of the plan for a new war for which Hitlerism has been frenziedly working since the very first moment of its accession to power. Gone are all the demagogic promises of better times to the petty-bourgeoisie, to the peasants, to the unemployed, to the working class; all that remains is the real Nazi programme, the programme of big capital, of Krupp and Thyssen, the programme of imperialist war directed at Germany's capitalist rivals and of counter-revolutionary war against the Soviet Union and the cruel and barbarous persecution of all democratic, pacifist, humanitarian, Socialist, and Communist movements at home.

Accompanying the bellicose statements of Hitler, Goering, and Goebbels, it is estimated that £1,500,000,000 (in Australian pounds: £1 equals 10 marks) has been expended on rearmament in the few years of the Hitler Government, whilst the same period has witnessed the increasing impoverishment of the toiling masses and gigantic efforts to bring about their mental, moral, and physical enslavement by the war machine.

To understand the present-day policy of German capitalism and its Fascist Government, one must understand the history of German capitalism. Coming late on the scene, developing after British and French capitalism had seized upon the choicest colonies and markets, German capitalism found itself struggling against these powerful and older-established rivals, striving for elbow-room, and demanding "a place in the sun." German capitalism, by efficiency and the cheapness of its goods before the War, strove to oust Britain from the markets, achieving a measure of success, because it had the advantage of being

equipped with a more modern industry than Britain. The economic struggle gave rise to militarism, to the military and naval race between German capitalism and its opponents, and finally the struggle was submitted to the arbitrament of arms, the Great War, which ended in the defeat of Germany.

Despite its terrific losses, German capitalism is driven by the inherent urge of capitalism to expand. "The need for markets chases the bourgeoisie all over the globe," wrote Karl Marx in "The Communist Manifesto."

The period since the closing of the World War saw an enormous growth of the revolutionary proletarian forces within Germany, the party of Ernst Thaelmann receiving more than 6,000,000 votes at the last free election held in Germany. In a frenzy of fear at the near approach of the proletarian revolution, the German bourgeoisie brought Hitler's party to power with the view of exterminating the German revolutionaries and preparing the country for war in order to realise its imperialist aims of conquest.

The main aim of Hitler Germany has been and is suppression of the working class and an attempt to solve the insoluble problems of capitalism by means of war. In this, of course, German capitalism does not materially differ from any other capitalism, except that due to its historical development and situation these problems have been rendered more urgent for German capitalism than for most other capitalisms. Modern imperialist war is the product of the capitalist system, the example of Germany demonstrates.

Hitler, the chief spokesman of post-war German imperialism and militarism, has consistently directed the attention of the German bourgeoisie towards the Soviet Union as the proposed scene of the new German conquests and colonies. What the people of the Ukraine and other threatened areas, as well as the small capitalist States whose independence would be terminated if Hitler's plans fructify, think of German rule does not worry Hitler, any more than the feelings of the Irish or the Indians ever troubled British imperialism, or the lack of desire of the Abyssinians for Fascist rule has influenced Mussolini.

Hitler, knowing the common hatred of the bourgeoisie for the proletarian republics and the growing strength and influence of the Soviets over the toilers of the whole world, speculates upon the possibility of being allowed a free hand in rearming Germany and attempting the conquest of Soviet soil. In so far as British imperialism is concerned, this speculation has by no means been baseless. Huge finances have been poured into Germany from

London; Hitler's defiance of the Versailles Treaty, conscription, and rebuilding of the German navy have also received the tacit and open approval of British imperialism. Hitler Germany has also, in all probability, a secret military agreement with militarist Japan, whilst Fascist Poland and Hungary orientate themselves towards rearmed Germany.

These are among the main reasons why all the friends of peace see in Hitler Germany and Fascism the chief instigator of the new world war.

Soviet Russia, openly threatened by German and Japanese imperialist aims, in view of this peril has taken a number of steps to meet it. Soviet Russia has been the chief spokesman for peace and disarmament in the councils of the nations. At each international conference at which it has been possible for Soviet Russia to raise her voice, that voice has always been raised in denunciation of the imperialist war plans, for peace and disarmament. These wise counsels of the Socialist State have been disregarded, and the disarmament proposals of Litvinov rejected. In view of open threats, the steps taken by the Soviet Union to meet them have been: Firstly, to strengthen the Red Army and the defences of the Eastern and Western frontiers; secondly, the Soviet Union has proposed collective security pacts (as well as joining the League of Nations), in which Poland, Germany, and Japan have been invited to subscribe, but have refused. However, success has been achieved in regard to France and Czechoslovakia. Both these capitalist countries, as well as others, fear and suspect Hitler Germany. Rearmed Germany is a threat to France also, and it is consequently on this basis that agreement could be reached with the Soviet Union.

The aim of the Soviet Union was to bring together all the States which for different reasons at the moment do not desire war. Hitler complains that already 275,000,000 people have been united in defence of peace, but Soviet diplomacy desires that agreement be reached with Britain and other States in order that such a mighty front may be organised that it will deter Hitler or any other adventurer from daring to make war.

It will be seen that the activities of the Soviet Union in international politics do not arise from any endorsement of capitalism, as the "Labor Daily," tries to tell its readers, but in order to safeguard the stronghold of the proletariat against the menace of Hitler and Japan and a sincere desire to save the toiling masses of the world from a new massacre. That is why every friend of peace must support the policy of the Soviet Union.

which, in conjunction with the anti-war attitude and growing revolutionary sentiments of the working class, has been able to prevent another world conflagration up to the present.

British imperialism has aided German rearmament. It is reported to have investments totalling £800,000,000 in Germany. It made a naval pact with Hitler, giving important concessions. British imperialism wanted Germany as a counter-balance to French domination of Europe. British imperialism also favors Hitler's plan for an anti-Soviet war. It would also like to see Japanese imperialism, which is becoming a more dangerous competitor of Britain in China and elsewhere, exhausted in war with the Soviet Union. But British imperialism, whose equilibrium was disturbed by Mussolini's Abyssinian military adventure, and faced with possible war with Italy (see Professor Varga, in last month's "Communist Review") needs the support of France in the Mediterranean, which will only be given in return for British support against Hitler.

This explains the difference in the British and French attitudes, the co-signatories of Versailles, to the war preparation of Hitler. British diplomacy wants to "consider" Hitler's so-called "peace" plan, which only, as Litvinov pointed out at the League Council, asked for a free hand to make war in the East, i.e., against Soviet Russia. Further than this, Hitler asks for a French and Belgian demilitarised zone, which means that he would like to have the tremendous French system of fortifications known as the "Maginot Line" removed. France is not at all likely to agree to that. Hitler further complains of Germany's growing isolation, but who but Hitler is responsible for that? Hitler's policy has estranged Germany's best friend since the war—Soviet Russia. Hitler's policy has aroused the growing suspicion of many of the smaller capitalist States, who feel that German imperialism menaces their continued independence. Hitler's policy of preparing war and his brutal terror against the workers, intellectuals, Jews, liberals, etc., in Germany have directed the hatred of the working class and all lovers of peace, freedom, and democracy the world over against the barbarisms practised by the present German Government.

Reports are current that new efforts to terminate the Abyssinian War are afoot. Apparently Mussolini realises that possibly Hitler's next coup, if he succeeds in keeping his troops in the Rhineland, will be in Austria, which brings him into conflict with Italy and its rival schemes of imperialist penetration of Central Europe and the Balkans. Mussolini has still failed to

make serious progress in Abyssinia. The reply of Haile Selassie that Italy's claim of annihilating victories and the rout of the Abyssinians was simply made to influence the League of Nations and the decision on oil sanctions seems to be true, according to later reports, and that the Abyssinian armies are still intact, with the exception of losses sustained by the army of Ras Mulugeta, who recently died of pneumonia, seems clear. Latest reports indicate that Mussolini is hiding the fact that the "Legion of October 28," composed of hand-picked Fascists, who were sent in to the firing-line to show the unenthusiastic troops how to fight, was completely annihilated by the Abyssinians at Makale towards the end of January.

An excellent example of how Fascism will conduct war, if Hitler succeeds in unleashing it, is given by the barbarities practised by the Fascists in Abyssinia, which are quite in keeping with the methods employed by Fascism to quell the toiling population at home. Poison gas is used, although Italy is a party to the international treaty to outlaw poison gas, and there has been systematic destruction of peaceful Abyssinian settlements and hospitals by incendiary and chemical bombs from aeroplanes. Not only Abyssinian hospitals have been bombed, but Swedish, Egyptian, and British Red Cross hospitals have been subjected to such aerial attacks. Such is the true barbarous countenance of Fascism. In Fascism's war, in its "noble" task of "saving" corrupt, degenerate, and dying capitalism, the weak and helpless, the wounded, the babes and the mothers must be destroyed: no "sickly humanitarianism" must stand in the way of the "civilising" plans of the savage Hitlers, Goerings, and Mussolinis.

But the bringing of Italy back to the reconstituted Stresa front suggests that some new edition of the Hoare-Laval plan is being cooked at the expense of Abyssinia which will give concessions to Mussolini but prevent the control by Italy of the Abyssinian plateau to which British imperialism objects, in return for Italian support of French security and to bar the way to Austria against Hitler.

British imperialism supported Germany in the early phase of its rearmament, but the sweeping plans of Hitler raised British suspicion also. The German General Staff is said to have drawn up not only Plan No. 1, for the attack on the Soviet Union, but also a plan for the invasion of France, via Belgium and Holland. Such things as this have brought British imperialism into line for "collective security." The outcome of Hitler's reoccupation of the Rhine appears to be a strengthening of opposition to any

attack on France, or "westward expansion" by Germany. But the latest grouping of Britain, France, Italy, and Belgium does not close the door to Hitler's anti-Soviet plans. The danger exists that British imperialism may still favor Hitler's attack on the Soviets and induce France to forego the Soviet Pact in return for "security" of her own frontiers. We must remember that the aim of attempting the solving of the problems of capitalism at the expense of the U.S.S.R. is never buried very deep in bourgeois minds, whether German, French, or British. The defence of the Soviet Union is, therefore, the paramount task of the working class.

For the present, it would seem that the immediate danger of an outbreak of armed violence in connection with the Rhineland is passing, but new crises arise almost daily these times, and the war danger remains urgent. The recent vast Budgets of the imperialists, headed by Britain, the U.S.A., and Japan, running into hundreds of millions of pounds sterling, betoken that the capitalist Powers are adding the **final touches to their preparations for the new war.**

In the developing situation, whilst main attention has been centred on Abyssinia and the Rhine, we must not lose sight of the actions of the two great imperialisms outside of Europe—the U.S.A. and Japan. Karl Radek comments that the "neutrality" decision of the American ruling class does not mean "no more war." It can be upset when circumstances dictate, and the huge expenditure on the navy enables the U.S.A. to set at nought British blockades cutting her off from good customers, as in the case of Germany in the last war, the same writer says. The U.S.A. is building bases which aim eventually to bring her within striking distance of Japan. The main antagonism in bourgeois world politics is that between U.S.A. and Britain, and the U.S.A. rulers are ever mindful of that fact.

There is also growing friction between Britain and Japan, and Japan is not only preparing for eventual armed struggle with the U.S.A., but is striving at the moment to free herself from the menace of the great British base at Singapore. Japan is building an enormous canal—the Kra Canal—in Siam, upon the construction of which 50,000 workers are at present engaged, and which, it is claimed, will restore freedom of movement to Japanese ships and nullify Singapore to a great extent as far as Japan is concerned.

Japan, as we have seen, is the partner of Germany in the anti-Soviet front. It is waging war on the Chinese people. It recently "tested" Outer Mongolia to see what the Soviet Union

would do. It soon found out. Soviet fliers are reported to have assisted the Mongols, and a declaration came from Moscow that Mongolia would receive support. Hence, Japan has desisted for the moment, at any rate, from further interference with Mongolia. The energetic preparations by the Soviet Union to defend Soviet soil in the Far East have also caused the wiser elements of the Japanese ruling class to ponder. Hence the recent rebellion of the Japanese military caste and the slaughter of politicians whom they considered were slowing down the war machine. The Japanese election showed also that the Japanese masses, like their fellows the world over, are not greatly enamored of the drive to war of the militarists. This does not mean to say that Japanese imperialism is giving up its plans of conquest. By no means. The slain politicians and their slayers disagreed, not on "principles," but on "tactics," as it were. Japanese imperialism is eager to participate in the anti-Soviet war as soon as it can get sufficiently "strong" allies. It plans to crush the Chinese Revolution and enslave China; it visualises eventual war with the U.S.A.; whilst its conflict with British imperialism sharpens.

Out of all this tortuous diplomatic manoeuvring and the criss-crossing of the ambitions, intrigues, and policies of the imperialist "Great Powers," the intense preparation for war, the final preparations, it would seem, are now being made. And it may "just happen" at any time, without any formal declaration of war, as Comrade Stalin recently pointed out.

That is the lesson of world events.

To What Did Menzies Pledge Australia?

And in these preparations British imperialism is involved up to the neck. It is preparing to participate. The Communist Party has repeatedly stated that a war alliance for imperialist purposes exists between the Baldwin and Lyons Governments. The declaration of Menzies when he arrived in London confirms that thesis. Menzies said: "When the King of England is at war, the King of Australia cannot remain at peace."

The working class must struggle for the breaking of that alliance and fight against this wholehearted support by Menzies, Lyons & Co. for the sinister war plans of the British imperialists. "Not a man, not a ship, not a gun for imperialist war!" must be our slogan.

Furtive plans are being hatched for the introduction of compulsory training. This must be opposed, together with credits for the building of huge armaments and militarisation of this country. The Australian people do not want militarism and

conscription, and the fight against these designs must be better organised.

