

Vol. 3, No. 8 AUGUST, 1936



THE COMMUNIST REVIEW

Principal Contents:

DIMITROV SPEAKS TO
THE YOUTH

FRANCE AND THE NEW
GOVERNMENT

THE UNITED FRONT OF
STRUGGLE FOR PEACE,
by G. Dimitrov

SOVIET CONSTITUTION

SPAIN: THE FASCIST
CAMP ORGANISES

AUGUST, 1936 :: PRICE SIXPENCE

CONTENTS

	PAGE
FOREIGN NOTES, by E. W. Campbell	1
DIMITROV SPEAKS TO THE YOUTH	8
THE PEOPLE OF FRANCE WILL ENSURE THE SUCCESS OF THE NEW GOVERNMENT, by J. BERLIOZ (Paris)	13
CONCERNING WORDS AND DEEDS, by L. Donald	18
AUSTRALIA'S FIGHTS FOR FREEDOM, DEMO- CRACY, AND PROGRESS, by J. N. Rawling ..	25
THE UNITED FRONT OF STRUGGLE FOR PEACE, by Georgi Dimitrov	35
THE FASCIST CAMP ORGANISES ITS ACTIVI- TIES, by Vicente Uribe (Madrid)	47
THE CONSTITUTION OF SOCIALIST SOCIETY, by L. F. Boross	51
LESS HOURS, MORE WAGES, AND THE TASKS OF THE TRADE UNION MOVEMENT, by D. . .	56
THE PARTY FORGES AHEAD IN DISTRICT 3, by C.	60

The Communist Review

A Magazine of the Theory and Practice of Marxism-Leninism

Vol. 3, No. 8

SYDNEY, N.S.W.

August, 1936

Foreign Notes

World
Affairs
Roll on!

Outer Mongolia Threatened by Japan;
Revolution in Spain!

Powers Fail in Naval Conference;

End of Sanctions;

Byssinia Falls;

Class Conflicts in France;

European Bloc of Dictators!

By E. W. CAMPBELL

REMORSELESSLY the pieces in the jigsaw puzzle of international events fall into place with the passing of each day to confront the masses ever more sharply with the question as posed by these headings selected at random from press clippings over the past six months. August 1, 1936, finds the danger of war more menacing than ever. Let us examine these happenings now in some sequence in order to place on record their significance.

What happened at the London Naval Conference? This gathering was summoned in a vain endeavor to salvage something from the wreckage of the Washington Treaty. Did it succeed? No. It foundered miserably upon the rock of Japan's demand for equality. The overruling of this by Britain and the United States was the signal for Japan's withdrawal. The conference gave birth to a sickly treaty, signed by Britain, France, and the U.S.A. These countries agreed only to build ships of a certain tonnage and armament and to keep each other informed of their respective programmes. In the event of another Power deciding to build bigger and better ships than those specified, then certain "escape" clauses in this treaty permit the signa-



ories to follow suit. The construction race in naval armaments is well and truly on. This is the information that the London Conference shrieks aloud to the world at large.

The New Year opened with Abyssinia at least appearing to have an even money chance of keeping the Italian hordes at bay. Sanctions in their limited application, so we were told, were slowly crippling Italy. The Abyssinian warriors were making a name for themselves and things mighty uncomfortable for the invaders by guerilla warfare. The geographical and climatic conditions of the country combined to assist the Ethiopians. The tragedy was that the same cannot be said of all the nations comprising the League. Only one among them was found to support Abyssinia's struggle for independence as a matter of principle. Only the U.S.S.R. consistently raised to the forefront the right of a nation to self-determination as the issue at stake. Britain and France, on the other hand, treated Abyssinia as a pawn in the international chess game for positions of advantage.

Thus was Abyssinia butchered to make a Fascist holiday. Constant bombing and the ceaseless rain of poison gas from the air crippled backward Ethiopia far more rapidly than the restricted sanctions succeeded in even seriously maiming imperialist Italy. So, early in March, Signor Mussolini was able to announce to the populace assembled outside the Palazzo Venezia that the first part of his dream of a new Roman Empire was realised.

The revolution in Spain has entered a new stage with the victory of the People's Front, organised on the initiative of the Communists, over reaction. Among other things, the successes of the nation-wide People's Front both inside and outside Parliament has changed the foreign policy of Spain. From being linked with the anti-Soviet group of Powers, Spain to-day has become a country supporting peace through collective security and mutual aid pacts.

The class battles in France, the victories of the Popular Front, and the enhanced role of the Communists in that country are not without far-reaching significance.

Already, before the People's Front assumed the colossal dimensions of to-day, France was becoming alarmed at the growing military strength and aggressiveness of Nazi Germany, and leaned towards the Soviet Government as a force for peace.

The movement of the masses coming more and more under Communist influence, has done much to strengthen this progressive tendency and to hasten the finalisation of the mutual aid pact.

Hitler, alarmed at the net of peace which threatened to enmesh him in its folds, rapidly countered this pact by pushing ahead with further provocative measures that had been under contemplation since the Saar plebiscite.

The first week in March witnessed German troops spreading out, and German guns trundled into position in the forbidden Rhineland zone. The occupation, said the Nazis, was purely symbolical. With this we can agree. It was symbolical of the fact that Hitler is determined to pursue to the bitter end the reactionary course outlined in "Mein Kampf."

The anti-Soviet ally of Germany in the Far East is likewise pushing ahead with unabated enthusiasm in gobbling up China.

Following the little affair of transforming Manchuria into the "independent" State of Manchukuo, Japan has succeeded in "liberating" the two northern provinces of Hopei and Chahar from the Central Government of China. To-day Japanese goods have already, to all intents, driven out the products of other countries from the markets of North China. Another step has been taken in the digesting of this vast country by Japanese imperialism.

More prominence is given to-day than previously to Japan's "southward policy"—her policy of South Seas expansion. How much this is due to Stalin's decisive answer to the question of what would happen should Japan invade Outer Mongolia is hard to say. At any rate, it is not without interest to the people of this country, especially when coupled with Japan's naval politics.

Coming down to current events, there is the German-Austrian agreement and the Dardanelles conference.

Austria's future has long been a bone of contention in middle Europe. The German plans for Anschluss have hitherto given cause for alarm to Italy, and has provided a barrier to any closer understanding between these two major Fascist countries.

The recent agreement, whereby Germany guarantees to respect Austria's independence and to recognise the protocols between Italy, Austria, and Hungary, have transformed Austria from a gulf dividing into a bridge uniting Italy and Germany.

Furthermore, the agreement looks like being the forerunner to the formation of a middle European bloc of the most reactionary and aggressive Fascist Powers—Germany, Italy, Austria, Hungary, and Poland, by virtue of the understanding already existing between that country and Nazi Germany.

Signor Gayda, spokesman for Italian Fascism, in the "Giornale d'Italia" is already speaking of the possibility of Mussolini announcing the formation of an anti-League entente.

These developments place in jeopardy the immediate future of world peace, and offer a dire menace to the security of the Soviet Union.

At the Montreux conference, held to discuss Turkey's application for permission to refortify the Dardanelles, the pro-Hitler role of the National Government and the reluctance of Britain to do anything concrete for the organisation of peace came to the forefront.

The British proposals centred around the demand that if foreign warships were to be restricted in their entry to the Black Sea so as to increase Soviet security, then Soviet ships coming out of the Black Sea should be similarly restricted. Furthermore, the British proposal was that in wartime, with Turkey neutral, restrictions on ships passing through the Straits should not be applied to a belligerent to the detriment of its belligerent rights. This made no distinction between an aggressor and a victim of aggression.

Viewed in the light of the Anglo-German naval treaty, this attitude of Britain's has the utmost significance. It shows once again that the role of Britain is anything but peaceful.

The Soviet delegates, supported by French and Rumanian, quite justifiably insisted upon the freedom of the Straits for Soviet ships and their remaining open to warships bent upon rendering aid to victims of aggression under terms of peace pacts concluded within the framework of the League Covenant.

The British objection to any inclusion of clauses relating to such pacts being inserted means in essence that the Straits would be open to German and other fleets in wartime, but would be closed to French and Russian navies carrying out measures of mutual aid, unless specifically authorised by the League. Considering how slowly the League machinery operates, it can be seen what this means. British diplomats give lip service to collective security, but when it comes to the point of dealing a blow against aggression, Britain is once again found wanting.

What stands out from the foregoing maze of happenings is that the struggle between the contending forces of peace and war is entering a new stage. More than ever is it emphasised that the decisive role rests with the masses in each country regarding what will be the outcome.

Abyssinia fell to Italy, and the world forces of reaction and aggression were encouraged thereby, mainly due to the League's failure to apply effective sanctions in time.

This failure was due to two main causes. First, the failure of the British and French Governments to arrive at a common

policy. Secondly, the failure of the international working class to bring sufficient pressure to bear upon the League.

Today some reform of the League machinery is being mooted. It is not a matter of indifference to the masses what happens to the League. The main obstacle to Britain and France reaching agreement was the pro-German line of the National Government. Britain's leaning towards Nazi Germany forced France into a pro-Italian and anti-sanctionist policy. The change of Government in France has modified the foreign policy of that country in the direction of a more concrete and constructive struggle for peace. United struggle of the masses and the downfall of the National Government in Britain can go far towards bringing about similar changes there.

What is the position regarding Australia?

We, the people, whose future is at stake, must seriously ask ourselves: Is the programme of Lyons & Co. one that is best calculated to preserve us from war? The most cursory examination of this policy will prove the opposite.

The Defence Minister (Parkhill) has stated over and over again that "the basis of the Federal Government's policy conforms with certain guiding principles for imperial and local defence as laid down by the Imperial Conference." As we are bound to measures of imperial as well as local defence, it is well to be clear on what this implies.

According to Ercoli, in his speech before the Communist International, "The requirements of struggle for preservation of its colonial hegemony, against revolution and against national liberation movements remain to-day the fundamental mainspring of British policy."

To such a policy is Australia bound to-day. Morally, therefore, we share in the guilt for Abyssinia's betrayal. Whether we like it or not, we are tied to the pro-Hitlerism of Baldwin and Co. in Britain.

Under the terms of the Imperial Conference, Australian forces are committed to sharing in safeguarding British imperialism's possessions in India, China, etc. This is one of the main reasons why the defence of Australia, as it is interpreted by those who sit in high places, is a particularly illusionary and reactionary policy.

Does this mean that we are not interested in the defence of Australia? Does it mean that we are indifferent as to whether Australia retains her independence or not? By no means. The masses have very much to lose in the sacrificing of national independence. They also have very much to lose in the event of

this country being dragged into imperialist war in the wake of Great Britain. These are some of the reasons why we cannot remain disinterested in the future of the League of Nations, in the future of world peace.

Australia is represented on the League, and possesses a voice in the deliberations of that body. Our duty lies in seeing to it that the said voice is raised loudly and clearly in support of world peace through collective security and that it ceases merely to echo faintly the voice of British imperialism.

Events have proven that really effective measures cannot be taken against aggressors without the existence of regional mutual assistance pacts (such as those concluded between the Soviet Union and France, Czechoslovakia, etc.). This gives the line along which reform of the League should proceed. Economic and financial sanctions by the League Powers should be immediately and automatically imposed upon the aggressor, who must be named without delay on the basis of a clear and precise definition of aggression (such as that which has also been worked out by the Soviet Union and accepted already by numerous nations). At the same time, regional pacts for collective organisation of peace concluded within the framework of the League would come into force automatically through mutual assistance to the signatories in any violated section.

Australia has far more to gain from adherence to such a policy of peace than she has from the present hole-and-corner arrangements linking her with Great Britain. At present things stand somewhat as follows. Australia is bound to assist Britain in the event of the world-wide possessions of that country being endangered from any source. In return for this the British fleet will come to the aid of Australia in the hypothetical event of Japan's expansionist policy extending to these shores. Surely a suicidal policy this, if viewed from all angles, with the best end of the stick grasped firmly by Britain. It must be admitted that, all things considered, Australia stands far more chance of being called upon to carry out her part of the bargain than does Great Britain. Besides, the aid that Britain could render Australia under such circumstances is a thing of considerable doubt. Anyhow, would it not be rather late in the day then to embark upon defence? Is it not far better to do something of a concrete nature today to offset this future danger.

The suggested line of reform of the League offers such a possibility. If the peace policy of the Soviet Union is supported, if Litvinov's thesis that peace is indivisible is accepted, if Japanese aggression in the East and that of Germany in Europe can

be checked to-day, does this not offer the best guarantee that Australia will be kept out of war. Therefore, is this not a course far more desirable than the present programme of Lyons & Co. that is based upon arming to the teeth and trusting to luck and British diplomacy to postpone war.

There is one force and one force alone that can succeed in switching the foreign policy of Australia on to this peaceful path, and that is the united and organised movement of the masses. Let it grow and grow and grow, and let that growth be speedy, because upon it depends our future. Upon it depends whether the question—Peace or war?—will be answered favorably or otherwise for the people.

Dimitrov Speaks to the Youth

[The following is the full text of an address delivered by Comrade Dimitrov at the opening of the Sixth Congress of the Young Communist International, September 25, 1935. —Ed.]

COMRADES, I am bringing you warm greetings from the Executive Committee of the Communist International. (Loud applause.)

The remarkable words of the great leader and teacher of the proletariat and of all the oppressed of the world, Comrade Stalin, that "internationalism is the fundamental idea that permeates the activity of the Young Communist League," find their living embodiment in you.

No dangers that beset your long and arduous road, no Fascist or police cordons were able to prevent you from gathering in the Red proletarian capital for the purpose of discussing, in a friendly and amicable way, like the international family that you are, the tasks of uniting the forces of the young generation of toilers.

You are a congress of the revolutionary youth, a congress of strength and courage. How many of the best and most exemplary fighters in the cause of the toiling youth have assembled at your Congress!

Among you delegates there is young Diego, wounded while bravely fighting on the barricades of Asturias. (Applause.)

In your midst there is Janicki, who has already served eight years of his life in Gaol, who succeeded in escaping from his stone-walled place of imprisonment to take active part once more in the struggle of the Polish revolutionary youth. (Applause.)