Menzies, the strike-breaker and persecutor of Kisch, and his pledge to use Australian toilers as cannon-fodder to further the nefarious war plans of British-Australian imperialists made in London, must be repudiated. We Australian workers, if fighting must be done, will fight only for peace, bread, and freedom, and for a Soviet Australia, not for the enslavement of other peoples for the benefit of a few capitalist parasites.

Defend the Leader of the Working Class!

"Only a party which adopts the point of view of the vanguard of the proletariat, which is capable of raising the masses to the level of the class interests of the proletariat, is capable of diverting the working class from the path of craft unionism and converting it into an independent political force. The Party is the political leader of the working class.

"I have spoken of the difficulties encountered in the struggle of the working class, of the complicated nature of this struggle, of strategy and tactics, of reserves and manoeuvring operations, of attack and defence. These conditions are no less complicated, perhaps more so, than war operations. Who can understand these conditions, who can give correct guidance to the vast masses of the proletariat? Every army at war must have an experienced General Staff if it is to avoid certain defeat. All the more reason, therefore, why the proletariat must have such a General Staff if it is to prevent itself from being routed by its mortal enemies. But where is this General Staff? Only the revolutionary Party of the proletariat can serve as this General Staff. A working class without a revolutionary party is like an army without a General Staff. The Party is the Military Staff of the proletariat."—J. Stalin, "Leninism," p. 89.

Raise the Defence Fund!

Australia's Fights for Freedom, Democracy, and Progress

By J. N. RAWLING

V.—Bligh of the "Bounty" and Another Mutiny

A GREAT deal of interest has been aroused here, during the past few weeks, in Bligh and the mutiny of the "Bounty," as a result of the presentation of the episode on the screen. It is around Bligh that the story of another mutiny centres—this time when he was Governor of New South Wales and its dependencies. The mutineers in this latter case were not the scum of the earth of which George Mackaness says the rank and file of the British Navy in those days was composed, but Sydney's "upper ten"—upper, in any case, in the sense of "uppish," having laid their hands on nearly all the available wealth in the country, and on all authority—finally turning the Governor out of his position and ruling in his stead.

As a result of their victory, they were able to present their view of the episode and of Bligh's character to succeeding generations. Bligh's name and character have, therefore, been blackened and themselves painted as the saviors of a country from one man's tyranny. So that a one-sided version of Bligh and his career has come down to us, not only in regard to the revolt of 1808, but also (it being presented as a necessary prelude to 1808) the mutiny of the "Bounty" in 1789. In regard to the latter, it has to be considered that in the proportion that Bligh as an individual is blackened so the system is white-washed. Bligh was probably no worse than the average of navy captains of his day—a day in which sailors (and soldiers and workers) were made to feel that they were the scum of the earth and treated as such—with good points and bad points and obviously with administrative ability and disciplinary power, else he would not have been chosen to come out here as Governor to put some order into the chaos resulting from the rule of the N.S.W. Corps.

The Rev. John Dunmore Lang, a contemporary, has this to say of Bligh:

"The character of Governor Bligh has, at different periods, and according as different parties have successively obtained the management of the colonial press, been pursued with the most unqualified vituperation and loaded with the most unqualified praise. As is usual in such cases, the truth lies between. That he had faults, I will not attempt to deny; but that he had

also redeeming qualities, which in great measure neutralise these faults, and proved him to be a much better man than the greater number of his enemies, will, I conceive, appear equally evident from the following sketch." (Lang, "Historical and Statistical Account of N.S.W.," Vol. I, p. 93.)

In other words, our understanding of conditions at the beginning of the 19th century is not helped much by any discussion of Bligh's personal character. The mutiny of the "Bounty" sprang from the conditions of the service and a chance to escape from them. Those conditions included bad and very little food, plenty of floggings, hard work, little pay and an enforced subservience. In the other case, the revolt sprang from a struggle between the monopolist traders of the N.S.W. Corps and Bligh who was sent out for such a struggle.

While determined to carry out the tasks set him, however, Bligh was determined to make any hay he could while the sun shone. His career as Governor began with a pleasant little episode. He landed in Sydney in the beginning of August, 1806. But, between his landing and his assumption of his duties, there was a period of four or five days during which he was the guest of Governor King. During those few days Governor King made him three grants of land: 240 acres a few miles along the Parramatta Road (which Bligh called Camperdown after the naval battle against the Dutch in 1797 in which he had taken part), 105 acres near Parramatta; and 1000 acres near Rouse Hill (called after another battle, Copenhagen). Then he became Governor! A few months later (17/1/1807), Bligh made a grant of 790 acres in the district of Evan to Mrs. King, wife of the ex-Governor! Quite appropriately she called it "Thanks." One good turn deserves another. (In 1840, it was questioned whether the grants to Bligh were valid—his heir surrendered the land at Parramatta, but was allowed to keep the others.)

When Bligh took up the reins of office, several addresses of welcome were presented to him. One of these (14/8/1806) was signed by George Johnston (major in the N.S.W. Corps), for the Military, Richard Atkins (Judge-Advocate), for the Civil authorities, and John McArthur, for the free inhabitants. It read:

"We entreat your Excellency to believe that, anxious as we are for the improvement of agriculture and the extension of commerce (the two great sources of population, civilisation, and morality), we are perfectly sensible they alone are not sufficient to secure the welfare of our infant establishment, but that it is the indispensable duty of us all to combine with our endeavors to accomplish these

objects a reverential regard to the laws, and a cheerful acquiescence in such measures as your Excellency may adopt to improve the true interests of the colony."

Was this a hint as to the kind of "measures" for which "acquiescence" would be forthcoming? Was this the hint: "Don't concern yourself overmuch with agriculture and the farmers or with trespassing upon our monopolies"? At any rate, two other addresses were presented. One (22/9/1806) from "Sydney settlers." This repudiated the former address and at least one of the signatories. That was John McArthur, who signed as representative of the free citizens. But what did the free citizens have to say of him? "Had we," this second address informed Bligh, "deputed anyone, John McArthur would not have been chosen by us, we considering him an unfit person to step forward upon such an occasion, as we may chiefly attribute the rise in the price of mutton to his withholding the large flock of wethers he now has to make such price as he may choose to demand." ("Historical Records of N.S.W.," Vol. 6, p. 188.)

Then the Hawkesbury farmers also sent in an address. This address recited the disasters and difficulties they had been experiencing—not least being the March flood, which was "greater than had been in this colony since it was first inhabited by Europeans." And this flood had come "at a time when the landholders, settlers, and cultivators were struggling to overcome a still greater difficulty occasioned by the oppressions before in practice by a mistaken policy in oppressing the merchants and inhabitants in general by sending from the port ships that arrived with merchandise, of necessaries and comforts, by not suffering them to land their goods for sale, although the colony was in the greatest want of the articles they sought." It spoke also of the low price of agricultural products.

The address included what the farmers might have called their "Bill of Rights." They appealed to the Governor:

To restore freedom of trade;

To permit commodities to be bought and sold on the open market;

To prevent that painful monopoly and extortion heretofore practised;

To protect merchants in their properties and the people in general in their rights, privileges, liberties, and professions as by law established;

To suffer the laws of the realm to take their due course in matters of property without control;

To cause justice to be administered in the Courts according to the law of the land;

To cause payments to be made in such money, or Government orders, as will pass current in the purchase of every article of merchandise without drawback or discount.

The Hawkesbury settlers evidently considered their situation to be serious enough to warrant their undertaking "to lay down their lives and fortunes for the protection and the support" of the Governor! And, they went on, "We look up to the time when it may please His Majesty to authorise, in such a manner as his justice may deem meet, a legal authority to make laws for the government of the colony." Thus was the demand for self-government becoming articulate! They also repudiated the claim of McArthur to speak for them. ("Historical Records of N.S.W.," Vol. 6, pp. 190-91.)

Most striking is the difference between the language used in the first address and that in the second and third. McArthur and Major Johnston spoke of "law"—presumably as it was administered by their co-signatory, the Judge-Advocate, whom Bligh later described as "a disgrace to human jurisprudence." The Hawkesbury farmers speak of justice and of their rights, liberties, and privileges. And such "measures" as they were asking the Governor to take would assuredly not meet with the "acquiescence" of the people they had in mind when they recited the grievances from which they suffered, and when they expressed their willingness to lay down their lives for the Governor. Those grievances listed above represent the oppression of which they were the victims. Who were the oppressors?

They were those who had a monopoly of the supply and sale of spirits, which constituted the principal, if not the only, medium of exchange, and which they manipulated in such a way that they were gradually getting into their own hands the whole of the wealth of the colony. It was a rapidly growing and remorseless octopus, and its most powerful tentacles were the officers of the N.S.W. Corps—the military power in the colony and to become the civil authority as well!

During the first year of Sydney's existence, the armed force consisted of marines. But in 1789 a special Corps was raised for permanent service in New South Wales. It was recruited by a Major Grose, who was able to make some welcome pocket-money in the process. He was allowed three guineas for each recruit, and could pocket the difference between that amount and what the recruit cost him. He was also able to sell all the commissions in the Corps. Three hundred men were soon recruited, and another batch of 200 were later added. A second Major was added, who paid £200 for his commission. The full strength was ten companies, comprising between eight and nine hundred men.

The marines who were here before were allowed and encouraged to enlist in the Corps.

The method of recruiting ensured the building up of a body of men probably similar to the "Black and Tans" of our day, while the officers looked upon the purchase-money for their commissions as an investment to bring in big returns rapidly. Dr. Lang described them as a body of men "banded together on every suitable occasion to maintain by violence and injustice what they had obtained by the sacrifice of honor." Another spoke of them as "blacklegs or blackguards," and the Irish rebel General Holt, whom we have already quoted in this series, said that they were "characters who have been considered as disgraceful to every other regiment in His Majesty's service." Holt mentions two officers only who were no dishonor to "themselves or His Majesty's cloth." These were Captain John Piper and Captain Edward Abbott, who, he says, were "too noble-minded to desire to make a fortune from the labor of the settler, the plunder of the soldier, or from the sweat of the convict's brow."

Both officers and men were allowed extraordinary privileges—including concubinage with female convicts. The officers gradually became all-powerful, even forcing the recall of Governors. The growth of their power began in 1792, when Governor Phillip went back to England, leaving Major Grose as Lieutenant-Governor. The latter began the practice of granting land to officers, and their new possessions, combined with the monopoly they had over the traffic in spirits, constituted the basis of their power. They were becoming a select oligarchy, aiming at holding all authority in their hands.

The rum currency was the weapon they were able to use. The officers were allowed to buy all the spirits that came into the harbor, cheaply. One of their agents went on board every ship before anybody else was allowed to do so. He bought all the spirits on board and then divided it up to the various officers proportionately to the amount of money each subscribed. Each officer was a publican. The extraordinary thirst for spirits prevalent in the Sydney of 130 years ago was probably both a cause and an effect of the immense traffic in them.

Dr. Redfern bears witness to the capacity of many of the drinkers. He says that men would pour spirits into buckets and drink "until they were insensible, or until, roused almost frantic, they were swift to shed blood." Such scenes were common.

"Eighteen years ago (1802), the period when I arrived in the Colony, it was lamentable to behold the excess to which drunkenness was carried. It was no uncommon occurrence for men to sit around a bucket of spirits and drink it with quart pots until

they were unable to stir from the spot." (Quoted by Mackaness "Life of Bligh," Vol. 2, p. 131.)

Colonel Paterson, in a letter to Sir Joseph Banks, said that more than 50,000 gallons of spirits had come into the colony in less than four months. By 1806, rum had become the only currency. Agents of monopolists would visit the outlying districts and advance rum against crops—often advanced more than the farmers would ever be able to repay, so that farms fell into the hands of the rum-traders. Rum bought cheaply was valued at famine prices when it was used to purchase grain. Then, all wheat and grain purchased "was put into the King's stores, the traders drawing and consolidating all their bills on the Imperial Treasury, thus robbing both the settlers and the Home Government." (Mackaness, Vol. 2, p. 122.)

An example of the profits made by the Corps traders is given in a letter (Nov. 4, 1808) from Commissary Palmer to Governor Bligh. ("Historical Records of N.S.W.," Vol. 6, p. 801.) A trader buys $6\frac{3}{4}$ gallons of spirits at 12/- per gallon—his outlay thus being £4/1/-. Watch how that grows to £28! With that spirit he buys maize from the farmers. But now the spirit is valued at £2/10/- per gallon! So, with the $6\frac{3}{4}$ gallons, our trader could buy 112 bushels of maize at 3/- per bushel, that is, for £16/16/-. Then he takes the maize to the Government Store which pays 5/- per bushel! One hundred and twelve bushels at 5/- per bushel places £28 to his credit. And with that £28 he can buy an ox. Thus any one of our "officers and gentlemen" could stock the farm which he got for nothing with cattle valued at £28 per head for £4/1/- per head! Or he could heap up for himself in the Government Stores £28 credit by means of an expenditure of £4/1/-. Spirits constituted an excellent form of money—for the monopolist. It was like buying gold for one-seventh of its value and using it to buy goods at the ordinary price. The spirit monopoly returned to the monopolists an immediate dividend of 700 per cent. on the money invested!

It is no wonder, therefore, that the officers of the Corps became wealthy. In 1802, Lieut.-Colonel Foveaux was the richest officer in the colony, owning 2020 acres and 1250 sheep. Captain John McArthur came next, with 1930 acres, 970 sheep, and many cattle and horses. (Mackaness, "Life of Bligh," Vol. 2, p. 120.)

The officers of the Corps were thus, says Mackaness, "sucking the life-blood of the community," and were making it "almost impossible for the few honest and laborious settlers to make a living." The soldiers themselves were also paid in goods, so that they really received about half of their nominal pay. It is not

surprising, therefore, that Bligh added his complaints to those of the previous Governors, and recommended that the Corps, gradually becoming "a dangerous militia," should be recalled for immediate active service. [England was then at war with Napoleon, it will be remembered.]