In your midst there is Commissar Su I-ping, a League member hailing from the ranks of the heroic Chinese Red Army, which is fighting for the liberation of the Chinese people. (Applause.)

In your midst there are Timofeyev, Khan Murat, Krainov, and Sviridov, foremost representatives of Soviet youth, decorated with the high Order of Lenin by the Soviet Government for their conspicuous services in the struggle for Socialism. (Applause. All rise. Cheers of welcome from the German, French, American and Czech delegations.)

The delegation of the greatest organisation of the toiling youth in the world, the delegation of the Leninist Young Communist League, which under the leadership of the Bolshevik

Party won honor and glory in the cause of building Socialism, and which is fighting for the Communist training of the youth, is headed at your Congress by its leader, Comrade Kossarev, who has grown up in the youth movement and been awarded a decoration. (Tempestuous, prolonged applause. The French delegation sings "The Young Guard." All delegates answer the call of the German delegation to join in a mighty, thrice-repeated "Red Front.")

In the ranks of the Young Communist International, staunch, devoted and valorous fighters for the liberation of the working class from the yoke of Fascism, the yoke of capitalism, receive their training. Prominent representatives of the youth movement like Comrades Raymond Guyot, Gil Green, Michal Wolf and Chemodanov have grown up in its ranks and are present at this Congress. By their militant activity they have gained authority not only in the Young Communist International but also among the masses of the youth in the Socialist and other youth organisations. (Loud, prolonged applause.)

It is with pride and affection that I welcome, through you, in the name of the older revolutionary generation, the glorious young guard of the toiling classes of the whole world. (Loud applause.)

Comrades, a month ago the Seventh World Congress of the Communist International completed its work in this hall where you are assembled to-day.

The Congress of the Comintern, led by the brilliant teaching of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin, thoroughly discussed all the main problems of the international labor movement and mapped out the road that must be taken to overcome the split in this movement, and to weld together the forces of the toilers in the struggle against exploiters and oppressors, against Fascism and war. The Congress of the Communist International paid particular attention to the youth movement as one of the principal problems of the international revolutionary movement, understanding full well that the victory of the class struggle of the toiling masses depends upon the correct and successful development of the youth movement, upon its assuming a sweeping mass character.

Fascism has wreaked bestial vengeance upon the best fighters of the revolutionary youth. At the same time it is making every endeavor to adapt its putrid demagoguery to the moods of the broad masses of the youth, and to take advantage of the growing militant activity of the youth for its own reactionary ends, in order to convert it into a prop of dying capitalism.

Depriving the young generation of the toilers of all rights, the Fascist Governments militarise the whole of the youth, and try to raise from their ranks obedient slaves of finance capital in civil as well as imperialist war.

What can we place in opposition to Fascism and the threat of imperialist war, which has become particularly accentuated in view of the preparations being made by Italian Fascism to attack Abyssinia and by German Fascism to attack Lithuania?

We can and must place in opposition to it the union of all anti-Fascist forces, first and foremost, the union of all the forces of the young generation of the toilers. We can counter it by enhancing a thousandfold the role and activity of the youth in the struggle of the working class for its own interests, for its own cause.

Let the entire activity of the Congress of the Young Communist International be devoted to the attainment of this immediate and principal goal. (Applause.)

On the basis of the experience you already have gained, and the decisions of the Seventh Congress of the Communist International, we expect you to be able to find the proper ways and means of accomplishing the most important task of your movement, the task of uniting the forces of the entire non-Fascist youth, primarily of the working-class youth, the task of achieving unity with the Socialist youth.

This, however, cannot be achieved if the Young Communist Leagues keep on trying, as they have done hitherto, to construct their organisations as if they were Communist parties of the youth; nor will this be possible if they are content, as heretofore, to lead the secluded life of sectarians, isolated from the masses.

The entire anti-Fascist youth is interested in uniting and organising its forces. Therefore you, comrades, must find such ways, such forms and methods of work as will assure the formation in the capitalist countries, of a new type of mass youth organisations, to which no vital interest of the toiling youth will be alien, organisations which, without copying the Party, will fight for all the interests of the youth, will bring up the youth in the spirit of the class struggle, of proletarian internationalism, in the spirit of Marxism-Leninism.

This requires that the Congress most rigidly check up and re-appraise the work of the Young Communist Leagues, for the purpose of actually achieving their reorganisation and the fearless removal of everything obstructing the development of mass work, as well as the establishment of the united front and unity of the youth.

We expect the Young Communist International to build up its activity in such a manner as to weld and unite all trade union, cultural, educational and sports organisations of the toiling youth, all revolutionary, national-revolutionary, national-liberation, and anti-Fascist youth organisations, for the struggle against Fascism and war, for the rights of the young generation.

We note with great pleasure that our young comrades in France and the United States have actively joined the mass movement for a united front of the youth, which is so successfully developing, and have already achieved in this sphere successes which hold out great promises. All sections of the Young Communist International should profit by this experience of the French and American comrades. (Applause.)

In many countries relations between the Communist and Socialist youth are becoming closer and closer. A striking example of this is the presence, at this Congress of the Young Communist International, of representatives of not only the Communist but also the Socialist youth of Spain. (Applause.)

Therefore, comrades, follow boldly the course of uniting with the Socialist youth and of forming common, single organisations with it. Follow boldly the course of uniting all forces of the anti-Fascist youth!

The Executive Committee of the Communist International will encourage and support in every way your initiative and activity in the struggle to unite and fight for all the vital interests of the toiling youth.

The millions of young men and women for whom capitalist society has created impossible conditions of existence, who either are not embraced by any organisation at all or are in organisations led by the class enemy, are your brothers and sisters, whom you can and must win over to the side of Socialism by your persistent work.

Don't wait until unity between the Communist and Socialist Democratic Parties and other organisations of the working class has been reached.

Be bold, independent and full of initiative. (Applause.)

You are the Congress of the most active, the most self-sacrificing section of the young generation of to-day. You cannot stand aside from the movement in favor of unity which is growing and strengthening in the ranks of the working class. You do not have to wait like the Socialist Youth International for permission "from above" before you can support the united front movement and the union of the toiling youth in one organisation.

In the name of the Executive Committee of the Communist

International I declare that the youth which is being united in the ranks of the Young Communist International enjoys and will continue to enjoy every opportunity of **independently** developing its revolutionary movement and solving the problems of this movement. (Applause.)

Communists in youth organisations must be able to work in such a way as to influence the decisions of these organisations by convincing their members and not by issuing orders in the name of the Party.

I call to mind the words of the great Lenin which form the basis for the relations between the Communist International and the youth and its organisations:

"Frequently the middle-aged and the aged **do not know** how to approach the youth in the proper way, for, necessarily, the youth must come to Socialism **in a different way, by other paths, in other forms, in other circumstances** than their fathers. Incidentally, this is why we must be decidedly in favor of the **organisational independence** of the Youth League, **not only** because the opportunists fear this independence, but because of the very nature of the case; for unless they have complete independence, the youth will be **unable** either to train good Socialists from their midst or prepare themselves to lead Socialism forward."

Comrades, you must **study, study while you fight.**

Combine your day-to-day practical activities with a profound study of the original sources of Marxism-Leninism, for without revolutionary theory there can be no revolutionary practice.

Be exemplary, staunch and valorous fighters against Fascism, against capitalism. (Applause.)

Hold aloft the banner of the liberation of humanity from capitalist slavery, the banner of the Communist International. (Loud applause.)

Rally the young generation of toilers of the whole world around this banner. This emblem of stupendous victories is already waving over one-sixth part of the globe and will fly triumphantly over the whole world! It is the flag of the great leader of the world proletariat, Comrade Stalin!

(All rise. A storm of applause. Shouts of "Long Live the great Stalin!" "Long live the helmsman of the Comintern, Comrade Dimitrov!" "Long live the Comintern." Shouts of "Hurrah!" "Banzai!" a triple "Red Front!" Singing of the "Bandiera Rossa" and the "Internationale." The German delegation, joined by everyone in the hall, sings the "Roter Wedding" march.)

The People of France Will Ensure the Success Of the New Government

By J. BERLIOZ (Paris)

IN his great speech, made at the National Congress of the Socialist Party recently, **Leon Blum** declared with emphasis that the programme of the Government will be the joint programme of the People's Front, which the Socialists solemnly pledge themselves to carry out, without for a moment admitting the possibility of any failure.

The events of these last days, such as the tremendous demonstration in commemoration of the Paris Commune on May 24 and the strikes of many thousand workers, especially in the engineering shops of Paris, show that the coming Socialist-led Government can press forward without hesitation, because it can be sure of the active support of the great popular masses of the country.

At least 600,000 persons have taken part in the demonstration before the Wall of the Federals. Important contingents of middle-class demonstrators had joined the workers, together with a strong group of intellectuals, who were cheered with special enthusiasm. Thousands of women of all social classes marched in the crowd, all forming a solid mass, united in their quiet and reasoned resolution of demanding a change of policy which would bring immediate results for the whole of the laboring population.

The procession was joyous, full of confidence, sure of a better to-morrow. Its march-past lasted more than eight hours, bristling with posters and banners, decorated with great symbolic tableaux which represented the development of the Soviets. The hopeful cry: "Soviets everywhere!" was heard all the time. Among the militants leading the march were Comrade Blum, the future Prime Minister, the Political Bureau of the Communist Party, the Executive of the C.G.T. Though the Radical Party had declined our invitation to take part in the demonstration, many of its rank and file marched with us.

The reactionary and Fascist press was startled out of its wits. "**Ami du Peuple**" had to admit with rage that "a disciplined, united mass, confident of its own strength, marched yesterday past the Wall of the Federals." Several papers joined the "**Figaro**" in stressing that the continuous intervention of the popular masses was turning into a thing that may well prove dangerous to the resistance of the 200 families of the financial

oligarchy. Sanvoisin wrote on May 25 that

"it was impossible to foresee at present the influence that these mass demonstrations may exercise over the fundamental developments which our policy is destined to undergo. But it is obvious that they constitute a new factor in our public life."

The increased struggle of the masses for better conditions has fortunately come to add to all this its strong support for a Government resolved to carry out the programme of the People's Front boldly and methodically.

The "**Bulletin Quotidien**," the mouthpiece of heavy industry, states sadly that

"after the restoration of trade union unity, and especially after the victory of the People's Front in the elections, it was easy to foresee that industrial disputes would increase in number."

The direct action of the working class naturally followed the political victory of May 3, which was followed by an all too long interval, during which the Sarraut Government continued its past mistakes.

The industrial struggle was most intensive in the **engineering works of Paris**. More than 100,000 workers were involved. The struggle rapidly spread to other trades, and is now spreading even to remote provincial regions.

The conditions of the metal workers of both sexes, who number about a million and a half in France, are scandalous. A fierce rationalisation drive is intensifying exploitation every day, without giving the workers any guarantee of a certain minimum wage. Overtime, cutting-down of working times and piece rates were forced on them at the pleasure of the employers, who thought they could do as they chose, who were united in a very strong organisation and disregarded trade union rights and freedom of opinion even of the most elementary description.

Ever since the economic revival—resulting from big armament orders—began to manifest itself, the engineering union of the Paris district began a systematic propaganda in favor of a collective agreement. Up to the present the potentates of the Comité des Forges insolently refused to discuss it. Finally the pent-up anger of the workers at their miserable wages (often less than 4 francs per hour) found vent in a formidable protest in the shape of a new kind of struggle: **stay-in strikes** in the shops until satisfaction was obtained.

The new tactics were applied since the middle of May in the aircraft factories of **Havre, Toulouse, and Courbevoie**. The object was to obtain the granting of certain special demands and the re-engagement of workers victimised for trade union or political activities. The day after the gigantic demonstration in front of the Wall, the struggle spread in Paris and its suburbs to several dozen shops, the largest of which were **Renault** with 32,000 workers, **Citroen** with 20,000, etc.

While waiting for the answer to their demands, the workers remained in the shops in order to prevent a lock-out on the part of the employers. They organised themselves in the shops, elected delegates, provided for food supplies and contact with the outer world, etc. Their perseverance was remarkable: in some shops they stayed inside for five to six days with the help of an ingenious relief system. Their discipline was and is such that the employers themselves had to commend it. Precautions were immediately taken to prevent agents-provocateurs from committing acts of sabotage. The workshops are guarded by pickets, the fire brigade is in readiness, the machines are maintained in excellent condition, etc.

Complete unity reigns in these strikes. The employers have hardly succeeded in staging even an effort at splitting the workers. The Croix de Feu had boasted of having hundreds of adherents in numerous workshops; if this is true, their adherents have joined hands with their workmates without bothering about the orders issued by Colonel de la Rocque in the service of M. de Wendel, the great iron and steel magnate. The women are standing in the front ranks. In many shops the clerical workers and the foremen have joined the movement.

The strikers enjoy tremendous sympathy among the overwhelming majority of the population. Collections in their favor have brought ample funds. Small tradesmen have shown an unprecedented spirit of solidarity. The committees of the People's Front, where they exist, have given their support to the strike; the lower middle class has rallied to the strikers and symptomatic cases have been reported of fraternisation between workers and the police, which had no occasion to intervene anywhere, as perfect order was kept by the men themselves. The People's Front slogan of the struggle for daily bread has been put into practice with the greatest enthusiasm.

The mature, calm, good-humored determination of the engineers (who had by this time been joined by thousands of

building workers, chemical workers, agricultural workers of the more distant suburbs) made a great impression on the employers. On May 28 the employers' federation, faced with a growth of the stay-in movement, had to agree to discuss a collective agreement, but still insolently demanded that the factories should first be abandoned by the workers. But as in several shops where the management took a too intransigent line, the men refused to yield, the employers were compelled after all to enter into negotiation, despite the fact that the workers still occupied the factories.

The great national dailies have, of course, attempted to distort the character of the movement in their reports, with the object of causing a social and financial panic, and especially of frightening the Radicals. They have talked about revolutionary occupation of the factories, of soviets, of a political movement, directed by the extreme Left against the Government of tomorrow. **Bure** wrote:

"The workers tried to show their employers that the 3rd of May marked the end of their rule, that they would not in future be masters in their own house without the consent of the workers."

But it was all no good. The People's Front stands solid. **Bayet**, one of the leaders of the Radical Party, calmly replied:

"The Radicals, true to their traditions, are with the suffering people and praise it for its sang froid."

Cold blood, self-control—these are the things which are frightening the big bourgeoisie. The torrent is unleashed, said their pen-pusher lackeys, but "the flood surprisingly keeps itself within exemplary bounds, revealing its real force, already organised and master of itself." The bourgeoisie is frightened also by the drive towards organisation, which has seized the proletariat and which recalls the time immediately following the war. The engineering federation has grown from 40,000 members last year to 65,000 this year, and is progressing merrily towards 100,000; in the Paris region the union has increased in a few months from 7000 to 20,000 members. The same applies to all the unions. Thus the Miners' Federation has added 40,000 members to its numbers since the unification. The railwaymen have gained 25,000, the trade union federation of the Paris region shows an increase of 50,000, etc.

Our Communist Party has supported this remarkable struggle with all its forces. The Communist deputies have everywhere put themselves at the disposal of the strikers; the

Communist municipalities immediately proceeded to organise the feeding of the men; Communist militants were prominent in all factories, where they kept in the closest contact with the workers.

At the Socialist Party Congress several speakers, including Comrade **Blum**, stressed the necessity of good contacts between the Government and the masses. The demonstrations and strikes of the past weeks make it certain that such a contact will be accomplished without the slightest difficulty. As **Blum** said:

"We have with us a tremendous current which is pushing us forward and outrunning us even now in extent and force."

Obviously this does not mean that "everything is possible" at the present time, as certain Socialists, drunk with success, seem to think. The job is not to make a revolution, not even in words, but to act wisely and boldly in order to effect a real change in French policies.

Our Central Committee declared in a resolution, voted on May 25:

"The Central Committee and the Communist deputies are unanimous in the belief that a close and loyal co-operation of the Party in the tasks of the coming Government is indispensable for the realisation of the programme of the People's Front.

"The Central Committee considers itself responsible for the accomplishment of these tasks and assures the coming Socialist-led Government of its complete and unflinching support."

Our Party, which now numbers 130,000 members, and which is incessantly recruiting new forces, has recommended the formation of a close net of committees of the People's Front throughout the country in order to ensure the best support for the coming Socialist Government.

Unfortunately, the Socialist Party and the Radicals raise certain objections to these committees. We are confident that events to come will convince the comrades who see the life of the coming Government from an exclusively parliamentary angle, that the formation of such committees is a necessity. It is the disciplined and irresistible force of the entire people of France, reconciled within itself, which will guarantee the success of the experiment in conformance with its requirements and hopes.

Concerning Words and Deeds

By L. DONALD

IT is said that deeds speak louder than words. There is no better proof of the correctness of this saying than the words and actions of the Victorian A.L.P. leaders, who are, in the main, also the leaders of the Trades Hall Council.

An examination of the words and actions of these people over the recent period exposes clearly and fully their insincerity and dishonesty. For the purposes of our examination, we take the published statements of the Labor leaders in two documents—"The Reply to the United Front Proposals of the Communist Party" and "Labor's Case Against War and Fascism"—and compare them with the actions of these people in the trade union movement and A.L.P. over the recent period.

In their reply to our united front proposals they state:

"If Communists desire a better spirit, a co-operative spirit, in the labor movement, they know how to get it. Most of them are members of unions—or entitled to be members of unions. Let them take part in the work of their unions—in a spirit of co-operation, not of disruption."

Further on they state:

"But as we have accepted your assurances that your Party sincerely and honestly desires co-operation, my executive reminds you that, if your adherents bring to the unions, the unemployed movement, and the Trades Hall Council the spirit of co-operation instead of the spirit of antagonism, they will help their fellow-workers. . . ."

The Communists did not need the advice of the A.L.P. executive that they should work in the trade unions. They were already working—and working hard—in the unions to build and strengthen them. They had brought to the trade unions "the spirit of co-operation," and were co-operating, with ever-greater success, with their fellow-unionists in building the unions and defending the interests of the members.

But the Communists accepted in good faith the statements of the A.L.P. executive that "the spirit of co-operation" should be brought to the trade unions, and have continued to do all in their power to have such a policy operated in the unions.

And what has been the result? Since this statement was made, the reactionary section of the trade unions leaders, headed

by the T.H.C. executive, which glibly supports "Labor's Reply to the United Front Proposals," has availed itself of every possible opportunity of attacking and harassing Communists in the trade unions, hindering their activities, using all means of preventing their election to responsible positions, etc. This vicious offensive against the Communists has taken several forms. On the one hand, the T.H.C. executive places every obstacle in the way of Communists (or those suspected of not agreeing with the splitting policy of the executive) being admitted to the council. Over the past two months the delegates of several unions were prevented from taking their seats on one pretext and another, and several of these delegates are still denied admittance. The delegate of the Miners' Union (Comrade J. D. Blake) has been denied his seat on the ground that he is not a bona fide member of the Wonthaggi branch. This despite the fact that the miners elected him in a completely constitutional manner as a member of the Wonthaggi branch of the federation. The tactics adopted by Monk & Co. in this instance were characteristic. Comrade Blake was elected to the first Labor Anti-War Conference, but as the credential contained the wrong name it was altered by McVicars, secretary of the branch, and the alteration initialled. This credential was rejected and was later produced by the renegade Mr. Lovegrove as proof of "Communist tactics." The Party wrote to the T.H.C. executive denying any suggestion of forgery, and demanded an investigation. Despite these things, Mr. Monk triumphantly produces the credential again and tries to use it against Comrade Blake. Unfortunately for the provocative gentlemen, the alteration of the credential was done by McVicars, secretary, and witnessed by the president and vice-president of the branch, and the management committee of the miners has informed the T.H.C. executive to this effect.

The leaders of the Shop Assistants' Union, amongst the most reactionary in the Victorian trade union movement, have introduced a new rule to the effect that no Communist may hold any official position in the union.

The reactionary leaders of the Geelong T.H.C. refused to accept the affiliation of the newly formed Coachmakers' sub-branch whilst Comrade J. Morrison, leading Communist in Geelong, was its secretary. Thus do they express their "co-operative spirit."

In a number of unions any proposals of Communists which have for their purpose the strengthening of the union and improving its activities are condemned in the most violent

fashion and their sponsors attacked and slandered. Attempts by unions to recommend steps for greater activity to the T.H.C. executive meet with abuse. Thus, when the Clerks' Union proposed to the T.H.C. executive that it should develop an active campaign against the Crimes Act, it received a reply from that body hurling abuse at the sponsor and supporters of the motion.

It is not the Communists who should be advised to bring to the trade unions the "spirit of co-operation," but those officials who are devoting the whole of their efforts to prevent co-operation, to prevent the building and strengthening of the unions and the carrying out of real trade union activity.

The Communists have shown and are showing day in and day out that they are prepared and willing to co-operate with anyone who is prepared to take steps to strengthen the position of the workers—economically and organisationally. We are showing in practice that it is the Communists who not only desire, but who take the initiative in developing and strengthening such co-operation and unity of effort. In a whole number of unions the Communist, Labor Party, and non-party workers and officials work together in a comradely fashion, and it is significant that it is in these unions that the greatest progress is being made.

The only condition that the Communists lay down for co-operation and support is the interests of the union and its members. The Communists cannot and will not co-operate in actions which have as their object only the weakening of the union, limiting the rights of its members, of preventing the necessary steps to secure the economic demands of the members, preventing the strengthening of union organisation and activity, etc.

Those who speak of the "disruptive, white-anting tactics" of the Communists never attempt to produce proof of their stupid and mischievous assertions.

What is the record of the Communists in the trade unions?

In the present struggle of the workers for shorter hours and higher wages, is it not the Communists who have initiated the main actions, who are working zealously everywhere to strengthen the movement and assist it to victory?

In the fight against war and Fascism, the Communists have fought consistently for unity, for the strengthening of the anti-war forces. When the Labor Anti-War Committee was set up as a splitting manoeuvre by its sponsors, it was the Communists who took the lead in building it into a real anti-war movement in the unions and industries.

Where Communists are elected to official positions, do they not show in practice that they are real union leaders whose only thought is the interests of the workers?

Is it not the Communists who fight tirelessly for unity within the trade union movement and the whole labor movement, who oppose any and every move to create greater disunity, who refuse to lose sight of this aim in face of the worst forms of provocation on the part of the splitters?

Are not the Communists among the most active unionists, among those who fight day in and day out for stronger and better unions, for greater efforts to improve the lives of its members, to bring happiness into their homes and health and well-being to their children?

This is the programme and policy of the Communist Party in the trade union sphere. Why do not those who attack the Communists deal with these things instead of chanting their stupid "bogy" stories which belong to the same category as the "horror" stories about the Russian Bolsheviks which nowadays are not even effective in frightening little children?

In "Labor's Case Against War and Fascism," the hypocrisy of the reactionary clique gathered round the A.L.P.-T.H.C. leadership is even more pronounced.

Let us examine the following extracts:

"Labor has not limited itself to a declaration against war and Fascism. It has laid down a definite platform against war and Fascism, upon which every section of the community may unite and stand solidly, shoulder to shoulder, in the cause of peace and progress."

"It is to meet this grave situation, then, that the labor movement calls upon the people of Australia to unite solidly against war."

"As the lives, liberties, and security of all citizens are vitally concerned, all men and women opposed to war and Fascism—and these constitute an undoubted majority—are urged to assist the Labor Anti-War Committee by every means in their power."

In reply to our united front proposals, the A.L.P. executive stated:

"The labor movement has created an anti-war organisation in which every worker can find work to do." [Our emphasis.—L. D.]

It seems that, for the A.L.P. and T.H.C. executives, Communists are not a "section of the community," are not included in the "people of Australia," or among those "opposed to war and Fascism," and, in fact, are not even workers. Maybe for the A.L.P. leaders the wish is father to the thought, and the Communists don't exist at all, because, in sharp contrast to these hypocritical statements, **Communists are debarred from participation in the work of the Labor Anti-War Committee.**

At the last Labor Anti-War Committee conference, the delegates of the Carters and Drivers, Shop Assistants, and Coach-makers' unions and Brunswick A.L.P. branch were refused admittance on the grounds that they were suspected of membership of the Communist Party or its "subsidiary" bodies. It is significant to note that the rejection of the credentials was carried only on the casting vote of the chairman. Although these delegates were elected by unions and an A.L.P. branch, they were denied admittance to the conference without one atom of proof being submitted that they were members of any organisation as charged. Apparently these delegates were the "exceptions to the rule" as laid down by "Labor's Case Against War and Fascism." A storm of protest was aroused over this action; the Carters and Drivers' Union carried a strongly worded resolution of protest which has since been endorsed by a large number of unions.

However, the opinion of the trade unions means nothing to the T.H.C. and A.L.P. leadership, and they have replied to the wishes of the unions for the admittance of all delegates elected by trade unions to such conferences by introducing an anti-Communist pledge which must be signed by all delegates before being admitted to the conference. Part of the pledge states:

"I also affirm that I am not a member of any of the organisations banned by the A.L.P. and T.H.C."

Such is the "spirit of co-operation" brought to the trade unions by the A.L.P. and T.H.C. leaders, by Messrs. Monk, Clarey & Co. Such is the "anti-war organisation in which every worker can find work to do."

However, the "ban" is applied not only to the Communists and their supporters, but also to members of the A.L.P. who desire to develop real anti-war activity. The Ascot Vale branch of the A.L.P. called a conference of A.L.P. branches and unions in the Essendon area to discuss a campaign on the economic conditions of the workers and against war and Fascism. The

conference was promptly banned by the central executive on the basis that it did not conform with A.L.P. policy.

Where is this policy of the A.L.P. and T.H.C. leaders leading to? Banning has become a veritable orgy: if there happens to be a Communist in any organisation it immediately comes under the "black ban"; if a trade union elects a Communist as its representative to anti-war and other conferences it is denied representation; if a union or A.L.P. branch takes any action that does not fit in with the particular wishes of the T.H.C. or A.L.P. leadership, it is ruled out of order and "measures" are threatened. **Every splitting, disruptive action is excused by reference to the anti-Communist resolutions on the books of the T.H.C. and A.L.P.**

These gentlemen declare themselves and their policy in no uncertain manner: The whole labor movement is to be kept divided, every attempt at unity and co-operation is to be smashed, every real step forward in the interests of the workers is to be prevented.

History—the facts of life—the developments throughout the world in the recent period—mean nothing to these people. It is this self-same disastrous and criminal policy which brought defeat to the workers of Germany and Austria. It is the opposite policy—that of real unity, co-operation, progress—for which the Communists are fighting, the self-same policy which has made possible the tremendous victories of the French and Spanish people.

And in the fight for this policy the Communists do not fight alone. The demand for unity in the fight against war and Fascism comes also from the great mass of the working class. Over the recent period the following unions have declared themselves strongly for unity in the fight against war and Fascism: A.R.U., A.F.U.L.E., Tramways, Carters and Drivers, Ironworkers, Sheet Metal Workers, Blacksmiths, A.E.U., Furniture Trades, Timber Workers, Hospital Employees, Tanners, Miners, Bricklayers, Clothing Trades, Boot Trades, and Ballarat, Maryborough, and Mildura Trades Hall Councils. Here are the most powerful and basic unions in the trade union movement. In addition, a large number of A.L.P. branches have also declared themselves for unity.

The splitters at the head of the T.H.C. and A.L.P. choose to ignore the demand from this powerful list of organisations. When they see the Labor Party and Communist Party workers co-operating, their only response is more determined efforts to keep them apart.

But, as in France, the demands of the workers cannot be ignored for ever. As in France, the great movement for unity which grows in the unions and A.L.P. branches will force these people to change their splitting, disruptive policy and act in the interests of working-class unity or get out of the working-class movement. But until this is done, the working class suffers disunity, it is weakened in its struggle for a better life, for peace and freedom.

The Communist Party and large sections of the working class can well say to the A.L.P. and T.H.C. leaders: "If you bring to the trade unions, to the workers' movement generally, the spirit of co-operation and not antagonism, the spirit of progress and action to defend the interests of the workers instead of preventing progress and sacrificing the interests of the workers, then you will help your fellow workers and justify your position at the head of the trade union movement and A.L.P. in this State. If you have any sincerity and do not repudiate your own written word then you will do these things."