After Bligh's deposition, a letter from the Provost-Marshal describes the state of affairs to which 20 years' rule by the Corps had brought the colony:

"The officers of the N.S.W. Corps, sojourning here for the long period of 20 years, have collectively aggrandised themselves by the acquirement and accumulation of considerable landed and personal property, and having at their disposal the force that has been destined to uphold the necessary obedience to the laws estranged from European manners and customs, and emboldened by their immense distance from the parent State, they have at length arrogated to themselves the most unlimited authority, as it is now but too fully evinced by their having rendered themselves paramount to the civil power, changed not only the very forms of justice in the commencement of their revolutionary career, but have annihilated her very existence in the territory, and, lastly, by their having subjected His Majesty's representative to their capricious indignities and domination." (Letter from Provost-Marshal Gore to Lord Castlereagh, April 26, 1808.)

One will now have some idea of the dire straits of the farming population, who stressed in their address of welcome to Bligh that the disastrous floods had come on top of all this.

Bligh made a tour of inspection and interviewed every farmer. There had been floods in February and March. Prices in Sydney rose. Maize meal and coarse flour were selling for 2/6 per lb., and 4/6 and 5/- were being paid for a 2-lb. loaf of bread. Many Windsor inhabitants went without bread for months. The popularity of Bligh, created by his tour, was increased when he ordered that Government cattle be killed and distributed amongst the sufferers. He also guaranteed to buy wheat at the Government Stores after the next harvest for 10/- per bushel.

But his most progressive move was his general order prohibiting the exchange of spirits for grain or for any other commodity! This struck at the very root of the wealth and power of the monopolists, was to bring down upon him their wrath, and constitute the immediate cause for their revolt and deposition of

him. The penalties laid down in this order for infringement of it were: **For a convict**, 100 lashes and 12 months' hard labor; **for a freed convict**, deprivation of all indulgences, a fine of £20, and three months' imprisonment; **for the free settler**, loss of all privileges and a fine of £50. Half of the fine in each case was to go to the informer!

The period of Australian history that culminated in the arrest and deposition of Governor Bligh is usually treated by historians and others as a duel between Bligh and John MacArthur. As a result, Bligh is the martyr and MacArthur the unscrupulous bandit, or Bligh is the wicked oppressor and MacArthur the people's hero, according to the sympathies of the writer. The latter point of view is taken by S. A. Rosa, who wrote a valuable "Political History of Australia," which ran through the columns of the "Labor Daily" for several years, beginning in 1926. According to Rosa, the whole cause of the seizure of power by the N.S.W. Corps was Bligh's rottenness. He gives instances of Bligh's use of convicts on his farms, of his turning Government cattle on to his own land just before they calved and then returning them to Government lands minus the calves and of his making £1000 profit on his farms in one year! Says Rosa, "Ex-Post Captain William Bligh found it a really fine and profitable thing to be a Governor of N.S.W." ("L.D.," Nov. 6, 1926.) But, with the facts of the fortunes made by the monopolist traders of the Corps in mind, we must look upon Bligh's gains in comparison as merely the result of petty pilfering!

It is not the moral aspect with which we are here concerned. Bligh was a rogue, if you will, but so were the others. Who the finest rogue was does not much matter. And MacArthur's "vision" and his wonderful work for Australia (and himself) in founding the wool industry are also beside the point. That point is that the iniquitous rum traffic and the hold of the N.S.W. Corps upon trade were ruining the farming population and preventing the extension of agriculture. In so far as Bligh was attempting to break the monopoly, he was on the side of progress and fighting reaction. The encouragement of farming and the abolition of fetters upon it were helping to change the colony from a penal to a free settlement. We want to stress that point—not to whitewash Bligh.

Nor, on the other hand, do we want to whitewash John MacArthur—an upstart ready to ride rough-shod over everybody

and everything that stood in the way of his own advancement. MacArthur (later the name was spelt "Macarthur") was born in 1767, and was apprenticed to a stay-maker. His wife tells us that he was looked upon as being "too proud and haughty for his humble fortune and expectations." ("Early Records of the Macarthurs of Camden," p. 52.) And he set about bettering both. He was one of those who bought a commission in the N.S.W. Corps when it was raised, and came to Sydney in June, 1790.

He rapidly became rich, until he was the wealthiest man in the colony—by the means that we have outlined above. McMahon (in his "Fragments of the Early History of Australia," p. 174) thus describes his methods:

"Trading in rum, dealing with the convicts, profiting by their vices, extortionate in his transactions, harsh when once he got his victims within his grasp, buying grain from the unfortunate settlers, who were prevented from sending it into the Government granary by his mendacity, then forwarding same to Government at 200 per cent. advance of his purchase. Selling seed grain to settlers on terms that permitted him to require payment from them when the bill became due, **at the price sold or the increased price of grain.** (This was the case of Andrew Thompson, convict, one of the first magistrates.) Buying from the soldiers and others their grants of land, and paying them in rum. Importing and establishing private stills for the purpose of making deleterious spirits, to be retailed to the convicts at enormous profits."

A man, that is to say, "with his head screwed on the right way"—an ideal bourgeois who is "sure to get on."

"He came here in 1790," said Governor King in a letter to Castlereagh, "more than £500 in debt, and is now [1801] worth at least £20,000." He was one of the officers who were granted land by Grose (see above), receiving 100 acres at Parramatta, and then, shortly afterwards, another 100. Is it to be wondered at that, in a letter to England in 1794, he could say:

"The changes we have undergone since the departure of Governor Phillip [two years before] are so great and extraordinary that to recite them all might create some suspicion of their truth. From a state of desponding poverty and threatened famine, that this settlement should be raised to its present aspect in so short a time is scarcely credible. As to myself, I have a farm containing 250 acres, of which upwards of 100 are under

cultivation. Of this year's produce, I have sold £400 worth, and I have now remaining in my granaries upwards of 1800 bushels of corn," . . . and so on. It was truly a land flowing with milk and—rum!

Mr. Rosa has it against Bligh that he quarrelled with McArthur. Who could help quarrelling with him? He quarrelled with everybody but his cronies: with every one of the first five Governors, with Dr. Balmain, with his own Colonel (with whom he fought a duel and was for that sent home to England), with the Rev. Samuel Marsden, and so on. He began his voyage to Australia by fighting a duel with the commander of the transport, and had to be transferred to another ship. "Strife with his fellows," says Collier (in his "The Pastoral Age in Australia," p. 38), "was a condition of his stormy existence or, at least, a necessary consequence of his irascible character." It must have been very difficult to avoid quarrelling with this officer and gentleman, whom a contemporary described as being "as keen as a razor and as rapacious as a shark."

It should by now be quite obvious that McArthur, being one of the richest of the monopolist traders (although no longer an officer of the Corps), having made his wealth by means of that monopoly and having a character as we have outlined it, should become the leader of the monopolists against Bligh's attempt to break that monopoly. McArthur was leader of the "Rum Corps"—Bligh was commissioned by the Home Government to crush it. The crushing of it would be in the interests of the settlers. There lies the social character of the conflict between the two.

At first, after Bligh's arrival here, relations between all parties were smooth. The first clash came over the case of Andrew Thompson, mentioned above. Before the March (1806) flood, McArthur accepted a promissory note for a sum expressed in bushels of wheat at the ruling price, 7/6. When the note fell due, the price of wheat was about 28/- per bushel. Thompson offered wheat to the value of the sum on the note—at the latter price. McArthur demanded the actual number of bushels mentioned in the note—that is, Thompson would, in reality, have to repay about four times what he owed! The court decided against McArthur, and he appealed to Bligh, who upheld the decision of the Court. McArthur discontinued his visits to Government House. He was no longer "speaking"! What hurt him more was, perhaps, that in the Sydney "Gazette" (July 5, 1807), just before the Governor gave his decision, a paragraph had appeared warning people against specifying the number of bushels in a promissory note, as "Shylock" might "insist upon his bond"!

After Bligh's proclamation prohibiting the use of rum as currency, hostility to Bligh grew. The first clash occurred in March, 1807. Two spirit stills landed in Sydney from England, one of them being addressed to McArthur. Bligh ordered them both into the King's Stores to be returned to London—as the distillation of spirits had been prohibited. McArthur allowed only the head and worm of his still to go into the stores, and kept the coppers. When the ship, "Duke of Portland," was to sail for England, in October, Bligh demanded that the whole still be placed on board to go back to England. McArthur refused to hand the coppers over.

Campbell, the Naval Officer, instead of going himself to seize them, sent his nephew, who, having no official status, seized the coppers, and was prosecuted by McArthur for illegal seizure of his property. The verdict of the Court was in favor of McArthur. But it is quite evident that Bligh was in the right and that the only error on the Government's side was Campbell's sending an unauthorised person to make the seizure. Nevertheless, McArthur's victory, together with what he was pleased to call the Governor's persecution of him, gave added zeal to his campaign against the latter.

McArthur, in his peroration to the Court, concluded with this:

"It would, therefore, appear that a British subject, living in a British settlement, in which the British laws are established by the Royal Patent, has had his property wrested from him by a non-accredited individual, without any authority being produced or any reason being assigned than that it was the Governor's order. It is, therefore, for you, gentlemen, to determine whether this be the tenor of which Englishmen hold their property in N.S.W."

In that statement, wholly exaggerated and untrue in implication as it is, and quite opposite in tone to the Address to Bligh signed by the same McArthur a little over twelve months before (in which acquiescence was promised to measures taken by Bligh "to improve the true interest of the colony"), there is nevertheless contained the germ of a progressive programme. McArthur is at war with the Governor—only because his own monopoly interests are threatened. But there was to grow a movement which would soon bring about the overthrow of the autocracy of the first Governors.

The Bligh "Revolution" had this social content in it, then, that it helped to draw attention to the anachronism of a one-

man autocracy, and helped to crystallise the growing move for self-government. But only in its effects—and not in its purpose. How the "Revolution" was engineered, and its effects upon the people of N.S.W. and their further progress, will have to be told in our next issue.

[To be continued]

CORRECTION.—An error crept into our last instalment. It was stated that nearly 100,000 convicts had come to Australia and that this figure represented about half of the population. What is true about the statement is that 100,000 represented about half of the population in the year mentioned, 1851, but, of course, many of the convicts had gone home and many free settlers had died since 1788, so that it was an error to convey the impression that half of the population in 1851 was of convict origin.

The Organised Detachment of the Working Class

"The Party is not only the **vanguard** of the working class. If it desires really to lead the struggle of its class it must at the same time be the **organised** detachment of its class. Under the capitalist system, the Party's tasks are huge and varied. The Party must lead the struggle of the proletariat under the exceptionally difficult circumstances of inner as well as outer development; it must lead the proletariat in its attack when the situation calls for an attack; it must withdraw the proletariat from the blows of a powerful opponent when the situation calls for retreat; it must imbue the millions of unorganised non-Party workers with the spirit of discipline and system in fighting, with the spirit of organisation and perseverance. But the Party can acquit itself of these tasks only if it itself is the embodiment of discipline and organisation, if it itself is the **organised** detachment of the proletariat. Unless these conditions are fulfilled, it is idle to talk about the Party really leading the vast masses of the proletariat. The Party is the organised detachment of the working class."—J. Stalin, "Leninism," p. 90.

ORGANISE MASS DEFENCE OF THE PARTY !

From the Concluding Speech of Comrade Wolf Mical at the Sixth Congress of the Young Communist International

WE are aiming at a fundamental change in our Leagues. We want an organisation of the youth which would be above parties, able to satisfy all the requirements of the youth and defend their vital interests, and to which young Socialist and non-party workers could belong. This means that we have in view here the formation of a new type of youth organisation.

Some comrades, however, see in this merely a simple and, so to speak, ordinary improvement of our organisation, and do not understand that it means complete reorganisation and the establishment of new organisations. They draw the conclusion that a change of form and methods of work is sufficient; then everything will be in order and all difficulties will be overcome. This is a big mistake! What use would a change of form and methods of our work be if the content of our organisations continued to be that of the Party and if the young workers continued to be dissatisfied with our organisations?

These sectarian tendencies are still more clearly expressed in some comrades, and I want to add that they acquire a form which is very dangerous for the future of the organisation which we want to create. These comrades believe that the Communist youth will form a fraction inside the extra-party mass organisations. That would mean a refusal to create a real non-party mass organisation and to unite with the Socialist youth organisations.

The main thing which must be understood first of all is that it is necessary to **change the content of work of our organisations.** We have often stated that our youth organisations in the colonial countries do not differ in any way from the youth Leagues in the European countries. But that is not all. The situation at present is that our European Leagues are all alike, and do not take into account the concrete situation and the traditions of their particular countries. It is therefore no wonder that our youth organisations often appear to be alien organisations. The change of character of our youth Leagues demands that they acquire a definite national character, and that their programme and structure correspond to the concrete situation and specific characteristics of their country. All the work of our Leagues must be so adjusted and organised that the youth of

each country will be able to say: I understand the language of this organisation; this organisation deals with my problems correctly, and I therefore regard it as my organisation.

In each city, each section of the city, each block of houses, each school, each village, the change in the youth organisations must be suited to the mentality of the given youth.