Australia's Fights for Democracy, Freedom, and Progress

By J. N. RAWLING

X.—Class Struggle and Progress

PROGRESS proceeds by means of class struggles. It is only by thoroughly understanding that dialectical process that we can read any meaning into history. Failure to understand that process makes us merely antiquarians or romanticists, not historians. But there are several points about the materialist conception of history that are not thoroughly understood, even by many who claim to be Marxists. We cover these misunderstandings when we say that the materialist conception of history is neither mechanical nor fatalistic.

Firstly, the dictatorship of a class is not akin to the dictatorship of a colonel over a battalion or of a beach caretaker over his chairs. Both the dictators and those dictated to are active in the struggle, and, what is more, every individual and every class, sub-class or section of society plays its part in the struggle. It is not a static picture that we are looking at. It is a unity, a whole—but a whole made up of antagonistic and warring parts. In Hegel's Synthesis, thesis fights with antithesis—but it is the whole, the synthesis that we are faced with. And in society, at any particular epoch, one class—with its supporters—that stands for the past, remains on guard against another class—and its supporters—that represents the future. But, still, society is a whole and whatever is gained in enlightenment, freedom, or progress is the possession of all, even though at the moment possessed in varying degrees. **S**econdly, the materialist conception of history is not fatalistic. Too many look upon history, and also upon the activities of classes other than the working class, as something apart from the working class, its history and its objectives. They look upon the working class as existing through the ages separately from other classes, which have fought out their differences with the working class looking on, until the time comes for the latter to enter into its inheritance. What such people must realise is that it was the working class that did most for human progress in the past, and must necessarily and inevitably have formed no inconsiderable section of the forces of progress in any period.

These remarks are called forth by a statement made to the

writer that we owed no debt to W. C. Wentworth, because he merely wanted trial by jury, the vote and freedom of the press for his own class and not for the people generally. The remarks were excited also by the failure of S. A. Rosa (who wrote a "Political History of Australia"), to see any real difference between the party of Macarthur and the party of Wentworth in the eighteen-twenties. Both were "selfish," he says. Yes, Wentworth was "selfish" and he was rich—but whatever he was, he spoke for the masses against despotism, and helped to found some of our liberties. And the rich "emancipists" fought for progress against reaction—even if their one concern was to become richer than the "exclusives." History in its onward march often ignores the motives of individuals and classes. The future is, and always has been, for the masses who from time to time discard tired, satiated or bought elements. But these cannot take away what they helped to gain. So we recognise our debt to Wentworth—even while we understand the part he afterwards played.

Australian history furnishes remarkable illustrations of the dialectical process. We have already pointed out the class alignments at the time of Bligh (1806-8). (See "C.R.," April.) We can see even then the beginnings of one of the most bitter class struggles in Australian history: between the "emancipists" and the "exclusives." To a certain extent the deposition of Bligh was a part of that struggle.

When Macquarie succeeded Bligh as Governor, he was supported by, and in turn worked with, the "emancipists." Who were the "emancipists"? They were convicts who had been granted their freedom. Many became wealthy—landowners, publicans, merchants. On the other hand were the "exclusives" or "pure merinos"—the wealthy landowners who had come to Australia as free men; many of them were former officers of the N.S.W. Corps. They had got in first—they resented the newcomers, as interlopers and as not gentlemen. In addition to the convicts and the soldiers, there were besides the bulk of the people, made up of small farmers, artisans, laborers—free settlers, freed-men or men born here. This was the people—growing in numbers until it became the people of N.S.W. and the custodians of its liberties, when exclusives and emancipists had buried the hatchet. We have seen, when dealing with Bligh, the emergence of this class, when it repudiated Macarthur and presented what I have called its Bill of Rights to Bligh in 1806.

Governor Macquarie favored the rich emancipists and ration-

alised his liking for "opulent" (his favorite word) ex-convicts in this manner:

"I was very much surprised and concerned on my arrival here at the extraordinary and illiberal policy I found had been adopted by all the persons who had preceded me in office respecting those men who had been originally sent out to this country as convicts but who, by long habits of industry and total reformation of manners, had not only become respectable, but by many degrees the most useful members of the community. Those persons have never been countenanced or received in society. I have, nevertheless, taken upon myself to adopt a new line of conduct, conceiving that emancipation, when united with rectitude and long-trying good conduct, should lead a man to that rank in society which he had forfeited, and do away, in as far as the case will admit, with all retrospect of former bad conduct. This appears to me to be the greatest inducement that can be held out towards the reformation of the manners of the inhabitants, and I think it is consistent with the gracious and humane intentions of His Majesty and his Ministers in favor of this class of people. The number of persons of this description whom I have as yet admitted to my table consists of only four, viz., Mr. D'Arcy Wentworth, principal surgeon; Mr. William Redfern, assistant surgeon; Mr. Andrew Thompson, an opulent farmer and proprietor of land; and Mr. Simeon Lord, an opulent merchant."

The Simeon Lord mentioned had been a pickpocket—he now owned 4365 acres. Andrew Thompson, a supporter of Bligh, sent out for rick-burning, left Macquarie a fortune. Redfern was a surgeon in the navy in 1798, at the time of the Nore Mutiny and was transported for his share in that mutiny. D'Arcy Wentworth—father of W. C. W.—was not an emancipist. Having had the good fortune to have been found not guilty on five or six times when he was charged with highway robbery he was not a convict—although he thought it healthier to come to N.S.W. than, perhaps, to risk another trial in England. Other rich emancipists were Crossley, who had been a fence and a betrayer of criminals; Samuel Terry, who kept a public house and gathered unto himself 19,000 acres by filling up small farmers with his liquor and having them sign away their rights to their land. But Macquarie said: "There are only two classes of people

in N.S.W.—those who have been convicted and those who ought to have been.”

Commissioner Bigge, in 1826, gave the population of New South Wales as 23,939—1307 who had come free; 1495 born here; 962 conditionally pardoned; 3253 with sentence expired; 1422 with tickets of leave; 9451 convicts; 5668 children; 220 serving on colonial vessels.

The “emancipists” suffered from many disabilities and had to fight for the rights that the free settlers enjoyed. The first man to make a determined fight for the “emancipists” was Edward Eager. His character was not that of an angel, but that has nothing to do with it. In two cases of his, the court decided that not only Eager, but all of the “emancipists,” as ex-convicts, had no legal or civil rights—they would not be able even to give evidence in a court of law! The protest was great. An Australian Patriotic Association was formed and Eager and Redfern were sent home to England. A series of letters was sent to members of Parliament in England. The upshot was the removal of these legal disabilities.

But the big fight waged by the Emancipists was for the freedom of the press, and in this W. C. Wentworth, who returned to Sydney in 1824, played an active part.

XI—Freedom of the Press

Australia's first newspaper was the “Sydney Gazette,” which was begun in 1803 by George Howe and later carried on by his son Robert. It was a paper under the patronage of the Governor and was never critical of acts of government. There was therefore in reality no need for the strict censorship of the press that was in the hands of the Governor until 1824. In that year the “Gazette” was informed that the censorship was lifted. Almost immediately two new newspapers made their appearance. These were “The Australian,” founded and conducted by W. C. Wentworth and Dr. Wardell, and “The Monitor,” founded by Edward Smith Hall.

With the establishment of these two newspapers, public opinion for the first time in Australia became really articulate. Corruption in official circles, abuses and injustices were attacked by the two independent papers and defended by the “Gazette”—voice of the Government and the “Pure Merinos.” So vehement were the attacks of the opposition press upon the administration that the Governor sought to cripple the papers and to destroy the right of free speech. The fight against the autocracy of governors and for representative government became immedi-

ately a struggle for free speech and the liberty of the press.

The cause of the first clash between the Governor and the press was the “Sudds Case.”

The conditions of the soldiers were all but intolerable. They saw convicts whom they had guarded become emancipists and rich, and then—some of them—appointed magistrates, who ordered the lash for soldiers who revolted against the inhuman discipline and the devilish conditions. Many soldiers, who hitherto had had no stain upon their characters, began to commit robbery in order to be free from the life of a soldier. Two of these were Joseph Sudds and Patrick Thompson. They determined to commit some petty crime, serve a short sentence and then, as they would be discharged, return home to England. But they reckoned without Governor Darling. He was determined to make an example—instead of bettering the conditions of the soldiers he was going to shut the only door of escape.

The two would-be escapees stole a roll of calico from a George Street trader. They were sentenced to seven years' transportation. Within a fortnight of the trial, the inhuman Governor issued an order that was to be a death sentence for one of the two. This order was to the effect that the seven years were to be spent in chains on the public roads and then the two purloiners of a roll of calico were to return to their corps. On November 22, 1826, the two men were publicly clothed in felons' dress, placed in their irons, and “drummed out as rogues and vagabonds.” Each set of irons weighed between 30 and 40 lbs. They are thus described by the “Australian”:

“The rings from the ankles are made after a peculiar fashion and are of uncommon size. In place of having chains attached to them in the common way, they are connected by means of long and slender chains with another ring, which is put round the neck and serves as a collar. Two thin pieces of iron, each about eight inches long, protrude from the ring collar, in front under the chin, behind under the nape of the neck.”

It will be seen that the unfortunate men could not lie on their backs or bellies without twisting their collars around. And, if they did that, the chains would be twisted around the body and the legs drawn up. Thompson later described his predicament:

“The projecting irons would not allow me to stretch myself at full length on my back. I could sleep on my back by contracting my legs. I could not stand upright with the irons on. The basil of the irons would not slip

up my legs, and the chains were too short to allow me to stand upright."

Sudds fared the worse. He was ill, the weather was very hot, the irons cut into his flesh and his neck began to swell. On the first night—they of course slept in their irons—while, presumably, Governor Darling slept the sleep of the just, Sudds was in such a condition that a fellow-prisoner said, "He's not dead, but I don't think he'll live long." His gaoler ordered him to hospital, where the doctor told him he would be better out of the world. To which Sudds replied, "I wish to God I was."

His wish was soon granted. On Sunday, November 26, Darling, after returning from church, was informed that Sudds was dying. To prevent the holding of an inquest, which would result in unpleasantness to himself the Governor ordered Sudds to be transferred from the military hospital to the Public Hospital. There he died on that Sunday night. He had obtained his release from the 57th Regiment and Governor Darling's inhuman discipline

On Monday morning the storm broke. Darling, in the opposition press, was called a murderer, and Wentworth drew up an impeachment of him and sent it to Government House. Shopkeepers closed their shops in mourning for Sudds. The demand was made that a public inquiry be held. That demand was so insistent that the inquiry had to be held. Then Darling produced a set of irons weighing 13 pounds as the irons worn by Sudds. But a Captain Robison was able and willing to knock the bottom out of that story. It was then put forward that Sudds had died of dropsy and bronchitis. But the surgeon stated that no natural cause of death could be found. It was proved that Sudds had been cruelly done to death by Governor Darling—just for a bit of calico—the theft itself having been caused by the inhuman treatment of the soldiers.

The controversy lasted four years. It was, however, more than a question of the causes of the death of one man. It was a fight for the freedom of the press. The Governor sought to silence his critics. He had the Council pass laws curtailing the liberty of the press. One law made it illegal to publish a newspaper without a licence—any licence to be withdrawn at the Governor's will. Another placed a stamp duty of fourpence on every copy of a paper published!

The opposition had an ally in the Chief Justice. **Francis Forbes** was the first Chief Justice of New South Wales—the office

being set up by the Act of 1823. By that Act, too, he had to certify that any Bill introduced into the Legislative Council was not repugnant to the law of England. Until such certificate was issued a Bill could not become law. He had liberal sympathies, was a republican and no strong supporter of the British monarchy. So he refused to give a certificate in the case of the two Bills mentioned above. In spite of a long and sharp correspondence with the Governor and the latter's storming, he refused to change his attitude. Darling was forced to withdraw his Bills. Thus a successful stand was made for the freedom of the press. There is a debt owing by the people of Australia to Chief Justice Forbes.

But a greater debt is owed to the editors, writers, and publishers of the opposition press. Darling had now to rely on the laws that already existed. These had just been made harsher in England. It must be remembered that a fight for freedom of the press had been going on in England. Richard Carlisle and others had gone to gaol time after time in an heroic fight for free speech and that liberty of unlicensed printing for which Milton had so eloquently pleaded nearly two hundred years before. The fight had its counterpart here, and men went to gaol here, too, for the freedom of the press.

The Governor brought libel actions against all of his opponents. Imprisonment and heavy fines followed. Hall, editor of the "Monitor," was convicted seven times, and his sentences totalled over three years and hundreds of pounds. Hayes, publisher of the "Australian," was fined and imprisoned. Captain Robison had to suffer at the Governor's hands for giving testimony against him in the Sudds case. Dr. Wardell fought a duel with Colonel Dumaresq, the Governor's brother-in-law. Wardell, because he described the Governor as "ignorant and obstinate," was sued for libel. Hall was also deprived of the services of a convict compositor, and was refused permission to rent unoccupied Crown lands. It is no wonder that Dr. Long said that "the administration of Darling was the 'Reign of Terror' in New South Wales." No class struggle in Australia was more bitter than that of the eighteen-twenties between the "pure merinos" and the "emancipists."

For, of course, it was not merely a struggle between Darling and the opposition press. It was a class struggle between the "emancipists" and the bulk of the people on the one hand and the Tory merino-squatters and the Governor on the other. The "Sydney Gazette" was as sycophantic and sickly in its support of the Governor as the opposition was indignant and clamorous.

up my legs, and the chains were too short to allow me to stand upright."

Sudds fared the worse. He was ill, the weather was very hot, the irons cut into his flesh and his neck began to swell. On the first night—they of course slept in their irons—while, presumably, Governor Darling slept the sleep of the just, Sudds was in such a condition that a fellow-prisoner said, "He's not dead, but I don't think he'll live long." His gaoler ordered him to hospital, where the doctor told him he would be better out of the world. To which Sudds replied, "I wish to God I was."