It has already been emphasised many times at our Congress that if our organisations do not take into account all the requirements of the youth, if our organisations do not build their work so as to meet all these requirements, we will remain isolated from the masses. Notwithstanding the difficult position of the youth, they want amusements, strive for an education, are interested in sports. The bourgeoisie and the Fascists know this very well, and reckon with these wishes of the youth. That is why they have succeeded in creating such big mass youth organisations, so we must not in the least consider it below our dignity to learn from our enemies when we change the nature of our Leagues. We must so build our organisations that any youth who wants to dance, sing, engage in sports, take part in excursions or in travel, who wants to study languages or geography or to perfect himself in his trade will find the facilities for it in our organisations. If a girl wants to learn how to sew or embroider or study household management, the facilities for it should be given her in our organisation. Our forms of work and organisational structure should be adapted to these tasks. We must therefore create all kinds of cultural institutions and clubs where the youth can find amusement and education; we must form circles, tourist groups, girls' organisations, etc. Such a change will secure the affiliation of various educational, sporting, and cultural youth organisations and bring in as members many young people who wish to enjoy only sport, games, dances, etc., and who will join our organisations individually.

Comrades and functionaries who are frightened by this new feature of our movement, who regard such young men and women as members of secondary rank, and try to bring before these youth tasks which do not correspond to their age, really do not understand how our Leagues must be readjusted into organisations of a new type. Permit me to tell you that such comrades are sectarians behind whose "left" phrases against cultural work is concealed their inability to carry on cultural mass work among the youth.

We are correct in saying that the main task of the youth Leagues is to defend all vital political and economic interests of the younger toiling generation. Now, when the toiling youth

are experiencing hard times and all possible privations, not a single youth organisation that fails in the course of its practical work and practical struggle to defend the rights of the youth can become a mass organisation. The Youth Leagues must so readjust their practical work as to be able to assist, if only slightly, in improving the economic and cultural position of the youth. Raising this question, we do not in the least intend to organise youth strikes isolated from the working class or in any way take the place of trade unions. No, by no means! Only in closest contact with the trade unions and with their most active support can we successfully defend the economic interests of the youth. Since we are now raising this question more seriously than ever before, **trade union work becomes of colossal importance for the youth Leagues.** It is to be regretted that, with the exception of the American, French, and British comrades, practically no one seriously dealt with this problem. Observe, for example, how our Leagues previously tried to solve their task of trade union work. It was very simple! They passed decisions that all members of the Young Communist League must join a union, but the fact that, notwithstanding these decisions, very few young Communists joined the unions proves that such mass work was of a bureaucratic character.

This question stands quite differently to-day. It is the task to carry on constant systematic work of enlightenment among the members of the Young Communist Leagues and among the large sections of the working youth concerning the importance and the role of the trade unions, convincing the youth that in order to improve their cultural and economic conditions they must join the unions. We must take into account that the greater the number of members of our organisations and of young workers organised in the trade unions, the better will our League succeed, in close co-operation with the trade unions, and with their active support, in bringing about a serious improvement in the conditions of the youth. From this angle we should make it perfectly clear in our ranks that our position in relation to the Amsterdam trade unions must also be favorable, that we and the masses of the youth are interested in fully and wholeheartedly supporting the action of these unions if they seek to organise the youth.

Thus, comrades, we take the course of setting up a non-party mass organisation of the youth which will be open to every boy and girl who is prepared loyally to take part in its work. It seems to me, however, that some comrades take this to mean that it is of no great importance to win the large

sections of the young workers into the ranks of this organisation.

How do we put the question? The change of character of our Leagues succeed, in close co-operation with the trade organisations embracing the working youth. **On the contrary, it stresses the importance of this question even more strongly than in the past.** The more solidly the young workers are united in these organisations, the greater is the guarantee that the youth organisations will really carry out the line of our Congress. Needless to say, it is mere piffle to speak of defending the economic interests of the youth and forgetting that this concerns first of all the employed and unemployed youth who now suffer the most.

In this connection I wish to make a few remarks concerning our past and future work in the factories and among the working youth. Some comrades, as Comrade Max Weiss, for example, brought up for discussion the forms of our work among the factory youth. I quite understand that anyone who really wishes to follow the new path pointed out in the decisions of our Congress will on no account be enthusiastic over the past work of our factory nuclei. Indeed, a large section of our factory nuclei were created from the top by a mechanical bringing together of all our comrades working in a given factory. It therefore very often happened that our comrades did not understand their tasks and the need for work in the factories had no desire to work in the nuclei. Very often our nuclei became organs for the technical carrying through of decisions for circulating newspapers, leaflets, etc., made at the top. It should here also be mentioned that we regarded the Young Communist nuclei, except for the sad attempts to create youth sections of the Red Trade Union Opposition in the factories, as the only form of work among the factory youth.

It would, however, be wrong to conclude from that that our organisations in the factories will not justify their existence in the future, or that we must now simply dissolve our nuclei. It is our duty to organise our work in the factories along new lines, and, particularly, taking into account the situation in each given factory, to find such forms and methods which would guarantee the existence of a legal youth organisation. Any scholastic discussion as to whether factory nuclei are or are not necessary would only do us harm.

In this case we recommend our comrades to follow a road which facilitates our organisation of the youth in the factories. It is necessary to apply the most diverse forms, and wherever possible to set up also factory nuclei. Experience shows that the factory youth can be successfully organised

inside the factory. It is necessary to organise the youth in the most varied forms, in the workers' quarters, workers' settlements, the factories, on the territorial principle. This form of organisation of the working youth should occupy one of the most important places in our work. We must organise all kinds of clubs, study circles, vocational study groups, and so on, and likewise take an active part in the institutions of such a nature established by the municipalities, factories, trade unions, youth organisations, etc.

Particularly in this field our members must decide for themselves as to the form in which they wish to organise and what form our work should assume in the factory and among the working youth. This will help us to create factory organisations which will really be able to become the youth centres of the given factories.

Wherever we have our organisations, it is our task immediately to proceed with their alteration and transformation into national revolutionary youth organisations with the support of the large sections of the youth. Wherever the situation has matured for that, we must endeavor to establish a single youth organisation, including the other organisations of the youth. We must, at the same time, boldly establish all kinds of cultural and other independent self-relying youth organisations.

The question of changing the character of the youth Leagues concerns all links of our organisation without exception. We do not want to content ourselves by intensifying our work somewhat in the Fascist mass organisations and leaving the old system of work untouched. No, comrades! To what does a system in which the chief factors are impromptu demonstrations or distributing illegal leaflets lead us? It isolates us from the masses and increases repression, which frequently leads to the annihilation of our organisation. It does not lead to an accumulation of forces, but to their disintegration. A vigorous policy to bring the masses into motion by such methods is reminiscent of putschism, plotting. And it is precisely on such methods that our lower organisations have in the main been orientated and adjusted. We want to **radically change** the methods and nature of our organisations, and therefore raise the question of work in the mass organisations and of setting up all kinds of youth organisations on our initiative. Comrade Janitsky was quite correct in saying in his speech:

"The youth must organise in the way it considers most expedient, especially from the point of view of the legal possibilities of work."

True, it would be premature already to set down now the exact forms of the new type of organisations in the "illegal" countries. It would also be wrong to draw up a cut and dried scheme without the participation of the masses of the youth themselves. But we can say even now that this cannot be of any particular form; it will consist of the most varied forms, and life and experience will themselves be our teachers. In Bulgaria, for example, we had a legal league of the working youth with 20,000 members, a league with fairly wide forms of work and bit of experience. We had educational circles among the young students, which included 12,000 members. In Poland, also, we had similar organisations, but these were not fully independent organisations; they were "subsidiary organisations" in the full sense of the term. It is quite clear that various organisations of this kind, and many others, can and must in the Fascist countries be a component part of the organisations of the new type. We are beginning to create the united front in Germany, Austria, and Spain in illegal conditions. But we often make the mistake of trying to conduct this united front by sectarian methods, endeavoring to force our illegal forms and methods of work on the young Socialists or Catholics. Is it not instructive to remember the case which the German comrades related to us? The young Catholics rejected our proposals to make a collection for their prisoners and ours, but they expressed their readiness to collect money for the needy, in which case the funds collected should serve the political young prisoners. They rejected an illegal leaflet, but, on the other hand, they organised the collection of signatures with us in one factory and carried through the election of a youth delegate with us. Yes, comrades, we have every reason to declare that we have to learn from these comrades of ours how to gather and unite the masses.

Or in Austria, for example, after the victory of Fascism, only the task of drawing the youth into the illegal mass struggle was raised. Is this right, comrades? No. It is wrong. In this way we involuntarily restrict the basis of our work, and inevitably restrict the number who take part in the struggle.

If we are speaking of combining the legal and illegal methods—and this is a question which we must raise—then I must emphasise the following:—**In such a situation, when our primary task is to mobilise and unite the youth, illegal methods of work must be subordinated to legal and semi-legal mass work, must serve this work.**

The opinion that only conscious and fully prepared Communists are capable of applying legal and semi-legal methods and of leading the Fascists and the police by the nose is completely

wrong. Thus, the application of these methods must not be limited only to fully prepared young Communists. Things which can be done legally, or at least in an open form—lectures, speeches, literature, meetings—should be done legally and openly. These methods seem "moderate." But, comrades, this moderation is more dangerous for the Fascists than loud-sounding phrases or the appeals of isolated people.

In various countries, towns, villages, factories, and schools, our Leagues must consist of the most varied youth organisations, satisfying the interests and desires of the young in the most varied spheres. It can be said without exaggeration that when our Leagues carry out the line of the Sixth Congress of the Young Communist International, **this will mean the revolutionising of all our former organisational structure and the forms and methods of all the work of the youth Leagues.** Each organisation will have its own organisational life. One organisation will not resemble another in forms and methods of work, as has been the case hitherto.

But in spite of this, what will they have in common? In our Draft Resolution, an answer is given to this question, namely, that the youth in these organisations, while learning, **organising themselves and fighting** for the vital interests of the toiling class, will educate themselves in the spirit of the fight for freedom against reaction, Fascism, and imperialist war, and that the members of the youth Leagues will be educated in the spirit of the class struggle, of proletarian internationalism, in the spirit of Marxism-Leninism. These basic ideas of our Resolution must be the guiding line of our youth Leagues to create and lead various organisations.

But there are comrades who avoid this question in an incomprehensible manner. It may be that some comrades think that in order to win the masses of the youth it is necessary to abandon our Marxist-Leninist principles. No, the thing that we must abandon is the practice of explaining the teachings of **Marx-Engels-Lenin-Stalin on the struggle for freedom in a sectarian manner which the masses cannot understand.** We must understand how to explain patiently, in a popular manner, through pamphlets, stories, lectures, circles, newspapers, and discussion evenings, **who were Marx, Engels, and Lenin, and who is Stalin.** Only when we teach the masses of the youth in the spirit of Marxism-Leninism will they be capable of struggling successfully against Fascism and war, for their vital interests.

How do matters stand, comrades, with the leadership of these various organisations? Think for yourselves what our old leadership looks like, and you will understand that **this type of**

leadership cannot ensure their proper work. It will be necessary to change the structure of the leadership and to adapt it to the needs of the organisation.

The basic work of the former type of leadership consisted of purely political and inner-organisational activity. It will now be different. The leaders must busy themselves with all questions of the life of the toiling youth, and be able to understand their political, cultural, economic, and other questions and interests, to develop the abilities of the youth, help their education, organise their leisure hours, make them acquainted with literature and art, and give them a reply to the questions which they raise.

The changing of the structure of the leadership is also brought about by the fact that cadres of a new type will have arisen in the youth Leagues. In addition to Y.C.L. functionaries, we shall have Socialist youth and a wide circle of non-party activists in the leading organs of the youth organisation. These new cadres must possess the ability to reply correctly to the various questions; for example, to arouse interest and an understanding of the history of their own people and the oppressed class, insistently explain the falsification of history by Fascism, and arouse an understanding of their own national culture, love for the national revolutionary heroes, literature, folk songs, and art. The new activists must be able to organise good sportsmen from among the youth who come into our organisations. These cadres must be able to give the youth explanations and help on trade union questions. In the sphere of national minorities, they must teach the youth to talk and write in their own language. The new cadres must be able to educate the youth in the spirit of respect for other peoples and races, and explain to them the great significance of the Soviet Union. The new cadres must be able tactfully to draw in the girls and carry on insistent explanatory campaigns for the rights of girls, against the Fascist theory that women are of low value.

Some comrades think that the Communists will educate the members of these organisations in the spirit of Marxism-Leninism while the non-party cadres will look after cultural questions and the organisation of leisure time. There is no doubt that in the new type of organisation we also need activists who will be, so to speak, specialists on questions like sport, singing, dancing, art, literature, etc. But this in no way releases Communists from the necessity of learning and mastering the same ability as these activists. Communists must not only think of educating the youth in the spirit of Marxism-Leninism, but of setting an example for the youth in satisfying their

cultural needs. Only in this way will they gain great authority in these organisations and be able to win the confidence of the members.

This means that a definite stop must be made to the one-sided study and education of the activists, as was the case formerly in these organisations; and we must begin to teach our activists in a new manner.

The organisations of the youth are independent organisations. Only the bourgeoisie and opportunists are afraid of the independent initiative of the youth in their organisations. But we have unlimited confidence in the working and toiling youth. Comrade Dimitrov said to us, in his brilliant greeting to our Congress:

"Be bold, independent, and develop your own initiative."

Yes, Comrade Dimitrov, we shall go along this path! We know that if the youth organisations are independent, they will grow more rapidly, will gain influence, and will be able to work successfully to unite the forces of the younger generation.

It would nevertheless be incorrect to imagine that the youth organisations must no longer have any connection with our Parties. Connections with the Parties are the very things that will develop the independence of the youth organisations, support them, stimulate them, and defend them from any attack of the enemy. We must solve this question, like many others, on a democratic basis, with the members of the organisations. The Communists must everywhere explain the importance and necessity of contacts with our Parties. We are sure that if they explain this to their members in a correct and comprehensible form, the members will welcome close contact with the Party everywhere. We must also explain to the members how our Party wants to help them, what this means for them in practice, what our Party will give them. Then all the difficulties in connection with this question will disappear.