His wish was soon granted. On Sunday, November 26, Darling, after returning from church, was informed that Sudds was dying. To prevent the holding of an inquest, which would result in unpleasantry to himself the Governor ordered Sudds to be transferred from the military hospital to the Public Hospital. There he died on that Sunday night. He had obtained his release from the 57th Regiment and Governor Darling's inhuman discipline

On Monday morning the storm broke. Darling, in the opposition press, was called a murderer, and Wentworth drew up an impeachment of him and sent it to Government House. Shopkeepers closed their shops in mourning for Sudds. The demand was made that a public inquiry be held. That demand was so insistent that the inquiry had to be held. Then Darling produced a set of irons weighing 13 pounds as the irons worn by Sudds. But a Captain Robison was able and willing to knock the bottom out of that story. It was then put forward that Sudds had died of dropsy and bronchitis. But the surgeon stated that no natural cause of death could be found. It was proved that Sudds had been cruelly done to death by Governor Darling—just for a bit of calico—the theft itself having been caused by the inhuman treatment of the soldiers.

The controversy lasted four years. It was, however, more than a question of the causes of the death of one man. It was a fight for the freedom of the press. The Governor sought to silence his critics. He had the Council pass laws curtailing the liberty of the press. One law made it illegal to publish a newspaper without a licence—any licence to be withdrawn at the Governor's will. Another placed a stamp duty of fourpence on every copy of a paper published!

The opposition had an ally in the Chief Justice. Francis Forbes was the first Chief Justice of New South Wales—the office

being set up by the Act of 1823. By that Act, too, he had to certify that any Bill introduced into the Legislative Council was not repugnant to the law of England. Until such certificate was issued a Bill could not become law. He had liberal sympathies, was a republican and no strong supporter of the British monarchy. So he refused to give a certificate in the case of the two Bills mentioned above. In spite of a long and sharp correspondence with the Governor and the latter's storming, he refused to change his attitude. Darling was forced to withdraw his Bills. Thus a successful stand was made for the freedom of the press. There is a debt owing by the people of Australia to Chief Justice Forbes.

But a greater debt is owed to the editors, writers, and publishers of the opposition press. Darling had now to rely on the laws that already existed. These had just been made harsher in England. It must be remembered that a fight for freedom of the press had been going on in England. Richard Carlisle and others had gone to gaol time after time in an heroic fight for free speech and that liberty of unlicensed printing for which Milton had so eloquently pleaded nearly two hundred years before. The fight had its counterpart here, and men went to gaol here, too, for the freedom of the press.

The Governor brought libel actions against all of his opponents. Imprisonment and heavy fines followed. Hall, editor of the "Monitor," was convicted seven times, and his sentences totalled over three years and hundreds of pounds. Hayes, publisher of the "Australian," was fined and imprisoned. Captain Robison had to suffer at the Governor's hands for giving testimony against him in the Sudds case. Dr. Wardell fought a duel with Colonel Dumaresq, the Governor's brother-in-law. Wardell, because he described the Governor as "ignorant and obstinate," was sued for libel. Hall was also deprived of the services of a convict compositor, and was refused permission to rent unoccupied Crown lands. It is no wonder that Dr. Long said that "the administration of Darling was the 'Reign of Terror' in New South Wales." No class struggle in Australia was more bitter than that of the eighteen-twenties between the "pure merinos" and the "emancipists."

For, of course, it was not merely a struggle between Darling and the opposition press. It was a class struggle between the "emancipists" and the bulk of the people on the one hand and the Tory merino-squatters and the Governor on the other. The "Sydney Gazette" was as sycophantic and sickly in its support of the Governor as the opposition was indignant and clamorous.

See the hatred in these words of the purest merino of them all, John Macarthur:

"Four newspapers are published, all in the convict interest, and the editors are all desperate radicals, alike shameless and unprincipled. Our Chief Justice is their idol, and on him they rely for protection, whether their libels are aimed at individuals or against the Government. Fortunately this dangerous man has reached his mark. Col. Dumaresq says, without reserve, that Forbes is the most artful and dangerous man he ever knew. The most intimate companions of Forbes are Wardell, Wentworth, and Dr. Douglas. . . . You can have no idea of the operation of these firebrands upon the common people, and everyone not connected with the convict interest admits that most dangerous consequences are to be dreaded."

The "dangerous consequences" were that the freedom of the press was maintained, that Governor Darling was recalled, and great steps forward were taken in the progress of the Australian people towards nation-hood, freedom, and democracy. On the day that Darling left Sydney, Wentworth roasted a bullock at Vaucluse and entertained his friends in celebration of their triumph. . . . Then history opened a new chapter, at the end of which Wentworth was no longer the champion of freedom, but the apostle of reaction and the bosom friend of his former enemy, John Macarthur. As we have already related.

The fight for the freedom of the press had to be waged against the autocracy of the governors in the other Australian colonies also. In 1824, Colonel Arthur arrived in Hobart to become Governor of Van Diemen's Land. The most important of the newspapers which had sprung up in that progressive and flourishing colony was the "Hobart Town Gazette," published at the time by a man named Bent, the Government Printer. The predecessor of Arthur, Sorell, was a favorite with the free farmers of the island and, in his time, the columns of the paper did not contain much of a political nature. But Governor Arthur's coming made a difference. Up till then the Editor of the "Gazette" had been appointed by the Governor. But now Bent determined to make a stand for a free press, dismissed the editor and appointed his own nominee in his place.

Criticisms of the official acts began to appear in the paper and Arthur began to take notice. He claimed that the "Gazette" was Government property, but an appeal over his head to Sir Thomas Brisbane (Arthur's superior in Sydney) resulted in a

decision in Bent's favor. In the Editorial (8/10/'24) that followed, Thomas, the Editor, expressed his satisfaction with his triumph.

The criticisms appeared more frequently. Complaints appeared in letters and were commented upon editorially. The administration of Sorell was held up for favorable comparison with that of Arthur. The Governor acted decisively. He would simply proceed as if Bent were no longer the Government Printer. George Terry Howe, son of the George Howe who had founded the "Sydney Gazette," was called to Hobart (he had been running a paper in Launceston) and given the job of Government Printer at a salary of £300—Bent had been paid a subsidy of £30.

Howe immediately began publishing the "Hobart Town Gazette"—the same name as Bent's paper! Protest was of no avail to Bent, and his paper became the "Colonial Times." Howe's Hobart "Gazette" praised every act of Arthur's Government as his father's "Gazette" praised the powers in control in Sydney. The new editor even reprinted the letters of criticism that had appeared, altering them to read in an opposite sense to that originally intended!

That was Arthur's first move. His second was to sue Bent for libel. After several trials, Bent was sentenced by a jury of officers to imprisonment for six months and was fined over £500. The outcry amongst the free settlers was great. "Friends of the Liberty of the Press" were called together in a public meeting, where the mass indignation was voiced and a subscription list opened to pay Bent's fine. When released, Bent carried on as before with the principal correspondent and complainant in the columns of the old "Gazette" as Editor.

Those who rallied to the support of Bent demanded at the same time not only freedom of the press, but also trial by jury and representative government.

In 1827, in imitation of Darling in N.S.W., Arthur attempted to stifle the press by means of an Act passed through the new Legislative Council set up in Tasmania. The licence system and a stamp duty on each issue of a paper were introduced. Bent was defeated. He was refused a licence and he suffered in his brushes with the law. Although the free settlers organised a protest to the Home Government, the decision of the latter, in favor of a free press and annulling Arthur's Acts, found Bent ruined and bankrupt. Arthur failed, theoretically, because the principle of the free press had been maintained, but his illegal Acts had remained in operation long enough to ruin the owners

of the "free" press. Which reminds one of what Lenin said of the difference of "freedom of the press" for the capitalists and the workers.

In 1835, another struggle for the freedom of the press began when the "Colonial Times" (in different hands) and the "True Colonist" attacked unsparingly the administration of Arthur. There was then in existence a radical organisation known as the "Political Association," and Melville of the "Times" and Robertson of the "Colonist" demanded in their columns trial by jury and representative government. Libel suits, imprisonment and fines followed for both. In 1836, when Arthur was recalled, the "Colonist" hailed his departure in these terms: "Never has it fallen to our lot to communicate such welcome intelligence . . . He (Arthur) will be wafted from these shores by the curses of many a broken-hearted parent, and many a destitute child, which owe their misery to the foolish and wicked system of misgovernment. . . . He was the father of usury, the patron of falsehood, hypocrisy and deceit, the protection of perjury, and the rewarder of perjurers."

The struggle, therefore, as in Sydney, had taken upon itself a personal character, but the real basis could not be hidden: the mass demand for greater freedom and a say in the government. The firing of crackers in the streets of Hobart on the day that Arthur sailed, even though Robertson in a most undignified moment was arrested with his pockets full of crackers, was the expression of triumph over a reactionary enemy and of determination to maintain the freedom of the press.

(To be continued)

The United Front of Struggle for Peace*

By GEORGI DIMITROV

I

NEVER since 1914 has the menace of a world war been so great as it is now. And never has it been so urgently necessary to mobilise all forces to avert this calamity which threatens all mankind. But in order to do this, we must first realise from where the danger is arising, who are bringing on this danger, and on which countries they are preparing to hurl themselves.

It would not be correct to think that the war which is approaching threatens the Soviet Union alone or even the Soviet Union in the first place. As a matter of fact, the occupation of the Rhineland by Hitler's armies is a direct threat to France, Belgium, and other European countries. It is also a fact that Hitler's immediate plans of conquest are directed towards the seizure of territories in neighboring countries where there is a German population.

Whereas Hitler talks to-day about the "sovereignty of Germany," he will talk to-morrow about the "sovereignty of all the Germans." Under this slogan he will try to carry out the annexation of Austria, the destruction of Czechoslovakia as an independent state, the occupation of Alsace-Lorraine, Danzig, the southern part of Denmark, Memel, etc. And this is quite easy to understand. It is much easier for German Fascism to send an army first of all to seize the territory of neighboring countries under the slogan of the "national unity of all the Germans," and only later to fight against the powerful Land of the Soviets. German Fascism, in strengthening its positions on the Rhine, also threatens the independence of the Polish people, in spite of the fact that the present rulers of Poland are in the position of its allies.

As far as the Far East is concerned, there can be no doubt that the direct blow is aimed at the Chinese people, although the Fascist military clique of Japan are preparing for war against the Soviet Union and have an agreement with Berlin for such purpose. Japan has already occupied Manchuria, and is now occupying one province of China after another. Japanese imperialism is striving by this means to subjugate all the peoples of Asia, including India, and to seize the Philippines and Australia. It is preparing for a decisive encounter with the United States and Great Britain.

It follows that the peoples of the West would plainly make a

* This article was written before May 1.—Ed.

fatal error if they allowed themselves to be comforted by the illusion that the Fascist warmongers in Europe and the Far East do not threaten them. In particular, the people of the countries neighboring on Germany have food for serious thought regarding the defence of their independence and liberty.

As we know, the fundamental cause of imperialist wars lies in capitalism itself, its predatory efforts. But in the present concrete international situation, the instigator of the approaching war is **Fascism**, this mailed fist of the most aggressive and warlike forces of imperialism.

The war danger became so directly threatening because the road to power was not barred against German Fascism at the proper moment. Having obtained power by the means of an internal war against the people of its own country, Fascism has grown into a direct war menace to the countries of the whole world. Having enslaved its own people, it is advancing with the torch of war in its hand against other peoples.

The war danger has become increasingly menacing for the further reason that a state of affairs has been created in which the Fascist aggressor is left unpunished. The military preparations of German Fascism (the introduction of universal military service, the air and naval armaments) were carried out with the systematic connivance of capitalist powers and the direct assistance of the ruling circles of Great Britain. The passivity and irresoluteness of the League of Nations in regard to the Japanese attack on China and Italian aggression in Abyssinia encouraged the impudence of the aggressor.

But the growth in the aggressiveness of German Fascism and the Japanese military clique is first and foremost the result of the fact that the international proletariat did not succeed in acting unanimously with all the power of its gigantic forces, did not rally around itself all the working people and all the friends of peace into a mighty front against war. The resistance of the reactionary part of the leaders of the Labor and Socialist International and the International Federation of Trade Unions to the united front of struggle has not yet been broken. But the refusal of these reactionary leaders (supporting the imperialist policy of their own bourgeoisie) to bring about united independent proletarian action against war, their practice of lulling the masses to sleep with the illusion that the League of Nations would do everything necessary for the maintenance of peace—this has hindered the struggle of the proletariat against war and paralysed its pressure on the capitalist Governments.

In addition to the openly reactionary leaders who disrupt the

unity of action of the international proletariat in defence of peace, there are also "Left" phrasemongers who advocate fatalistic views to the effect that war is inevitable and the maintenance of peace impossible. Since the fundamental cause of war is capitalism, then, they say, so long as it exists it will be impossible to avoid war, and it is hopeless and useless to fight for the maintenance of peace. Such people are out-and-out doctrinaires, if not simply imposters. They see everywhere around them the raging forces of war, but they do not at all notice the mighty factors of peace.

The Soviet Union, the country of the victorious proletariat, with its consistent and resolute peace policy, is such a factor of peace. Another factor of peace is the proletariat of capitalist countries. These are the leading forces in defending peace against the warmongers. Masses of peasants, all the toiling people, the people in general in all capitalist countries, are also for the maintenance of peace. A number of capitalist countries at present are interested in the maintenance of peace. And in the countries where Fascism rules, as well as in the countries where the rulers abet the instigators of a new slaughter, the peoples do not want war.

Phrasemongering doctrinaires, such as those from the British Independent Labor Party, depict matters as if the question of war and peace depends only on the capitalist Governments. Yes, this would be the case if the masses simply played the role of pawns in the hands of the Governments and did not **fight** to maintain peace in spite of their Governments. But that is just the point: that it is utterly wrong to regard the masses of the people as puppets in the hands of the Governments. If these masses, without whom war could not be carried on, were to come out resolutely and promptly against the war plans of the Governments, they could force these Governments to give up war and the abetting of war plotters. The whole thing is to organise the struggle of the peoples for the maintenance of peace in good time and to carry it on continually and everywhere against the Fascist warmongers and their backers.