Taking the interests of the toiling younger generation as the point of departure, and trying to unite with the young Socialists and their organisation, we shall come boldly to the radical alteration of the nature of our Leagues. We must clearly understand, however, that we can only undertake this bold alteration because for sixteen years in heroic battles, full of self-sacrifice, we have been training young fighters who will be able, with correct leadership, to solve the tasks which are put before them.

Comrades, some of you will ask: What must we do to carry out the task of changing the nature of our youth Leagues? Firstly, we must be able to raise this question before the whole of the toiling younger generation and before the Socialist youth

organisations, explaining to them that by changing the nature of the organisation we are acting in their interests, in the interests of unity. We must immediately explain to our members the importance of this question, and, together with them, start in practice to reconstruct our organisations. In every place we must check-up on what steps should be taken in this direction. The more rapidly we change the nature, content, form, and methods of our organisations, the more successful we shall be in bringing about unity with the Socialist youth organisation and carrying on a joint, comradely struggle against war and Fascism, for peace and freedom, along with the non-Fascist youth organisations.

We have approached more closely to the vital questions of the youth. At our Congress we have raised the problems which occupy the minds of the younger generation in the capitalist countries. We have taken the right line which will give us the best prospects for the future. Our great Stalin teaches us:

“Good resolutions and declarations for the general Party line are only the beginning, because they only signify the desire to conquer, but not victory itself. After a correct line has been given, after a correct decision of a question, success, depends on organisational work, on the organisation of the struggle to carry out the Party line, on the correct selection of people, on the verification of the fulfilment of decisions of the leading organs. Without this, the correct Party line and the correct decisions run the risk of serious harm. Moreover, after the correct political line has been given, organisational work decides everything, including the fate of the political line itself, its fulfilment or its breakdown.”

Our successes depend on what we do to carry this line into practice. This should not be understood in the narrow sense of the term. Not only the fate of our Leagues, but that of the younger generation of toilers throughout the world depends on how we apply this line which corresponds to the necessities of life.

Our attention is directed with alarm to Abyssinia; not for a moment can we forget the provocation of Hitlerite Fascism with the aim of occupying Memel and Lithuania. Events are developing at a rapid pace. The instigators of war are hurrying. All this must stimulate us to carry out the line worked out by the Sixth Congress more rapidly and actively than formerly. Shall we be able to solve these great tasks? The determina-

tion of the youth to fight against imperialist war, for peace, the determination of the youth to fight against Fascism, for liberation, has never been so strong as now. The urge of the Communist and Socialist youth to unity helps us to make a concrete approach to the uniting of the two youth organisations and Internationals of the youth. The desire of all non-Fascist youth organisations to defend their interests and rights against Fascism makes it possible for us to work with all our power to unite all these non-Fascist youth organisations and forces in a single direction. Our Congress has opened a new great era in the history of the youth movement.

From the platform of our World Congress, our beloved Dimitrov advises us:

“Comrades, you must learn, study, and fight.

“You must combine all your everyday practical activity with a profound study of the original sources of Marxism and Leninism, because without revolutionary theory there can be no revolutionary practice.

“Be exemplary, firm, and valiant fighters against Fascism, against capitalism.

“Raise higher the banner of the liberation of mankind from capitalist slavery, the banner of the Communist International.

“Unite the younger generation of the whole world around this banner. The standard of great victories is already unfurled over one-sixth of the globe and it will conquer throughout the world! It is the banner of the great leader of the world proletariat, Comrade Stalin.”

Well, You've Read Comrade Mical's Speech. Have You Read

“YOUTH, UNITE!”

THE RESOLUTION OF THE SIXTH Y.C.I. CONGRESS ?

If not, get your Copy quickly from your “Communist Review” agent or workers' bookshop!

Price: ONE PENNY

A Farm Programme

By T. ENSFIELD

IN the February issue of "The Review" the main tasks of the Communists in the farm movement were stated as follows:—

(1) To take the initiative in establishing a united front with Labor Party and Douglas Credit farmers in organising a militant farm movement within the existing farm organisations, capable of winning the majority of exploited farmers over to a policy of

(a) militant struggle against the exploitation of finance capital, merchants, etc., for a programme which will raise the income of the impoverished farmers to a minimum of £150 a year, and end evictions and forced sales; (b) establishing joint action with the movement of the workers against the merchants, distributing companies, etc., for reduction of retail prices and for the development of producers and consumers' co-operatives on the basis of the existing marketing boards.

In District No. 1 the agrarian functionaries and Party members engaged in the poultry industry have already worked out a concrete, practical programme and policy for the poultry industry, and are planning organisational measures for work in the existing poultry farmer organisations.

In collaboration with Party members and supporters engaged in poultry farming, the agrarian leaders made a practical study of the situation of the industry, which, like all other agrarian industries, is severely affected by the capitalist crisis. During the crisis there has been a great expansion of poultry farming and increase in egg production, accompanied by a serious decline in prices. At present the situation is further complicated by a 20 per cent. reduction in exports to the British market and an increase in the price of wheat and its by-products (bran and pollard).

To put the position concisely, the great majority of poultry farmers are undergoing a process of ruination, because the price of their products does not exceed cost of production. This process is clearly illustrated in an article in "The Commercial Hen" (Sydney), Jan. 15, 1936, wherein A. Edwards, referring to the situation in Victoria, writes: "Feed merchants declared they are unable to financially carry certain egg-producers any longer. The result is that egg producers who lack financial reserve are unable to meet their obligations from their return from eggs, which is much below cost of production; consequently some have no other alternative than to call in a poultry dealer and take what is offered for the whole flock. During the past two weeks, one

dealer had bought out nine farms, some of which had 900 laying birds, and another dealer had bought all the birds from 60 farms in the same period. The number of poultry farms which have been forced to quit operations during the past two months is at present unknown. The poultry auction rooms in Melbourne are receiving heavier stocks for sale than for the corresponding period of any previous season. It could also be said that the total wrecks of poultry farms are greater than any other season." This picture also describes the situation in every other State.

The main difficulty of the poultry farmer is in the purchase of feed, which is the largest individual factor in the cost of production and which, by the way, places poultry farms in the highest category of capitalist farms. During the "off season" (i.e., when the hens are not laying), the cost of feed is far in excess of income, and in this period the average farmer gets heavily in debt to the feed merchant, who naturally takes advantage of such a condition to secure a grip upon the farmer. The merchant is thenceforth able to dictate terms in relation to price and quality, and can recover the whole of his debt as soon as a convenient moment arrives for the selling-up of the farmer. There are very few farmers who have not been delivered into the hands of the feed merchants by the capitalist crisis. The price of eggs and poultry never rises sufficient during the laying season to enable the farmer to pay off the arrears accumulated during the off season.

Needless to say, dealers in table poultry are making a rich harvest out of the misfortunes of the impoverished farmers. In the ordinary course of events, the average poultry farmer disposes of one-third of his flock every year on the live stock market, and out of this the agents and poultry dealers, employing the usual corrupt practices, make handsome profits. But when scores, possibly hundreds, of farmers have to dispose of their whole flocks under pressure, the dealers controlling the poultry market have everything in their favor. The increasing sale of poultry brings lower returns to the farmer and higher profits to the dealer.

The main factor in the economics of the poultry industry is the price of eggs. In Queensland and part of New South Wales egg marketing boards are in operation, whilst in other States (except Tasmania, where a highly efficient co-operative enterprise has been established) the marketing of eggs is completely in the hands of private agents who, taking advantage of the anarchic forces of capitalist production, are able to ruthlessly plunder the producers.

The majority of farmers are quite conscious of the exploitation of the agents and merchants, and are seeking an escape from their clutches. This is the main issue in the politics of the poultry industry—a conscious struggle between the majority of poultry farmers and the agents and merchants for control over the marketing of eggs.

In N.S.W., the Egg Marketing Board has been in existence for five years, and whilst it has succeeded in securing an average higher price than is paid by agents in other States and outside the Board area in N.S.W., it has failed to solve the problems of the industry. Owing to Section 92 of the Commonwealth Constitution, which prevents State restriction on interstate trade, agents are able to buy eggs in other States and ship them to N.S.W. in competition with the Board. These agents, buying in South Australia as low as 4d. a dozen, are doing a lucrative business in Sydney selling at just under the price fixed by the Board. Also a number of agents are engaged buying eggs outside the Board's area in N.S.W. and dumping them on the Sydney market. Because of this peculiar position, the Board has never been able to fulfil the only function for which it was constituted. It is now proving to be actually of great advantage to the agents, who are not only permitted to carry on their trade with other States and outside the Board area in N.S.W., but actually receive commissions from 6 to 8 per cent. for taking eggs from the Board floor and wholesaling them to the retailers.

The failure of the Board to materially improve the position of the industry has caused a great deal of discontent among the majority of farmers. But because they do not wish to submit to the worse conditions prevailing under complete agent control, they are seeking a way to improve the policy of the Board. Yet so much confusion exists in the movement of the poultry farmers that it is so far unable to formulate a constructive policy and organise for its adoption by the Board. This confusion is intensified by the existence of two distinct trends in the poultry farmers' movement—one aiming at the abolition of the Board and the other at changes in its personnel and policy. Needless to say, agents are exerting a strong influence in both camps, with the object of maintaining a state of confusion and disorganisation. The former tendency has brought into existence the Independent Poultry Farmers' Association, but its connections with the agents are so obvious that it has little more than a score of members, and influences only a very insignificant minority. The latter tendency expresses itself in the Poultry Farmers' Association, with 800 members and a growing influ-

ence. There are also a large number who take a passive attitude towards the Board.

The foregoing analysis leads to the conclusion that the main task of the Communists and their supporters is to join the P.F.A. and advocate the following policy:—

- (1) The Poultry Farmers' Association to be strengthened by a campaign of recruiting, and made an organisation democratically expressing the interests of the majority of farmers in the industry.
- (2) The democratically elected organs of the P.F.A. to have the right to determine matters of policy in connection with the administration of the Egg Marketing Board.
- (3) The extension of co-operative marketing to a Commonwealth basis in order to remove interstate trade from the hands of the agents.
- (4) The Board to extend its apparatus to conduct direct sale of eggs from its own floors to the retailers, thus eliminating agents' commission.
- (5) The Board to undertake the marketing of poultry livestock and table poultry.
- (6) The principle of co-operation to be extended through the Marketing Board to include wholesale buying of feed-stuff, thus eliminating feed merchants' profit and reducing the price of feed.

The majority of poultry farmers are looking for such a policy, and will readily support those who become active in fighting for it. But this policy will lead to serious conflicts with the agents and their friends in the Governments. Such powerful gangs as the P.D.S., Prescotts, Fresh Food & Ice Co., with very strong Governmental connections, will fight to the bitter end.

The energetic pursuit of this policy will intensify and clarify the split developing in the United Australia Party between the small producers and retailers who provide the U.A.P. with its mass basis, and the official tools of the big agents and companies holding the administrative positions. Big agents and produce companies, such as Prescotts, P.D.S., Fresh Food & Ice Co., Norco, Dairy Farmers' Co-op., etc., who ruthlessly rob and plunder the small and middle producers under the protection of the Egg and Milk Boards, cannot keep their victims harnessed to their political chariot—the U.A.P.—much longer.

Marketing boards must be taken out of the hands of Government nominees and individuals who are not directly responsible to those whom they represent except at an election every three

years, and placed directly under the control of democratically elected organs of the producers.

The slogan "Producer control" is becoming very popular, but it still needs to be clarified in accordance with the above policy before expressing the interests of the small and middle farmers. Producer control, to be a sound policy, must aim mainly at the elimination of the middleman and the robber distributing or produce companies. In the poultry industry, the poultry dealers, the feed and egg merchants, who take more out of the industry than the farmers themselves, must be driven out. Under producer control of this kind it will be possible to considerably reduce the cost of production, reduce the retail price of eggs and poultry and improve the quality, and increase the income to the farmer.

At present there is a tendency to translate producer control to mean price control to raise prices to a level that will enable the farmer to increase his income, and at the same time carry the whole burden of merchants' exploitation as well. Such a policy is an attempt to place the burden upon the consumers, the great majority of whom are workers receiving the basic wage or less. Experience proves that an increase in the price of eggs takes place at the expense of consumption. A number of managers of chain stores interviewed by the writer all agree that twice as many eggs are bought at 1/3 a dozen as at 1/9. They also state that the dumping of a consignment of Interstate eggs of doubtful quality also brings about a quick falling off in the demand for eggs.

There can be no question about which kind of producer control serves the interests of the majority of farmers.

Yet producer control cannot solve the problems of the small and middle farmers. It can only bring about a certain improvement. There still remain other forms of exploitation, mainly that of the landowner and banker and the debts and interest payments due to the produce merchants accumulated in the past. The interests of the working farmers are bound up with the interests of the working class in the struggle against the whole system of capitalist exploitation.

But the struggle for organisation and producer control will, if led by the Communists, bring the small and middle farmers closer to the working class and prepare the way for the alliance with the working class in the struggle against capitalism.

The Present Rulers of the Capitalist World are Temporary Powers—The Real Ruler of the World is the Proletariat!

Speech of Comrade Dimitrov in the Closing Session of the Seventh World Congress of the Communist International on August 20, 1935

COMRADES, the Seventh World Congress of the Communist International, the Congress of the Communists of all countries and all parts of the world, is about to end its work.

What have been its results? What does the Congress mean for our movement, for the international working class, and for the toilers of all countries?

This Congress was a Congress of complete triumph for the unity between the proletariat of the country of victorious Socialism—the Soviet Union—and the proletariat of the capitalist world, which is still fighting for its emancipation. The victory of Socialism in the Soviet Union, a victory of world historic importance, has released a powerful movement in favor of Socialism in all capitalist countries. This victory consolidates the cause of peace between the peoples, increases the international significance of the Soviet Union, and strengthens the Soviet Union as the bulwark of the toilers in their struggle against capitalism, Fascism, and reaction. It also consolidates the Soviet Union as the basis of the proletarian world revolution, and sets millions into movement throughout the whole world, not only millions of workers, who are turning more and more towards Communism, but also millions of peasants, of petty-bourgeois in the towns, a great section of the intelligentsia, and millions of the oppressed colonial peoples. It gives them enthusiasm in the struggle, increases their feeling of solidarity with the great fatherland of all the toilers, and strengthens their determination to support and defend the proletarian State against all its enemies.

This victory of Socialism increases the firm belief of the international proletariat in its own powers and in the possibility of its victory, a firm belief that can develop into a powerful weapon against the rule of the bourgeoisie.

The unification of the forces of the proletariat in the Soviet Union with the fighting forces of the proletariat and of the toiling masses in the capitalist countries brings with it tremendous chances for the collapse of capitalism and a guarantee for the victory of Socialism all over the world.

Our Congress laid the basis for a mobilisation of the forces of all the toilers against capitalism on a scale never before seen in the history of the struggle of the working class.

Our Congress gave the international proletariat the immediate and important task of merging its forces both politically and organisationally, of ending the isolation into which it has been led by the Social-Democratic policy of class collaboration with the bourgeoisie, and of mobilising all the forces of the toilers around the working class in a broad people's front against the offensive of capitalism and reaction, and against Fascism, and the danger of war in each single country and on an international scale.

We have not invented this task sitting round a green baize table. The experience of the international working-class movement, and above all the struggle of the French proletariat, has raised this task. The great service of the French Communist Party consists in the fact that it realised what must be done to-day, that it refused to listen to the sectarians who would have dragged the Party away from the right path, dissipated its forces and hindered the formation of a united fighting front against Fascism, and that instead it created a united front of the proletariat as a basis for the developing broad anti-Fascist people's front. It did this in a daring and Bolshevik fashion by concluding a pact for joint action with the French Socialist Party. (Applause.) As a result of these efforts in the vital interests of all toilers, the French workers, Communists and Socialists, the French working-class movement, once again move up into the first and leading place in capitalist Europe, thus showing themselves worthy successors of the Communards and worthy upholders of the glorious traditions of the Paris Commune. (Storms of applause. The delegates rise from their seats Cheering. Comrade Dimitrov turns to the Presidium and together with the other delegates applauds Comrade Thorez and the other French members of the Presidium.)

It is to the merit of the French Communist Party and of the French proletariat that by their practical struggle in a proletarian united front against Fascism, they have contributed to the preparation of the decisions of our Congress, which are of such tremendous importance for the workers of all countries.

However, what has already been done in France represents only the first steps. Our Congress, which has laid down our tactical line for the future, could naturally not content itself with merely registering this experience and it went further than this.

We Communists are a class Party, a proletarian Party, but

we are prepared, as the advance guard of the proletariat, to organise joint actions of the proletariat with the other toiling classes which are interested in the struggle against Fascism. We Communists are a revolutionary party, but we are prepared to organise joint actions with other parties which are prepared to fight against Fascism.

We Communists have other aims than these parties, but whilst fighting for our own aims we are at the same time prepared to fight together with these parties to carry out such tasks for the immediate future whose fulfilment would weaken Fascism and strengthen the positions of the proletariat.

We Communists use other fighting methods than these other parties, but we are nevertheless prepared to support the fighting methods of these parties—no matter how inadequate they may seem to us—providing that these methods are really directed against Fascism.

We are prepared to do all this because we wish to check the advance of reaction and Fascism and the offensive of capitalism in the countries of bourgeois democratic liberties, to prevent the liquidation of the last remnants of bourgeois democratic liberties, to repulse the brutal terrorist campaign of Fascism against the proletariat and against the revolutionary sections of the peasantry and of the intelligentsia, and to protect the younger generation from physical and mental degeneration.

We are prepared to do all this because we wish to prepare and accelerate the overthrow of the Fascist dictatorship in the countries of Fascism.

We are prepared to do all this because we want to save the world from Fascist barbarism and from the horrors of a new imperialist war.

Our Congress is a Congress of struggle for the preservation of peace and against the danger of imperialist war.

We shall now carry on the struggle in a new fashion. Our Congress has rejected the fatalistic attitude towards imperialist wars, an attitude originating in old Social-Democratic prejudices.

It is true that imperialist war is a product of capitalism and it is also true that only the overthrow of capitalism can guarantee the abolition of war once and for all, but at the same time it is also true that by their fighting action the toiling masses can prevent imperialist war.

The world to-day is no longer the same world as it was in 1914.

To-day a powerful proletarian State exists over one-sixth of the surface of the earth, having at its disposal the material

forces of victorious Socialism. Thanks to the wisdom of Comrade Stalin's peace policy, the Soviet Union has more than once foiled the aggressive plans of the war-mongers. (Applause.)

To-day the world proletariat possesses not only the weapons of mass action in its struggle against war, as in 1914, but to-day the mass struggle of the international working class against war is allied with the political influence of the Soviet Union and its powerful Red Army as the most important guardian of peace. (Storms of applause.)

To-day the international working class is no longer exclusively under the influence of Social-Democracy as it was in 1914, when Social-Democracy was allied with the bourgeoisie. To-day there is a Communist world Party—the Communist International. (Applause.) To-day the masses of the Social-Democratic workers are turning more and more to the Soviet Union, and its policy of peace, and to a united front with the Communists.

To-day the peoples of the colonial and semi-colonial countries no longer regard the cause of their emancipation as a hopeless cause. On the contrary they are taking up the struggle against their imperialist oppressors more energetically than ever before. The best proof of this can be seen in the **Soviet revolution in China** and the heroism of the Red Army of the Chinese people. (Storms of applause. All the delegates rise from their seats. Cheering.)

The hatred of the people against war is becoming more and more deep and burning. The bourgeoisie, which is driving the toilers towards the abyss of imperialist war, is risking its head. To-day not only the working class, the peasantry and other sections of the toilers are fighting for the preservation of peace, but also the oppressed nations and those weaker peoples whose independence is threatened by new wars. Even certain big capitalist Powers who fear that they would lose as a result of a redivision of the world, are interested, at the moment, in the avoidance of war.

From this follows the possibility of the broadest united front of the working class, of all toilers and of whole peoples against the danger of imperialist war. Supported by the peace policy of the Soviet Union and by the will to peace of millions and millions of toilers, our Congress has opened up a perspective for the development of a broad anti-war front not only for the Communist advance guard but for the whole international working class and for the peoples of all countries. It will depend on the stage of development of this world front and on its political effect whether the Fascist and imperialist war-mongers will be

able to plunge the world into a new imperialist war in the near future, or whether their criminal plans will be foiled by a powerful popular anti-war front. (Applause.)

Our Congress is a Congress of the unity of the working class, a Congress of the struggle for a proletarian united front.

We harbor no illusions concerning the difficulties which the reactionary section of the Social-Democratic leaders will place in the way of the realisation of a proletarian united front, but we are not afraid of these difficulties because we represent the will of millions of workers and because by our struggle for the united front we are best serving the interest of the proletariat, for the proletarian united front represents a sure path to the overthrow of Fascism and of the capitalist system as a whole, and to the prevention of imperialist war.

We have raised the banner of **trade union unity** at our Congress. We Communists do not insist under all circumstances on the independent existence of red trade unions, but we want trade union unity on the basis of the class struggle, and we want to see an end to that situation in which the most steadfast and determined supporters of trade union unity and of the class struggle are expelled from the trade unions affiliated to the Amsterdam International (I.F.T.U.). (Applause.)

We know that not all the officials of the Red International of Labor Unions and of the Unions affiliated to it have grasped and adopted this policy of our Congress. There are still remnants of sectarian self-satisfaction amongst these officials, and we must abolish these remnants in order to secure the unwavering carrying out of the policy of our Congress. We must carry out this policy at all costs, and we shall succeed in finding a common language with our class comrades, the workers who to-day belong to unions affiliated to the Amsterdam International. (Loud applause.)

At this Congress we have laid down a policy to secure the creation of a **united political mass party of the working class** and to liquidate the political disruption of the proletariat caused by the policy of class collaboration pursued by Social-Democracy. The political unity of the working class is not a manoeuvre for us, but a question of the future fate of the working-class movement. Should there be comrades in our ranks who regard the establishment of political working-class unity as a manoeuvre, we shall fight against them as against persons who damage the cause of the working class. Just because we treat this question with all seriousness and all honesty, and in a fashion dictated by the interests of the proletariat, we have put

forward certain fundamental conditions as the basis for such unity. These fundamental conditions have not been invented by us, but the proletariat has formulated them in a process of struggle and suffering. They are also in accordance with the will of millions of Social-Democratic workers, a will which has sprung from the lessons of the recent defeats. These fundamental conditions have been confirmed by the experience of the revolutionary working class movement as a whole. (Applause.)

Just because our Congress has been held in a spirit of proletarian unity, it was not merely a Congress of the Communist advance guard of the working class, but a Congress of the whole of the international working class which is thirsting after trade union and political fighting unity. (Applause.)

Although no delegates from the ranks of the Social-Democratic workers were present at our Congress, although no delegates were present representing the non-party workers, and although the workers who have been driven by compulsion into the Fascist mass organisations were also not represented, nevertheless our Congress did not speak for the Communists alone, but also for these millions of workers because it expressed their aspirations and their feelings, the aspirations and feelings of the overwhelming majority of the working class. (Applause.) If the working class organisations of the various tendencies throughout the world were to permit a free discussion of our decisions in their ranks, then we do not doubt that the workers of the world would declare themselves in favor of those decisions which you have adopted so unanimously here.

This makes it still more urgently our duty to make the decisions of our Congress the common property of the whole of the working class. It is not enough to vote for these decisions here. It is not enough to popularise them amongst the members of the Communist Parties. We want those workers who are members of the parties of the Second International, and of the unions affiliated to the Amsterdam International, or of working class organisations of other political tendencies, to discuss these decisions with us, to make practical proposals with regard to them, to bring forward supplementary proposals and to discuss with us how these decisions can best be carried out in practice and to work hand in hand with us to carry them into effect.

Our Congress was a Congress of new tactical orientation for the Communist International.

Our Congress, which stood four-square on the unshakable basis of Marxism-Leninism, confirmed by the whole history of the international working-class movement and, above all, by the victory of the great October Revolution, has examined the tactical attitude of the Communist International in accordance with

the changed world situation and in the spirit, and with the assistance of the methods of living Marxism-Leninism.

The Congress has arrived at a firm decision that the united front tactics must now be applied in a new fashion. The Congress demanded with all energy that the Communist Parties should not content themselves with propagating general slogans about the proletarian dictatorship and Soviet power, but that they should pursue a concrete, active Bolshevik policy in all the home and foreign political affairs of their own countries and in all questions affecting the interests of the working class, of their own peoples and of the international working-class movement. The Congress demanded energetically that all the tactical steps adopted by the Parties should be based on an objective analysis of concrete reality, and that they should take into consideration the real relation of class forces and the political level of the broadest possible masses. The Congress also demanded the complete extermination of every vestige of sectarianism in the practical work of the Communist Parties, for at the present moment sectarianism represents the biggest hindrance to the successful carrying out of a really Bolshevik mass policy by the Communist Parties.

Firmly determined to carry through this new tactical policy and convinced that its fulfilment will lead the parties to new great successes, the Congress nevertheless considered the possibility that in practice the carrying through of this new Bolshevik policy will not always take place without mistakes being made and without isolated deviations to the right and to the "left," deviations either in the direction of tardy and dilatory tempering adaption or in the direction of sectarian self-isolation. To quarrel about which is the "chief danger" of these two possibilities is a matter for scholastics. The greater danger at a given moment and in a given country is that one which represents the chief hindrance to the carrying out of the policy of our Congress and to the development of a correct mass policy on the part of the Communist Party in question. (Applause.)

In the interests of the cause of Communism we do not need an abstract, but a concrete struggle against deviations, a prompt and decisive rejection of all damaging tendencies immediately they show themselves, and a prompt correction of all errors. To replace this concrete and necessary struggle against deviations by introducing a sort of sporting hunt after alleged deviations and those guilty of them is an impermissible, damaging and grotesque exaggeration of what is actually needed. In the practical work of our parties we must encourage in every way the development of initiative in the discussion of new questions; we must seek to obtain an all-round discussion of all questions

appertaining to the activity of the Party, and we must not precipitatedly condemn as a deviator every Party member who expresses doubt or makes a critical remark concerning the practical tasks of the movement. We must do our best to see to it that a comrade who makes a mistake is given a chance of correcting it in the practical work. We must ruthlessly crush only those who obstinately persist in their errors and those who disorganise the Party.

In working for the unity of the working class we shall fight with increased energy and steadfastness for the inner unity of our own Parties. There can be no room in our Parties for factions and factionalism. Whoever attempts to damage the iron unity of our Party by any sort of factionalism will soon learn to his cost what Bolshevik discipline as taught to us by Lenin and Stalin really means. (Applause.) Let this be a warning to those isolated elements in individual parties who hope to exploit the difficulties of their parties, the bitterness of defeat or the blows of a furious enemy, to carry out their factional plans or to pursue clique interests. (Applause.) The Party must be above everything! (Loud applause.) Guard the Bolshevik unity of the Party like the apple of your eye—that is the first and supreme law of Bolshevism.

Our Congress was a Congress of Bolshevik self-criticism, and of the consolidation of the leadership of the Communist International and its sections.