Such a united front of peace is required which will not only include the working class, the peasants, the intellectuals and other toilers, but also the oppressed nations and the peoples of countries whose independence is threatened by the warmongers. A peace front is required which extends to all parts of the world, from Tokyo to London, from New York to Berlin, fighting with might and main against the warmongers, against German Fascism in Europe, against the Japanese military clique in the

Far East. And this peace front will become powerful and invincible if it organises concrete mass action, not restricting itself to protests, resolutions, and declarations.

By economic and political measures, the warmongers should be put absolutely in a **state of siege**. They should be cornered in such a way that it will be impossible for them to try to carry out their criminal plans. The globe should be encircled with such a network of organisations of the friends of peace, such a mighty movement of international solidarity, such effective measures of a united international policy of the proletariat for the maintenance of peace as will effectively tie the dastardly hands of the warmongers.

The Fascist aggressor must be made to feel most emphatically that his every step is vigilantly watched by millions of people and that any attempt to attack other peoples will meet with the determined resistance of the proletariat and the toiling people of the whole world.

Only the proletariat, uniting its ranks, can be the organiser of such a peace front, can be its driving force, its backbone. This is now the **central task** of the international proletariat as a whole. The success of the fight against Fascism itself also depends on its successful solution.

II

It is not enough to **want** peace. It is necessary to **fight** for peace. It is absolutely inadequate to carry on general propaganda against war. Propaganda against war "in general" does not in the slightest degree hinder the conspirators sitting in Berlin or Tokyo from carrying out their dastardly work. They would be extremely satisfied if the working class were to go no further than such general propaganda.

A successful struggle to maintain peace absolutely requires that the joint activity of the proletariat and the widest masses of the population be directed against the **specific instigators of war** and against those forces inside the country which help them directly or indirectly. From this point of view it is extremely important in every country to work out a definite and correct tactical line in the struggle for the maintenance of peace, taking into account the situation of the Party and the working class movement of the given country and also its internal and international situation.

In the countries where Fascism is in power, the working class, focussing its struggle against the Fascist dictatorship on the exposure of chauvinist demagoguery and war preparations,

unites all forces to avert the catastrophe into which Fascism is preparing to hurl the people. When the proletariat and the masses of the people of Germany, Italy, and other Fascist countries fight against the power of Fascism and its military aggression, they are acting not only for their own salvation, but in the interests of peace, in the interests of all peoples, of all mankind.

A particularly important question in the tactics of the working class at present, especially in the countries which are directly in danger of an attack, is the attitude which should be taken towards the foreign policy of the Government and the defence of the country. It is by no means a matter of indifference to the working class and all toilers what foreign policy the Government carries on towards the Fascist enemies of peace; whether this policy will help to strengthen collective security or hinder it; whether the Government aids the agents of the Fascist aggressor or takes effective steps against them; how the sons of the people in the ranks of the army are treated, in what spirit they are trained, what elements the commanders of the army are composed of, whether these are reliable in the fight against the Fascist enemy or whether they are Fascist reactionary elements; how the population is to be protected against the horrors of war, etc.

If an attitude of indifference is assumed towards the question of the defence of the country, if this question is left without control in the hands of a bourgeois Government, such a position will not in any case assist the cause of defending peace. It is no accident that the ruling groups of the bourgeoisie have always looked upon this sphere as their monopoly, regarding it as a kind of "holy of holies." This monopoly of the bourgeoisie must be demolished once and for all.

The proletariat cannot get along without its own independent policy on these questions. Without under any conditions permitting itself to sink to the position of the bourgeoisie, the Party of the proletariat must actively interfere in foreign policy and in the sphere of the question of the defence of the country, advancing its own platform, its own demands.

As the outstanding supporter of the active defence of its own people and country from Fascist enslavement, the working class must closely link up the question of the defence of the country with the demands for the extension of the democratic rights of the workers and peasants and the defence of their vital interests, basing themselves on the fact that only the democratisation of the régime, the democratisation of the army, its cleansing from

Fascist and other reactionary elements, and the satisfaction of the urgent demands of the workers and peasants, is able to strengthen the defensive capacity of the people against a Fascist attack. In every concrete situation, the representatives of the working class will come out in support of such proposals and will seek to secure the carrying out of such measures as open up the greatest possibility for bringing the pressure of the masses of the people on the widest scale to bear upon the foreign policy of the Government, and also provided for their effective control over the activity of the Government in the questions of the defence of the country. They will also give their support to all those measures which hinder the capitulation of the bourgeois Governments to the Fascist aggressor and the betrayal of the independence and liberty of the people by these Governments.

In conditions of a direct threat of war by a Fascist aggressor, the Communists—emphasising that only the proletarian power is able to provide for the reliable defence of the country and its independence, as is plainly shown by the example of the Soviet Union—will seek to bring about the formation of a **people's front Government**. Such a Government, taking determined steps against Fascism and the reactionary elements in the country, against the agents and backers of the enemies of peace, ensuring the control of the organised masses over the defence of the country, will assist in raising the capacity of the people for defence against a Fascist aggressor. Whereas to-day the power is in the hands of bourgeois Governments who are no guarantee for the genuine defence of the country and who use the armed forces of the state against the toiling people, the Party of the working class cannot take any political responsibility for the defensive measures of these Governments, and therefore opposes the war policy of the Government and the military budget as a whole. This does not exclude refraining from voting in definite cases, giving the reason for doing so, on those various measures of a defensive character which are necessary to hinder the attack of a Fascist aggressor (e.g., the fortification of frontiers), or voting and speaking for such measures which are dictated by the interests of the defence of the population against the horrors of war (gas shelters, gas masks, Red Cross work, etc.).

The time has passed when the working class does not participate **actively and independently** in deciding such vital questions as war and peace. The difference between Communists and reformists, between revolutionary and reactionary leaders of the working-class movement, is not that the latter participate in settling these questions while we revolutionaries remain aside.

No! The difference is that on these questions, as on other questions, the reformists defend the interests of the capitalists, while the revolutionaries defend the interests of the toiling people, the interests of the people as a whole.

These flexible Bolshevik tactics, which are the application of the general tactical line of the Seventh Congress of the Communist International to a specific question, arise of necessity from the whole present-day international situation, particularly from the existence of definite Fascist aggressors.

It is truly laughable when "Left" phrasemongers of various kinds take a stand against these tactics and strike the pose of irreconcilable revolutionaries. If we are able to believe them, all Governments are aggressors. They even quote Lenin, who, during the imperialist war of 1914-18, correctly rejected the argument of the social-chauvinists that "we were attacked and we defend ourselves." But the world at that time was divided into two military-imperialist coalitions which were equally striving to establish their world hegemony, which had equally prepared and provoked the imperialist war. At that time there were neither countries where the proletariat had conquered nor countries with a Fascist dictatorship.

But now the situation is different. Now there are: (1) A proletarian state which is the greatest bulwark of peace; (2) definite Fascist aggressors; (3) a number of countries which are in direct danger of attack by Fascist aggressors and in danger of losing their state and national independence; (4) other capitalist Governments which are interested at the present moment in the maintenance of peace. It is, therefore, completely wrong to depict all countries as aggressors at present. Only people who are trying to conceal the real aggressors could distort facts in such a way.

III

The peace which exists at present is a bad peace. But in any case this bad peace is better than war. And for every consistent supporter of peace it is obviously necessary to support all measures which assist in maintaining it, including the measures of the League of Nations, particularly sanctions. Sanctions can be made into an effective means against the aggressor.

If the sanctions undertaken by the League of Nations did not prevent Italy continuing the war against Abyssinia, this is not an argument against sanctions but against the Powers which frustrated their application.

And if German Fascism to-day is throwing out a challenge to the peoples of the whole world, this is precisely because it reckons on freedom from punishment, because sanctions were not applied to Japan, because the sanctions against Italy were frustrated by the capitalist states, because, finally, when Hitler sent his troops to the frontiers of France and Belgium, he was convinced in advance that sanctions against him would be frustrated by the British bourgeoisie.

The statement is made that the application of sanctions increases the war danger and will lead to war. This is not true. It is just the opposite, that the **impunity of the aggressor** increases the danger of war. The more resolutely sanctions of an economic and financial character are applied to a Fascist aggressor (complete refusal of credits, stopping commerce and the supply of raw material), the less will German Fascism be inclined to begin a war, because the greater will be the risk.

The League of Nations must be ruthlessly criticised for its irresoluteness, passivity, inconsistency. The working class is carrying on an irreconcilable struggle against the Governments of those imperialist countries, members of the League of Nations, which help the aggressor on account of their own selfish interests, disrupt the measures for preserving peace, and sacrifice the interests of small peoples to the interests of big imperialist Powers. But it does not follow from this that we should in general take up a negative attitude towards the League of Nations. What interest have the proletariat in playing into the hands of the warmongers, which are all at present against the League of Nations? The League of Nations has been deserted by the chief instigators of war, Germany and Japan. The Soviet Union is in the League of Nations, throwing all its international weight into the scales on the side of peace and collective security. There are other states in the League of Nations which do not want to give the Fascist aggressors an opportunity to attack other peoples. Those who cannot distinguish between the League of Nations in the past and the League of Nations at present, those who cannot make a varied approach to the different members of the League of Nations, those who refuse to bring the pressure of the masses to bear on the League of Nations and various capitalist Governments for the adoption of measures to maintain peace, such people are windbags and not revolutionaries, not proletarian politicians.

The working class must support those measures of the League of Nations and various states which are really directed

towards the maintenance of peace (non-aggression pacts, pacts of mutual aid against the aggressor, pacts of collective security, financial and economic sanctions). And not only must it support these measures, but it must force the League of Nations and the governments of various capitalist states to take serious steps in defence of peace by a mighty mass anti-war movement.

It is not true that the policy of constantly yielding to the demands of the Fascist warmongers by the League of Nations and by various countries (Great Britain, France, Belgium, etc.) can help to maintain peace. The workers have not forgotten that at one time in the internal policy of Germany, it was precisely the concessions and capitulation to attacking Fascism which paved its way to power. In the international arena, a similar capitulatory policy sets the hands of militant Fascism free to make an attack.

It is also not true that the cause of peace will gain from an attempt at present to raise the question of re-distributing the sources of raw material, the colonies and mandated territories, as the reactionary Social-Democratic leaders demand. In reality, this is done with the aim of distracting the attention of the masses from a definite struggle against the warmongers. On the other hand, such proposals conceal the desire to give colonies to German Fascism, which is bound to strengthen the military position of German Fascism still more. It is no business of the proletariat to advocate any particular division of colonies and mandates between the imperialists. Its task is to support the struggle of the colonial peoples for their interests and their rights and for their final liberation from the imperialist yoke.

IV

While demanding effective measures from the League of Nations and the bourgeois governments against the aggressiveness of the Fascist warmongers, the proletariat must not forget for a moment that the **chief, fundamental, and decisive thing** in the maintenance of peace is the **independent action of the masses in defence of peace against the concrete war incendiaries.**

There cannot be the slightest doubt that if the international proletariat, with its mass organisations, especially the trade unions, had acted in unison and by strikes and other measures prevented a single ship or a single train going to or from Italy, Italian Fascism would long since have been forced to stop its war of plunder against the Abyssinian people.

But the formation of a really wide people's front of peace, strong enough to carry on such a struggle against militant Fascism, is possible only if there exists **unity of action of the pro-**

letariat itself. It was precisely the establishment of the unity of action of the working class which made it possible for the French and Spanish proletariat to build up a mighty anti-Fascist people's front.

Torn by internal contradictions, the London conference of the Labor and Socialist International and the International Federation of Trade Unions, under the pressure of the reactionary wing, evaded the question of the necessity for immediately bringing about unity of action of the proletariat on a national and international scale. This conference did not call upon the working masses for independent action, but limited itself to an appeal to rely entirely on the League of Nations. It did not take a stand in defence of the Chinese people, who are being attacked by Japan. It did not condemn in the slightest degree those labor leaders and Social-Democratic leaders who are defending the aggressive policy of German Fascism, hiding this with talk about the "maintenance of peace."

But, simultaneously, a movement for the united front of the working class is rapidly developing of late in the ranks of the Labor and Socialist International and the International Federation of Trade Unions. The basic interests of the whole international proletariat require that these forces gain the upper hand and overcome the resistance of the opponents to the united front.

The fact that Fascism, taking advantage of the discord in the parties and organisations of the working class in various countries, has gone over to a military offensive, insistentlly demands a single international policy of the working class for the purpose of maintaining peace.

To sum up, this single international policy of the proletariat can be brought about on the following basis:

(1) The restoration and strengthening of real international proletarian solidarity to defend the interests of the masses of toiling people; the Social-Democratic parties must make a decisive break with the imperialist interests of their bourgeoisie.

(2) Every possible support for the peace policy of the Soviet Union, the proletarian state which stands unswervingly in defence of peace between peoples. And this presupposes in the first place a determined struggle by the working-class parties against the counter-revolutionary attempts to depict the foreign policy of the Soviet Union as being identical with the policy of the imperialist states, to represent the Red Army, which is the bulwark of peace, as being the same as the armies of imperialist states—attempts which play into the hands of the Fascist war-mongers.

(3) The blow must be directed with definite purpose and with concentrated force at every moment against the Fascist aggressor; a different attitude must be taken towards the aggressor and the victims of his attack; any attempt to gloss over the difference between Fascist and non-Fascist countries must be exposed.

(4) An independent struggle by the proletariat for the maintenance of peace, independent of the capitalist governments and the League of Nations, making it impossible for the working class movement to be subordinated to the behind-the-scenes designs of the imperialist governments in the League of Nations.

In present conditions, the fight to maintain peace is a fight against Fascism, and this fight is in essence **revolutionary**.

The maintenance of peace is a deadly danger for Fascism, because, by increasing its internal difficulties, it leads to the undermining of the Fascist dictatorship of the bourgeoisie. The maintenance of peace helps the growth of the forces of the proletariat, the forces of revolution, helps to heal the split in the ranks of the working-class movement. It helps the proletariat to become the leading class in the struggle of all toilers against capitalism. It undermines the foundations of the capitalist system and hastens the victory of Socialism.

*

"War may break out unexpectedly. Wars are not declared nowadays. They just start" (Stalin). But this demands first and foremost that Communists have a clear understanding of the extent and nature of the war danger and the ways and means of overcoming it.

A decisive step at present towards the establishment of the unity of action of the international proletariat against the war-mongers is for the Communist Parties of each separate country to develop the most active, insistent, and extensive campaign for the maintenance of peace in all branches of social and political life. The Communists will carry on this campaign, not postponing it until pacts for joint activity have been signed with the leaders of the Social-Democratic parties, but unflinchingly carrying it on from the point of view of the struggle for the establishment of unity of action between the Communist Party and the Social-Democratic Party. Communists will exert every effort to overcome the resistance of the reactionary Social-Democratic leaders to the united front and to strengthen the bonds of joint struggle against the common enemy in every way between the Communist and Social-Democratic workers.

Such a campaign, helping to draw the Communist and Social-

Democratic workers closer together, will help to activise and rally all the forces of the proletariat, not only on a national, but on an international scale. This will actively aid the drawing into the movement of other strata of the toiling people of town and country, the masses of petty bourgeoisie, the peasants and the intellectuals, all friends of peace. All this will hasten the formation of an invincible front of struggle of the international proletariat, of all toiling people, of all peoples, for the maintenance of peace.

The struggle for peace is a struggle against Fascism, a struggle against capitalism, a struggle for the victory of Socialism throughout the world!

SPAIN

The Fascist Camp Organises Its Activities

By VICENTE URIBE (Madrid)

THE victory of the People's Front on February 16 struck panic into the hearts of the reactionaries and Fascists of Spain. They had not believed that the People's Front, faced by violence and terrorism on all sides, would gain so startling a victory. But now they have pulled themselves rapidly together again and are organising a wide-spread campaign against the People's Front, and against the proletariat and the Communist Party in particular. The differences in form of the various Fascist organisations are set aside, and all join in the common aim: to crush the People's Front; to drive the masses of the workers to despair, harrying them into hasty spontaneous movements from which Fascism might hope to profit.

This reactionary movement of attack on the Republic and the masses of the people is led by the **Accion Popular** (People's Action) the Fascist party of **Gil Robles**. With a large press at its disposal it is carrying on a campaign to blacken the name of the People's Front, and is supporting the movement among the landowners and employers who are opposing the decrees issued by the Government in fulfilment of the People's Front Pact. A characteristic feature of this campaign is the intensified demagoguery of the **Accion Popular**. This strategic manoeuvre finds expression in many of the statements of **Gil Robles**: "The social content of the Ceda must be intensified." In the Parliamentary debates the Cedists make every endeavor to appear as "friends" of the people. When they are accused of defending the capitalists and big landowners, they are highly indignant, and state that they are the enemies of "bad employers."

All this does not, however, prevent them from exploiting to the utmost their opportunities, in the press and Parliament, to plead the cause of the "unfortunate employers" who are "being ruined by the unrestrained demands of the workers." On one occasion the Ceda even expressed readiness to help in carrying out the programme of the People's Front, on the condition, however, that the Republicans separated from the workers and broke off all connections with their organisations. Here the Ceda pretended to agree to even those items of the People's Front programme which it has designated anti-national, anti-patriotic, the work of the devil, and so forth. It need not be said that the Republicans have not been decoyed by these pretences. But all these facts go to show the manoeuvring abilities of Fascism,

which does not yield a foot of ground or shrink from any device enabling it to pursue its policy.

With social demagogy by Fascism on the one side, we find on the other a large-scale terrorist offensive against the Republic and against the toiling masses, organised by the Spanish Phalanx and the Spanish Regeneration. Not a day passes without champions of the People's Front being killed or wounded by the Fascist gangsters in some town or village of Spain.

The Spanish Phalanx is the organisation of gangster mercenaries engaged in organising attacks and terrorist violence against the People's Front. This organisation is financed by the politicians of the Accion Popular. There have already been innumerable attacks on individual members of the People's Front.

It must be stated that the people themselves are taking energetic measures against these attacks. In many cases they have exercised summary justice against the assassins. In other cases the indignation of the people has caused them to rise against the churches. We Communists have repeatedly declared that we do not think it right to set church buildings on fire, for they and their wealth should be put into the hands of the people, and utilised for educational purposes.

That the people have risen against the churches in some places is due to the fact that they are hotbeds of reactionary conspiracy, and that shots have been fired from them against the people. Reaction of course raises an outcry at what it pleases to call barbarism. And of course it invariably omits to mention the causes of the action against the churches: the raids and conspiracies.

The courts of justice, before which the Fascists are brought, either acquit them or sentence them to two months' imprisonment, a mere parody of justice. In innumerable cases Fascists have been acquitted of charges of murder. This mildness and complicity where Fascists are concerned contrasts vividly with the barbarous penalties imposed on the workers during the period in which reaction was in power, and with the punishment still dealt out by the courts to workers found with arms in their possession.

But the most dangerous centre of Fascist activities at present is the army. Reaction has not yet abandoned the idea of the military coup d'état. It utterly fails to arouse any echo among the rank and file. Among the officers of low rank, too, it holds no strong position, though insolent action may be observed among an energetic minority. The danger lies among the officers of high rank and the commanders. To-day, after the triumph of the People's Front, the few Republican commanders and officers

are unable to express their allegiance and love of the Republic. The Fascist military organisation, collaborating closely with the Spanish Phalanx, initiated terrorism in the army by murdering an officer sympathising with the Socialists, Captain Farauto. The barracks are being shamelessly used as conspiratorial centres.

The provocation on April 16—hundreds of officers fired their revolvers at the people in the streets—is one of the most eloquent symptoms of the seriousness of the position among the officers of the army. The incident at Alcala de Henares, where the officers of two regiments mutinied against the transference of the garrison, furnishes further evidence that the majority of the officers are in open opposition to the Republic.

The Government of the first period of the Republic were foolish enough to leave the monarchist officers in the army. A decree was issued permitting anyone who desired, to leave the army on full pay. Some thousands left the army; but many other thousands of monarchist officers remained in it. It must be borne in mind that under the monarchy the army had a staff of commanders large enough for an army three times the size.

These officers, bound by a thousand economic, political, and social ties to the monarchy and to reaction, have never relaxed for a single day their efforts against the Republic. On August 10 the Sanjurjo rising gave the alarm signal. Hundreds of commanders and officers who participated in the uprising on August 10 were taken back into the army by Gil Robles, and promoted to confidential positions. The commanding staff of the Civil Guard in particular was recruited from the insurgents of August 10. This was the situation at the time when the Left Republican Government came into power. Since February 16 an atmosphere of conspiracy and opposition against the Republic has pervaded the barracks. Although a number of changes have been made, the army forces are in the power of the Fascists. No drastic measures have been taken as yet for the elimination of reactionary elements from the army. Some of the enactments issued affect only pensioners.

The Fascists reach and influence the army officers, with the utmost insolence, by means of their many agents in the barracks. They carry on continual agitation for insurrection against the Republic and against the People's Front.

This is the manner in which the Fascists have organised their activities: Social demagogy, mixed with terrorism, on the one hand, and undermining work among the army officers on the other. And there is still another aspect which must be emphasised: the refusal of the employers to carry out the Gov-

ernment decrees; the non-payment of wages, the land left uncultivated by the Caciques and large landowners, the unceasing endeavors to drive the workers to desperation, in order that they may rise against the Government and that the People's Front may be broken up.

But though the reactionaries have strong positions, they will not succeed in their efforts. The People's Front will not be broken up, for the masses see that it has already effected a tangible improvement in the situation. The proletariat of Spain, steeled in the heroic struggle, will face the difficulties of the present hour. It will remain closely united, it will deal one blow after another at reaction, until it has destroyed it.

We Communist, Socialist, Anarchist, and non-party workers remain united. The shameful reaction, which has spread misery and barbarism to every part of Spain, will be reduced to silence.

SOCIALIST CONSTRUCTION IN THE SOVIET UNION

The Constitution of Socialist Society

By L. F. BOROSS

A Short Announcement of Very Great Importance

THE Soviet Press published a short announcement from the Telegraphic Agency of the Soviet Union (TASS) on May 17. According to this message, a plenary session, under the chairmanship of **Stalin**, had been held of the Constitution Committee appointed by the Central Executive Committee of the Soviet Union on May 15.

The committee examined carefully the draft of the Constitution of the Union of Soviet Republics which was submitted to it by the editorial sub-committee, confirmed the **final text**, and resolved to discuss it at the next session of the Central Executive Committee of the U.S.S.R. Then followed the bare recital of the headings of the sections of the draft, and the announcement that Comrade **Yakovlev** had been appointed secretary of the committee in the place of Comrade **Akulov**, who is ill.

The details of the new Constitution have not yet been made public; but their main outlines and the basic principle of their differences from the "Fundamental Law" of 1918 and the "Union Constitution" of 1923, are mentioned again and again. The first time that the proposal to make alterations in the Constitution of the U.S.S.R. was mentioned was at the Seventh Soviet Congress of the Union on February 6, 1935, in the course of **Molotov's** speech. On this occasion he said:

"The question of introducing certain changes in the Soviet Constitution has been raised at this Congress in pursuance of a proposal by the Central Committee of the All-Union Communist Party. In the Central Committee itself this question was raised on the initiative of Comrade **Stalin**.

"Why has the question of introducing changes in our Constitution been raised? First, because since 1918, when Lenin laid the foundations of the Soviet Constitution, the relationship of class forces in our country has radically changed, especially after the victory of the principles of public property both in the city and village. Second, because the time has come when we can develop Soviet democracy completely, and in accordance with it revise our electoral system. The present condition of the country,

both in regard to its social-economic structure and in regard to the cultural-political consciousness of the toiling masses, also cannot be compared with 1923, when Comrade Stalin's commission formulated the Constitution of the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics."

It is also known that Molotov, in the further course of his speech (on behalf of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union), placed the following points before the congress as "indispensable measures in order to accomplish the further democratisation of the Soviet system":

Firstly, the replacement of indirect, that is to say, graduated voting by **direct election** of all Soviet organisms.

Secondly, the replacement of the not entirely equal election (in town and country) by **equal elections**.

Thirdly, the replacement of the open ballot by the secret ballot.

At that time he did not broach the matter of election open to and embracing generally every citizen of the Soviet Union, but he declared amid great applause that "Whilst all new bourgeois States are abolishing whatever remains of the electoral rights of the people, the Soviet Union is approaching nearer and nearer to the complete abolition of every limitation on the general right to vote." This prospect is fulfilled in the present draft of the Constitution, for in the interview of Stalin with Howard, in the interview of Molotov with the "Temps" representative, the matter of **general, equal, direct, and secret** suffrage is mentioned, according to which every citizen of the Union has the right to vote and to stand for election, with the sole exception of those who have been deprived of that right by the verdicts of the Courts of Justice.

It must be realised that the basic alteration of the relations between the classes since the adoption of the first Soviet Constitution, which made possible the alteration of the Constitution as a useful and necessary measure towards reaching the great goal of freedom of the workers, has achieved a further step towards completion since the Seventh Soviet Congress. The first Constitution laid down as the first class task of the Soviet Republics "the abolition of all exploitation of man by man." The Seventh Soviet Congress was able to establish the fact that this task had **in the main** been completed.

This fact was fully proved also by statistics in Molotov's principal speech. A total of 28.1 per cent. of the population, according to the statistics available at the time (those of the

beginning of 1934), belonged to the proletariat, that is to say, to the ranks of the workers, employees, technicians, engineers, and so on, of the Socialist concerns and offices.

(In pre-revolutionary times the percentage of the proletariat was 16.7.)

To the Socialist group of the collective farmers and the artisans organised in co-operatives 45.9 per cent. of the population belonged in 1934.

(In pre-revolutionary times this category of collective farmers did not, of course, exist.)

A further 3.4 per cent. of the population covered students, the Red Army, pensioners, and other elements principally linked with the two above-mentioned Socialist peoples' groups. This means that a total of 74 per cent. of the population in 1934 was making a living from Socialist sources.

The percentage of working individual peasants and working private artisans, that is to say, elements which derived a living neither from Socialist nor capitalist sources, amounted to 22.5 per cent., as compared with 65.1 per cent. in the year 1913. And finally, only a fraction—about 0.1 per cent. of the population made its living from capitalist sources (i.e., by employing the labor of other people), in the year 1934, against 15.9 per cent. in pre-revolutionary days.

Naturally these last statistical comparisons scarcely give a true picture, inasmuch as a number of big trust magnates belonged to the percentage of 15.9 before the war, as well as big landowners with tens of thousands of hectares of land, whereas the "capitalists" of the 1934 type were mainly kulaks (big farmers) or master craftsmen employing a few workers. This is also borne out by the statistics of property for the year 1934.

To the 74 per cent. of the Socialist elements, the rulers and owners of the Socialist economy, belonged 95.81 per cent. of the whole of the fundamental economic wealth of the Soviet Union.

To the 22.5 per cent., representing the non-Socialist but at the same time non-capitalist elements, belonged 4.1 of the fundamental economic wealth, while the amount controlled by the 0.1 per cent. of the capitalist elements did not exceed 0.09 per cent. of the whole. It was, therefore, possible to state even then that the task of abolishing the exploitation of man by man had been accomplished. This did not mean, nor does it mean to-day, that the class struggle is over. For it is perfectly clear that the wish, the desire, and the endeavor of the capitalists and some of their offspring for the exploitation of other people could not be stamped out simultaneously with the economic expropriation of

the capitalists and with the accomplished fact of the abolition of the exploitation of human beings by their fellows.

What further alterations have taken place since the Seventh Soviet Congress?

In this connection it is not possible for us to quote exact new statistics—the census of January 6, 1937, will supply a much more accurate picture. But it is possible at least to take stock of these changes as they are taking place. To begin with, the major portion of the small capitalist remnant has disappeared from the economy of the Union since 1934. Molotov stated in his speech at the last meeting of the Central Executive Committee of the Union that there no longer existed capitalists either great or small in the Soviet Union.