We are not afraid to point out the errors, weaknesses, and defects in our ranks, for we are members of a revolutionary Party and we know that this Party can grow and develop only if it abandons everything which hampers its development as a revolutionary Party.

The work which this Congress has performed with its ruthless criticism of self-satisfied sectarianism, mechanical standardisation, mental laziness and the replacement of the leadership of the masses by the methods of the leadership of a Party, must now be continued accordingly in all our Parties, on the spot and in all the branches of our organisations, for that is one of the most important pre-conditions for the correct carrying out of the decisions of our Congress. (Applause.)

In its resolution on the report of the activity of the Executive Committee of the Communist International our Congress decided to concentrate the operative leadership of our Movement in the hands of the sections themselves. This makes it the duty of the sections to intensify their work to create and train their cadres and to strengthen themselves by developing real Bolshevik leaders in every possible way, in order that the Parties are in a position at sudden turning points in the course of events

to solve speedily and correctly the political and tactical tasks of the Communist movement on the basis of the decisions of the plenary Congresses of the Communist International and of the plenary sessions of its Executive Committee. In electing the leading organs of the Communist International the Congress aimed at electing comrades who will adopt the new tactics and the new decisions of the Congress voluntarily and not merely from a sense of discipline, comrades who are ready to, and capable of, carrying out these decisions in practice. (Applause.)

The correct fulfilment of all the decisions adopted by the Congress must be guaranteed in each country, and this will depend above all on the corresponding control, distribution and orientation of the cadres. We are well aware that this is not an easy task. We must not forget that a section of our cadres has not been trained on the basis of experience in the carrying out of our Bolshevik mass policy, but chiefly on the basis of general propaganda. We must do everything possible in order to assist our cadres to reorganise themselves to meet the new situation, and to educate them in the new spirit, in the spirit of the decisions of this Congress. However, where it is seen clearly that one cannot put new wine into old bottles we must draw the necessary conclusions—we must not pour away the new wine, or let it go stale in the useless old bottles, but we must replace the old bottles by new ones. (Sensation in the hall and loud applause.)

Comrades, we have deliberately excluded fine-sounding phrases about the revolutionary perspective both from the reports and the decisions of the Congress. We did this not because we have any reason to estimate the rate of revolutionary development less optimistically than formerly, but because we wish to free our Parties from every tendency to replace Bolshevik activity by revolutionary phrases, or fruitless disputes about the estimation of the revolutionary perspective. When we wage a decisive struggle against any reliance on spontaneity, we are observing and estimating the process of revolutionary development not as mere observers but as active participants in this process. If we perform those tasks which lie in the interests of the revolution at each stage of development in accordance with the concrete conditions of the given stage and on the basis of an objective estimation of the political level of development of the broad masses of the workers then, as the Party of revolutionary action, we shall be doing everything possible to accelerate the creation of the necessary subjective preconditions for the victory of the proletarian revolution. (Applause.)

"We must take things as we find them," declared Marx. "that is, we must utilise revolutionary sentiments in a manner corre-

sponding to the changed circumstances." (Marx's letter to Kugelman, Aug. 23, 1866.) Here is the essence of the matter, and we must never forget it.

Comrades, we must carry the decisions of our world Congress deep into the masses, we must explain them to the masses and use them as a guide for action of the masses, in a word, we must see to it that they become the flesh and blood of the millions of toilers all over the world.

We must do everything possible to strengthen the initiative of the workers on the spot, the initiative of the lower organisations of the Communist Parties and of the working-class movement, in the carrying out of these decisions.

Returning from here to their home countries, the representatives of the revolutionary proletariat must take with them the firm conviction that we Communists bear the responsibility for the fate of the working class, for the fate of the working-class movement, for the fate of our people and for the fate of the whole of toiling humanity.

The world, built up by the hands of the workers, belongs to the workers and not to the social parasites and idlers. The present rulers of the capitalist world are temporary powers.

The proletariat is the real ruler of the world, the ruler of to-morrow. (Storms of applause.) And the proletariat must assume its historic rights and take over the reins of government in every country throughout the world. (Applause.)

We are the pupils of Marx and Engels, of Lenin and Stalin, and we must show ourselves worthy of our great masters. (Applause.)

With Stalin at the head our political army of millions can and must overcome all difficulties, rise above all obstacles and storm the fortress of capitalism to win the victory for Socialism throughout the whole world. (Storms of applause.)

Long live the unity of the working class!

Long live the Seventh World Congress of the Communist International!

(Storms of applause which develop into a protracted ovation. The orchestra plays the "International" and the delegates rise from their seats and join in. Shouts are heard from the body of the hall: "Long live Comrade Stalin!" "Long live Comrade Dimitrov!" "Hurrah!" and a thrice repeated "Rot Front!" The French delegates sing the "Carmagnole," the Czechoslovakian delegates the "Rudy Prapor," the Chinese delegates the "March of the Chinese Red Army," the Italian delegates the "March of the Italian Red Army," the German delegates the "Bandiera Rossa," and the German delegates "The March of Red Wedding." Further shouts are then heard: "Long live the helmsman of the Comintern, Comrade Dimitrov!" Loud applause.)

George V and Edward VIII

By R. BISHOP (London)

THE death of George V, King of England, was signalised by a broadcast address over the air by Stanley Baldwin, Prime Minister. There was in this address one passage that caused very considerable speculation. It ran as follows:—

"I cannot help feeling that with a King, knowing how lonely the high places of the world are, knowing that he has no one but his wife with whom he may have really intimate converse, I tremble to think what it might have been for him had he been alone in his awful task, with no voice by him to cheer, to comfort, or to encourage. We are thankful to feel that even in her sorrow Queen Mary is spared to the people who love her."

The reason for so much discussion of this ordinary commonplace passage lies in the fact that the new King—Edward VIII—unlike his brothers, is a bachelor. The future position of Queen Mary is a matter about which there is much speculation.

Even before Christmas, after a highly secret conference of doctors and Princes had been held at Buckingham Palace to discuss the King's health, the position of the Queen came up for discussion. From that conference came a warning: the King's heart was so groggy that he could not live for more than six months, much less if he contracted even a common cold in the interim.

When Edward VII died, his Queen went into virtual retirement, coming out only as a charitable lady from time to time. But during the reign of George, assiduous newspaper propaganda—greatly aided by the development of cinema and radio—served to develop an aura around the King and Queen which had a very wide appeal, particularly in middle and lower-middle class circles. The ruling class of Great Britain found this atmosphere very useful, enabling the King to intervene directly in politics without arousing the resentment of the people, which always followed similar action by Edward VII and Victoria. This atmosphere had great political value, value which the ruling class are not anxious to lose.

Edward VIII is not likely to be able to make a similar appeal. The atmosphere he will build around his name is more likely to resemble that accruing to the preceding Edward than to George. In addition, the Queen herself is determined to remain in the picture. But she is an old woman, and cannot last for ever;

hence the guarded reference of Baldwin to the necessity for Britain's monarch to have a Queen by his side to comfort and solace him—and in Edward's case to give him a greater reputation for domesticity than he has at present.

The marriages of the Dukes of Kent and Gloucester, and their subsequent offspring, have given the necessary domestic touch which the ruling class think has such a moving effect on the hearts of the people. England's new King lacks that touch, and in his last years as Prince of Wales lost much of the lime-light to his younger brothers.

It is widely believed that it was such considerations as these which led to an unusual departure from constitutional practice during the King's last illness, namely, the formation of a Council of State with the King at its head. That Council, of course, has now lapsed, but it is certain that Queen Mary is not going to fade out of the political picture as did her predecessor.

The reign of George V was marked by intense class struggles at home, by fierce movements of revolt in the colonial countries, and by the first World War. Whilst always careful to maintain the appearance of constitutional figure-head, the King neglected no opportunity of intervening in major political issues. During the great Home Rule controversy which followed his ascent of the throne, George intervened strongly on behalf of the reactionary Ulster rebels, whose object it was to prevent the passage of the Irish Home Rule Bill. When the army officers in the Curragh camp mutinied and made known their refusal to act against the Ulster capitalist rebels, they did so in the knowledge that the King and the Court were behind them. The outbreak of the imperialist war alone prevented the outbreak of civil war, in which not only the prestige of the Government and the future of Ireland were at stake, but the very existence of the Monarchy itself.

In the midst of the streams of sickly adulation which the Union, the King used all his influence against the hesitations which some members of the Government felt for intervention and the avenging of his cousin Nicholas.

In 1931—it is universally admitted—George was the principal driving force behind the formation of a National Government, which, by its inclusion of quondam leaders of Labor, would be able to put across policies which would have aroused widespread revolt had they been attempted by a purely Conservative Government.

Prior to ascending the throne, the bulk of George's personal friends were high officers of the Army and Navy, and these

were always able to persuade him to intervene strongly on behalf of whatever reactionary policy they may have sponsored from time to time.

In the midst of the streams of sickly adulation which the capitalist press poured over the dead King, it was refreshing to come across a more realistic appreciation from the pen of A. J. Cummings, the well-known Radical journalist, in the columns of the "News Chronicle." Said Cummings:

"King George was a Tory. His political sympathies—perhaps inevitably—were those of the party and class which put above all other considerations the maintenance of the status quo in the British social structure. At one time he feared a great revolutionary upheaval, something in the nature of the Russian Bolshevik Revolution in 1917, which he regarded as a major disaster."

In international affairs, also, he played a much more important role than is generally recognised. The marriage of his son, the Duke of Kent, to a Greek Princess, was an almost indispensable preliminary to the calling back of the Greek King from exile. The Greek monarchy now acts as an agency of British imperialism in the Mediterranean. Only a month or so before his death, the intervention of the King was being sought in the Italo-Ethiopian dispute. The agent used for this purpose was the Belgian King, brother-in-law of the Crown Prince of Italy. George was appealed to to initiate moves which would bring about peace on terms which would save Mussolini's face and prevent Italian capitalism—including the monarchy itself—from being toppled down.

What about Edward VIII? Like his father, his education and his formative years were spent in the company of the hierarchy of the armed forces. In his manhood he became the associate of all the potentially Fascist elements in the ruling class.

From the time of the General Strike in 1926, however, those in authority were at great pains to devise a role for the future monarch which would enhance his popularity. Consequently, he was sent round to the great industrial districts, where it was hoped that he would win the friendly support of the workers by his sympathetic attitude. In between his trips to the industrial areas, and his patronage of unemployed settlements, he was sent on tours round the Empire and to foreign countries, to act as a glorified commercial traveller for Great Britain.

In 1935, Edward, as Prince of Wales, sponsored the sending

of a British Legion delegation to Germany, a move which, as the press has since declared, was originally inspired by the Anglo-German Fellowship for the purpose of popularising the Nazis in Britain. A week or two afterwards, Edward was again in the limelight by his pronouncement that opponents of O.T.C.'s in schools were "misguided cranks."

Edward has certainly had much more opportunity to study the social structure than his father ever had. It is equally certain that his chosen friends and advisers—as distinct from any possible future Government—are drawn from the same reactionary military circles as were those of his father. That his leanings are towards Fascism can also not be doubted, from the character of his friends. To what extent he will attempt to use the throne as an open weapon against the working class and in furtherance of Fascist aims remains to be seen.

Back in 1920—when more than normally fearful of a British Revolution—George V is reported to have remarked to a friend that he was probably the last King of England, and that his eldest son—if he ever ascended the throne—would certainly be the last.

One thing is certain. In the big struggles that lie ahead both at home and in the colonial countries more and more the reactionary elements will attempt to use the throne as a buttress of reaction and as a cover for their activities. In such a situation the illusions fostered—even in some sections of the labor movement—as to the monarchy being nothing but a figurehead, devoid of power, of influence, or politics, becomes more than usually dangerous. It is not a question of a good King or a bad King. The domestic virtues of Royalty have nothing to do with the matter—Nicholas the Bloody of Russia was, by all accounts, a devoted father and a good husband. The British monarchy is one of the most cunningly devised instruments in the world. The ruling class goes to great trouble and expense to maintain it because, in moments of crisis, they find it a much stronger support than any President could ever be.

But the task of the working-class movement has to be the building up of such a strong united front movement in this country as will make all the Fascist forces realise that there is something stronger even than the monarchy itself, namely, the organised might of the working people fighting against oppression, striving to be free.

A Great Congress of the Communist Party Of France

By J. BERLIOZ (Paris)

THERE can be no doubt that the Congress held by the Communist Party of France from January 22 to 25, at Villeurbanne—a big industrial town in the neighborhood of Lyons, which was won by the Communists at the last municipal elections—constituted the finest demonstration by the C.P.F. during the 15 years since it became a section of the Third International.

It was the Congress of a great Party, which is in close touch with the masses, can point to great successes, and is making full and uninterrupted progress; which is fully confident of final victory because it has become an ideologically complete united bloc grouped around a strong leadership and around leaders who are loved and respected; which, clearly understanding its theory and tactics, is passionately determined better and better to put the theory of Marx-Lenin-Stalin into practice.

For the first time the bourgeois press was permitted to follow the debates of the Congress. The bourgeois journalists were unable to conceal their astonishment at the intensive life dominating the Congress, at the penetrating way in which the most difficult problems were approached, and at the "fanaticism" (as they expressed it) of the delegates to the Congress, who, inspired by revolutionary conviction and revolutionary determination, were also imbued with a revolutionary sense of actuality.

There were 844 delegates at Villeurbanne. The greater number of them were young comrades: 276 were less than 30 years old, and 153 had been members of the Party for less than 2 years. But a number of older Party workers were also present: 33 delegates had belonged to the Party since the split at Tours in 1920, and 97 joined the Party between 1920 and 1923. As regards the social composition of the delegates, 215 of them were metal-workers, 43 railwaymen, 18 agricultural workers, 55 building workers, 36 small farmers, 18 postal workers, 31 technicians and teachers, 20 textile workers, 37 artisans, small tradesmen, and so on.

The delegation unanimously adopted resolutions and reports laid before them by Comrades Cachin (on the work of the Party), Thorez (the C.P.F. and the People's Front), Marty (on the international situation), Frachon (economic struggles and the liberation of the trade unions), Ferrat (movement for the liberation

of the oppressed colonial peoples), **Renaud Jean** (rescue of French agriculture), and **Duclos** (unity among the youth). Never before has such unanimity been achieved. The correspondent of the "**Populaire**," who was present, could not understand such ideological unity—so very different from the personal squabbles in other parties.

The progress made by the C.P.F. since the last Party Congress, at Paris in 1932, and particularly during the last two years, is shown by its growing strength: 4221 cells, compared with 2725 in October, 1934; with 776 factory cells, compared with 586; more than 80,000 members and the prospect of a rapid rise to 100,000, compared with 30,000 in 1933; "Humanite" with a daily circulation of 250,000, compared with 155,000 in 1933; 300 Communist municipalities, won in 1935, compared with 150 before.

And the results of the policy of the C.P.F.? The almost complete realisation of unity of action between the C.P.F. and the S.P.F.; the establishment of a unified trade union executive, to accomplish which the Communists contributed a great deal; the establishment of a people's front which is continually extending; and, as the result of all these achievements, the fact that up till now it has been made impossible for the Fascists to impose their rule on France. This was also confirmed in the message sent to the Congress by the Communist International, in which emphasis was placed on the great international significance of the fact that the C.P.F. had proved that, by uniting the great masses of the workers, "it is possible to combat Fascism with success."

The influence of the C.P.F. was illustrated by the presence at the Congress of two great French writers: Andre Malraux and Jean Richard Bloch, by the letters of greeting received by it from a number of prominent scientists like Professor Langevin and Paul Perrin, and by the close attention with which sympathisers, Socialist workers, and the friends of the people's front followed the debates of the Party Congress—and also by the interest shown in this Congress by the opponents of the C.P.F., who nowadays no longer treat the C.P.F., as they did before, as an insignificant sect hovering in the clouds of abstraction.

In opening the Congress, Comrade **Cachin** set forth the causes of this great advance and of this prestige: (1) The C.P.F. is more thoroughly occupied with the daily troubles of the workers; it speaks to them in more comprehensible language and provides a better defence of their daily demands; (2) in the eyes of all, the C.P.F. is the best champion of unity, and the

masses rightly give it credit for the great work of having compelled Fascism to retreat; (3) the C.P.F. has constantly extolled the great example of the Soviet Union, the establishment of Socialism in the Soviet Union, and its peace policy; (4) the C.P.F. has constantly worked in full accord with the Communist International, and welcomed its advice and assistance.

The Congress of Villeurbanne declared that the C.P.F. is alone capable of saving the French people, in that it unites them against their enemies, the 200 families of the finance-oligarchy, who are bent on exploiting them, bleeding them, degrading them and leading them to destruction. From beginning to end the Congress was dominated by one single slogan: Unity of the French nation in the struggle for a free, powerful, and happy France. The Congress drew up a programme for the salvation of the country, of its youth, its culture, its material wealth, and its democratic and revolutionary traditions. It resolved to accelerate the creation of one of the chief instruments for achieving this goal, the United Party of the French proletariat, and to make even greater efforts to extend the people's front of work, freedom, and peace, and to consolidate it through the establishment of elected local people's front committees.

The Congress sharply censured all those who continue to make stubborn attempts to pile up difficulties in the way of unity. It expressed its profound regret at the attitude of the Right wing of the Second International, which obstinately refused to accept the proposals for a united front made repeatedly by the C.I. It criticised statements, articles, and deeds for which leading French Socialists were responsible, regarding them as tending to obstruct the application of the pact for a united front and the establishment of a United Party capable of leading the proletariat to victory. The "**Populaire**" wrote that the delegates were much more inclined to criticise the activities of the S.P.F. than the reports submitted to them. The reason for this was that all these reports, permeated with the will to unity, met with the joyful approval of the delegates, who consequently aimed their reproaches at those who are not acting in the same spirit or are still hesitating to appreciate the necessity of an extremely wide mustering of the people.

In the name of the entire Party, the delegates to the Congress demonstrated their unshakable and grateful loyalty to the **Communist International**. Mention of the names of **Stalin** and **Dimitrov** never failed to call forth a storm of applause. Besides our great international leaders and our heroes **Thaelmann** and

Anna Pauker, the honorary Presidium also included the name of Stakhanov, in honor, as it were, of the new human being in the Soviet Union. There were repeated and hearty demonstrations of proletarian internationalism when the representatives of the brother parties and the delegates of the Alsatian people greeted the Congress and made known their determination to fight, in common with the French people, against the imperialism of the 200 families of the French finance-oligarchy and against Hitler-Fascism.

Communist work in all mass organisations—for, as **Renaud Jean** said, "the man who walks by himself is no Communist"—and the patient organisation of economic struggles calculated to get the masses on the move—these were other resolutions adopted at Villeurbanne.

Even though the advances noted at Villeurbanne give rise to the greatest hopes, the C.P.F. is not letting these successes go to its head. It knows perfectly well that it has only covered a small part of the road leading to victory; that it still has weaknesses which were revealed at its Congress. The Communists of France must become even more convinced of the truth that "organisation decides everything," and that organisation of their forces and those of their allies has not yet reached the level demanded by circumstances. The C.P.F. is still much too weak in the factories. The policy decided upon by the Central Committee still often lacks the necessary adaptation to local conditions, and the initiative of the lower Party organisations lags much too frequently behind that of the Party leadership. The cadres are still inadequately trained, and not sufficiently constant; the abilities of many comrades are not yet sufficiently trained and are not always employed in the proper place. The absolutely essential condition for a bold struggle in a broad people's front movement consists in jealously guarding, as it were, the inviolability of Communist principles, in systematically propagating them, and in encouraging everywhere the Soviet idea.

The Congress was not content to laud the successes of the Party; it also severely criticised its own shortcomings. Thus it regretted that there were only 23 women among the delegates and that 47 delegates qualified for organisation in trade unions did not belong to any union. It expressed its amazement at certain cases of lack of understanding in the main questions concerning the unconditional defence of the Soviet Union (the comrades concerned, however, soon recognised their error), and at the contemptuous attitude, still to be encountered, adopted by

certain comrades towards the defence of the minor daily demands of the masses.

The Congress provided such an example of discipline—a discipline to which the Party members have themselves won through—of enthusiasm and stoicism, of ideological unity and of self-confidence, that it is possible without exaggeration to describe it as the first great Congress of a mass Party, which, if it continues to improve and to gain in strength, justifies the hope that it will rapidly succeed in becoming the "movement to unify and to direct," to use Lenin's expression.

The Congress of Villeurbanne was able to register the resignation of the Laval Government, which was brought about at last by the resignation, forced by pressure from the masses of the people, of the four Radical Ministers, as a victory in the advance of the C.P.F.

The Congress, however, had hoped that the new Government would have been more in conformity with the will of the people and would mean a more definite break with Laval's policy. But efforts have been made to continue to maintain co-operation between the champions of the Fascist leagues and of Mussolini and hesitant adherents of the People's Front, and to bring into being a so-called transitional Ministry which includes some sworn enemies of the people.

Laval has been driven out at last. But one has dropped back at once into the behind-the-scenes combinations. It is true that the Fascist **de Kerillis** has declared war on the new **Sarraut Government**, writing in tearful tones that "the 6th of February has been wiped out, liquidated; the sacrifice of the dead has been for nothing. The endeavor, undertaken by Laval and Doumergue, to put the affairs of the country in order and to clean it up has been nullified." But the head of the Government is the man who uttered the famous phrase: "Communism—that is the foe"; but **Flandin**, now Foreign Minister, was head of the Government when Laval was negotiating the Rome Agreement; but **Regnier**, the man of the emergency decrees, remains Finance Minister. There is, therefore, no question of a real political change.

The Democratic Alliance asserts that it approves of its chairman (**Flandin**) co-operating with **Sarraut**, since the latter has a programme hostile to the People's Front. But side by side with **Sarraut** and **Flandin** are Ministers, Radicals and Independent Socialists, who have zealously shared in the work of rallying the people to the struggle for bread, peace, and work, and they must not surrender themselves as hostages of reaction.

A heterogeneous and doubtful combination, whose Government statement and first deeds must be awaited before it can be known on which side the scales will be weighted, the scales which were to be balanced, mainly apparently in order to discredit certain champions of the People's Front and to avoid a Government of the Left. But in spite of the Parliamentary intrigues of a dying Chamber, the People's Front will not allow itself to be discredited. The C.P.F. will guard against that, as is stated in one of the resolutions adopted at Villeurbanne: "The real guarantee for the defence of democratic liberties lies in the organisation of wide masses of the people in a great number of committees." And we regret that the members of the Socialist Parliamentary fraction see such a guarantee only in eventual participation in the Government, participation which Blum would be very glad to see, and in a Government which, despite their presence, would have nothing in common with the People's Front Government as we visualise it, in complete accord with the definition given by Dimitrov at the Seventh World Congress of the Communist International.

THE CONCERN OF THE ENTIRE WORKING CLASS: DEFEAT THE CRIMES ACT THREAT!

"If we Communists exert every effort to establish a united front, we do this not for the narrow purpose of recruiting new members for the Communist Parties. But we must strengthen the Communist Parties in every way and increase their membership for the very reason that we seriously want to strengthen the united front. The strengthening of the Communist Parties is not a narrow Party concern, but the concern of the entire working class."—Dimitrov, "Speech to the Seventh Congress of the Communist International."

£5000 wanted to strengthen the C.P.A. and defend its right to legal existence! (See "The Workers' Weekly.")

Lenin's Method of Work

By N. KRUPSKAYA

No matter what work Vladimir Ilyich undertook, he did it extremely thoroughly. He himself did a tremendous amount of the ordinary routine work. The more importance he attached to any particular work, the more he would delve into all the details.

At the end of the 'nineties, Vladimir Ilyich saw how difficult it was to establish in Russia an illegal newspaper, appearing regularly. On the other hand he attached tremendous organisational and agitational importance to an all-Russian newspaper that would elucidate from the Marxist standpoint all the events and facts of actual Russian life and the working-class movement that was beginning to develop more and more widely. He, therefore, selected a group of comrades, and decided to go abroad and organise the publication of such a newspaper there. "Iskra" was conceived by him and organised by him. Every number received exhaustive attention. Every word was thought out. And—what is a very characteristic detail—Vladimir Ilyich himself corrected the proofs of the whole paper. This was not because there was no one else to read the proofs (I quickly adapted myself to this work), but because he was anxious that no errors should slip in. First he read the proofs himself, then passed them to me, then looked them over again.

And it was the same with everything. He put in a great deal of work, studying and drawing up agrarian statistics. His note-books contain a large number of carefully written-out tables. When he was dealing with figures that were of great importance, he even checked the additions, etc., of the printed tables. The careful verification of every fact and every figure was typical of Ilyich. He based his conclusions on facts.

Lenin did not rely on his memory, although he had an excellent one. He never cited facts from memory, "approximately," but always gave them with the greatest accuracy. He looked through piles of material (he read with extraordinary rapidity, just as he wrote), but whatever he wanted to remember he wrote down in his note books. A large number of these notes of his have been preserved. Once when looking over my brochure, "Organisation of Self-Education," he said I was wrong in stating that notes should only be made on the most necessary things—his experience had been otherwise. He used to read over his notes several times, which is evident from the various remarks, underlinings, etc.

Sometimes, if the book were his own, he found it sufficient

to make underlinings and marginal notes. On the cover he wrote the numbers of the pages marked, underlining them with one or several lines, according to the importance of the marked passages. He also re-read his own articles making notes to them as well. Anything he noticed that led up to some new idea, he also underlined and noted the page on the cover. That was the way Ilyich organised his memory. He always remembered exactly what he had said, where, and in controversy with whom. In his books, speeches, and articles we find very few repetitions. It is true that over a period of years we encounter the same fundamental ideas in Ilyich's articles and speeches. This is because his utterances bear the imprint of a peculiar unity, a unique consistency. But we do not find just an ordinary repetition of something already uttered. The same fundamental idea is advanced but as applied to new conditions, in a new concrete setting, and treating the question from a new aspect. I remember a talk with Ilyich when he had already fallen ill. We were talking about the volumes of his complete works that had just appeared. We spoke of how they reflected the experience of the Russian Revolution, how important it was to make this experience accessible to foreign comrades. We agreed that the volumes published should be utilised to illustrate how the basic, cardinal idea must inevitably be treated in varying ways, dependent on the changing concrete historical environment. Ilyich commissioned me to find a comrade who would carry out this work.

That has not yet been done, however.

Capitalism would not be capitalism if the proletariat "pure and simple" were not surrounded by a great many exceedingly variegated and transitory types—from the proletariat to the semi-proletarian (who half-way earns a livelihood by selling his "labor power"), from the semi-proletarian to the small peasant (and small craftsman, from the handicraft worker to the petty boss in general), the small to the middle peasant, and so on—if within the proletariat proper there were no divisions into brotherhoods, professional, and sometimes religious societies, etc. And this gives rise to the absolute, the imperative necessity, for the proletarian vanguard, for its conscious part, for the Communist Party to resort to manoeuvres, temporisings, and compromises with the various groups of proletarians, with the various parties of workmen and petty bosses. The whole thing lies in being able to apply these tactics and of **raising** and not **lowering** the general level of proletarian class-consciousness, revolutionary ability to fight and conquer. (Lenin: "Left Communism.")