The army of the collective farmers has increased by millions, and with this the percentage of the Socialist group of the population has naturally increased. Moreover, an appreciable further section of the small private concerns (working farmers and manual workers) has joined up with the Socialist form of economy.

Moreover, a further distinct improvement in the standard of living has taken place directly owing to the successes of Socialism. This factor has considerably increased the attachment of the population to Socialism, even among the most politically backward portions. Further enormous advances in the political and cultural consciousness of the workers have also taken place. Perhaps the best proof of this lies in the facts of the rise and swift development of the Stakhanov movement in industry and transport as well as in Socialist agriculture.

All these factors rendered possible not a gradual but a simultaneous abolition of all limitations on the general right to vote for and be elected to the organs of Socialist power.

The first Constitution was laid down at a time when the main tasks of the proletarian dictatorship were the freeing of the workers from capitalist exploitation, the assurance of the continued possibility of the building up of Socialism, the healing of the economic and social wounds caused by the world war and imperialist intervention, the victory over the legacy of capitalism in the economy of the country (anarchy, exploitation, unemployment, poverty, and hunger), and equally over its legacy of cultural matters (monopoly of education for the rich, illiteracy of the masses, and so on).

The first Constitution was a weapon against hunger, misery, exploitation, unemployment, and illiteracy, and a weapon for the building-up of Socialism.

The new Constitution will be the Constitution of a society in which exploitation and unemployment have ceased to exist, a Constitution of solidly constructed and victorious Socialism, of the preparation for the building-up of the higher phase of classless society—Communism. Therein lies the great political importance of the fact of the alteration of the Constitution.

Less Hours, More Wages, and the Tasks of the Trade Union Movement

By D.

THE employing class of this country and its Governments continue to disregard the widespread demands for the 40-hour working week and increased wages. In spite of the I.L.O. Convention, the recommendation of the Select Committee to the Victorian Government, in spite of the demands not only of the working class but of other sections of the people, in spite of the fact that the largest majority of the people have expressed themselves on this question, both the Lyons and Dunstan Governments continue to flagrantly deny the requests. With these Governments the interests of the great mass of the people count for nothing, but the interests of the employers count for all.

The Lyons Government, after refusing to set up a committee of inquiry on a basis that would ensure a real inquiry, and attempting to sidetrack the whole matter into the Arbitration Court, has done nothing but evade the issue by all means in its power. The Dunstan Government in Victoria goes even one better. It has done absolutely nothing to implement the recommendation of the Select Committee, and attempts to evade all responsibility by placing the onus on the Federal Government, and speaks vaguely of action by a "Premiers Conference" some time in the future. Out of a large number of Bills that will be introduced by the Government at the present session, there is no mention of hours or wages, but considerable attention is given to Bills that have no interest whatsoever for the great mass of the people.

Unfortunately the Labor Party leadership in Victoria share the opinions of the Dunstan Government in connection with the shorter working week and increased wages, and have declared their intention of maintaining the present alliance with the Government despite its refusal to attend to the needs of the people.

However, the Victorian workers are not content to wait until Mr. Lyons and Mr. Dunstan are prepared to give some concessions or to wait for a possible change of Government. The actions of the State and Federal Governments have served only to further strengthen the determination of the workers to secure shorter hours and more wages.

On June 21 one of the most momentous meetings of rail and tram men ever held took place in Melbourne. At this meeting 5000 workers cheered to the echo every statement made for

action to force the Dunstan Government to legislate the 40-hour week. Since the mass meeting the Tramways executive has declared in favor of a stop-work meeting if the Government refused to grant the 40-hour week; and, arising out of the refusal of the Government to receive a deputation elected from the mass meeting, the A.R.U. Council, at its last meeting, decided to request the Labor Party to withdraw its support of the Dunstan Government if it did not give the 40-hour week, and also decided that an ultimatum be sent to the Government to the effect that unless the Government received the deputation a further mass meeting be called for the purpose of organising a stop-work meeting of the three unions.

The Tramways Board, in negotiation with the union, has been forced to grant concessions which, although not what the members are demanding, are, at the same time, real gains in the shape of wage increases, restoration of penalty rates, etc. The tramwaymen will strengthen the campaign for 40-hours and prepare for a further approach to the board at a later date.

In the building industry there will take place important developments during July. On July 22 the Carpenters are organising a stop-work meeting, and on July 25 the Bricklayers are taking the same action. Almost all the building trade unions have declared themselves in favor of stop-work meetings and other action to enforce the granting of the 40-hour week and increased wages.

In other industries there is taking place a broad campaign on these basic demands. The metal workers have decided on a meeting of all metal union executives to consider the steps to be taken; the Boot Trades Union is conducting an energetic campaign in its demands, and in the process building a network of shop committees throughout the industry; the recent conference of the Carters and Drivers' Union decided on a series of mass meetings on hours and wages; the Tanners' Union have planned factory gate meetings, two special union meetings to discuss the campaign, and a mass meeting of the whole Federation, a committee of five has been set up to organise the campaign; similar activities are taking place in the timber industry and the Postal Workers' Union has a motion on its books for a mass meeting of all employees of the Postal Department. The movement is developing to a lesser extent in practically all industries and unions.

There has never been any movement in the trade unions which has created such activity and interest, and which receives

such widespread support as the present movement for less hours and more wages. The characteristic features of this movement are very important:—

(1) It is directed essentially against the Lyons and Dunstan Governments and the employers.

(2) It is supported by the greatest majority of unionists and a large number of officials.

(3) It is creating an ever-strengthening demand that the A.L.P., as a working-class party, should sever its connection with the Government of Dunstan—friend of the rich, and enemy of the poor.

(4) It is swinging into action large sections of workers and is strengthening the interest and participation of the workers in the unions.

(5) The tendency becomes more and more pronounced for the taking of decisive action to force the granting of the workers' demands.

These facts are of extreme importance, not only for the Victorian, but also for the whole Australian labor movement, and it is essential that every possible step be taken to intensify the present campaign, to extend it to cover every section of workers, to raise it to a higher level by the organising of stopwork meetings, demonstrations, and strike actions, with the object of forcing the Governments and the employing class to accede to the demands of the workers.

The tasks standing before the trade union movement are:—

(1) Action by the A.C.T.U. and the State T.H.C.'s to intensify the present campaign for wages and hours. For this purpose the calling of a special A.C.T.U. Congress and special Trade Union Conferences in each State to plan the steps to be taken.

(2) Organising a widespread publicity campaign throughout the country in the form of mass public meetings, mass distribution of leaflets and other agitational material, wireless broadcasts, etc., with the object of bringing real mass pressure to bear on the Governments and employers. In view of the close proximity of elections such a campaign would also prepare for the removal of the reactionary Lyons and Dunstan Governments.

(3) In conjunction with such a campaign to organise stop-work meetings, strike actions, and other forms of job action, demonstrations, etc., as a means of securing shorter

hours and more wages in individual industries, thus facilitating the general campaign.

(4) In the process of such a campaign to strengthen the trade union movement by arousing greater interest amongst the members, bringing into activity large numbers of unionists, building and strengthening the shop committee movement, strengthening the unions by recruiting the non-unionists and ensuring 100 per cent. financial membership, and finally bringing about closer unity and greater solidarity throughout the trade union movement.

Is it possible for the Australian trade union movement to carry out such a programme? Definitely so! There is the keen desire of the workers for these demands; there is the will to fight for them, as all the present developments show clearly; the Australian trade union movement is tremendously powerful, and action by it would bring the greatest majority of the people into action; in these matters there could be complete unity of policy and purpose among all schools of political thought.

All the prerequisites exist. What is needed is leadership—the adoption of such a bold policy by the leaders of the A.C.T.U., the T.H.C., and the individual unions.

It is for the operation of such a policy that the active and sincere trade unionists throughout Australia are fighting, and will continue to fight.

The Party Forges Ahead in District 3

By C.

THE Plenum of No. 3 District Committee, which coincided with Comrade Miles's visit to Brisbane, revealed beyond all shadow of doubt that a turning-point has been reached in the work of the Party here.

By laying emphasis upon some of the recent outstanding achievements, the report of the D.C., presented by Comrade Burns, raised the level of discussion considerably above that which characterised similar gatherings of the past in District 3.

This district, among other shortcomings, has suffered from a distorted conception of Bolshevik self-criticism, which amounted, as J. B. Miles remarked, to self-flagellation. This criticism took the form of continual moaning about "our intolerable weaknesses," and a lamenting of "the terribly low political level," and so on. Instead of its being helpful and leading to an improvement in the district's work, it became harmful and gave rise to despondency and moods of pessimism in the Party ranks.

The Plenum report and discussions, no less than the wonderful receptions accorded J. B. Miles by South Queensland workers, show that District 3 has no cause to be pessimistic regarding the future.

It is true that the Party here has no small obstacles to surmount in bringing about unity.

The Labor Party-cum-Australian Workers' Union in Queensland with justification can be classified among the extreme Right-wing elements of the Australian labor movement. The hatred of Fallon & Co. for Communism is certainly not less than that of Lyons, Latham, or Menzies.

Besides which the Labor Party was returned again to office under circumstances which gave it increased possibilities to manoeuvre. The Queensland Labor Party escaped largely the discredit which fell to the lot of Labor in other States in carrying out the Premiers' Plan attacks.

The Moore Government replaced Labor in the earlier years of the crisis, and thus became responsible for the first great onslaughts upon wages and conditions. The Labor Party was again returned at a time when already the main burden of the crisis had been transferred to the masses, at a period when, as a consequence of this, the internal forces of capitalism were already at work towards some measure of recovery from the

lowest depths of the crisis. This factor has undoubtedly aided the Labor Party in manoeuvring against unity and in restraining the workers from struggle.

Furthermore, last year the Labor Government amended the Acts relating to relief of unemployment, which had been instituted by the Moore Cabinet. They reduced the wage tax by 1d. in the pound, and exempted from payment incomes under £78 per annum. At the same time, they increased the rates of pay for single men to 13/6 for one day's work each week. Previously these men did but one day a fortnight, and received rations on the alternate week. Other intermittent workers received an increase of approximately 2/6 per week, whilst the ration scales were likewise increased in some small degree. Then, again, without a doubt there have been a few hundred workers re-employed in industry.

On the basis of such factors, the Labor Government, as stated, has had increased opportunities to manoeuvre in Queensland. They brazenly claim that their administration alone is responsible for the improved economic position of the State. They point to the increased volume of production and business and say, "See what has happened since we came to power." They point to the slight increase in employment and the sops thrown to the unemployed, and say, "See what we have given you already." This, they add, must be regarded as a token of their goodwill in honoring the election promises made to the masses. It must be regarded as but an indication of what they intend to achieve for the workers in the future.

However, the prerequisites for further improvement in the conditions of the workers, they say, must be that they are left alone and unhampered to bring about still further improvement in the position of industry, etc. They say to the workers, "Please don't embarrass us with impossible demands just now." As Hynes told the public servants, who were demanding a return of "emergency" wage-cuts, "You can't expect a full restoration as long as there are still thousands existing on rations and relief work in the State." "Be patient," these Labor leaders say, "and, above all, refrain from demonstrations and strikes that might hinder progress towards further prosperity."

In this way the Labor Government has sought to carry on and restrain the workers from struggle. That they have not been entirely successful is proven by the strikes in the sugar industry, the cotton fields, etc. That they will be still less able to dam back unity and struggle in the future is shown by the tremendous vote recorded by Paterson in the Bowen by-

election.

There are still over 25,000 workless to be found in this "workingman's paradise," and whilst the "Daily Standard" (Labor paper now defunct) gloated in its leading article,

"HULLO, PROSPERITY!"

—another daily, the "Telegraph," carried appeals as follow:—

"ANY OLD CLOTHES ?

"THE TELEGRAPH WINTER APPEAL

"The need for warm clothing and blankets amongst the poorer sections of the community is great. YOUR DISCARDS can be conveniently applied to THEIR NEEDS."

—which reveals clearly to just what extent the masses are experiencing "prosperity." Under the stress of such widespread poverty, the workers are becoming more and more discontented with the failure of the Labor Government to effect any real improvements in their conditions.

At the same time they are commencing to draw political conclusions from events overseas, as the following authentic incident proves. A Party member on the job was recently approached by a prominent A.L.P. supporter. The latter, after commenting upon the French strikes and the People's Front Government, stated:

"That's good enough for me. I'm awake to the Labor Party here now. They've been telling us not to embarrass them, and we, like fools, have been paying heed. Well, I can see now that if we are ever going to get anywhere that's just what we must do. Embarrass them and still further embarrass them. Bring pressure upon them until they do carry out some of their promises. Then, maybe, we will experience the benefits won by the French workers."

Can we not assume with every confidence that this worker was but expressing the sentiments of thousands of present-day supporters of the Queensland Labor Government?

This being the case, is it not time that the Party in District 3 really got down to the task of delving into the election programmes and speeches of the Labor Party with a view to formulating demands which will express the aspirations of the masses and serve as a starting point for joint action

between Communist and reformist workers to improve their common lot?

The Plenum, whilst placing on record certain achievements won by the district on the basis of its correct application of the line of the National Congress and the Central Committee, nevertheless paid too little attention to this all-important question of the "united front where Labor Governments are in office," a question that was raised very sharply at the National Congress itself.

Comrade Miles summed up the results of the Plenum, and appreciated the gains made in the way of increased political activity, a broadening of the leadership, a development of cadres, and a stabilising of section committees, as well as successes in trade union work, increased literature sales, and the launching of a first-class bookshop, and so on.

He further indicated the following main immediate tasks confronting the Party in District 3:—

Firstly, reorganising its ranks to enable it to go still further among the masses and consolidate organisationally its undoubtedly large influence.

Secondly, to eliminate slovenliness from its methods of work and pay greater attention to organisational details.

Thirdly, to learn better how to utilise more fully the services of all those people who support the Party in various ways.

Finally, to indulge in much more extensive mass propaganda, both oral and written.

The meetings addressed by Comrade Miles reveal that thousands of Queensland workers are anxious to hear the Communist message. It is an important task of the D.C. to see that vastly improved facilities to meet this demand are devised in the near future. It must be realised that the Communist Party, more than ever to-day, must become in every respect a tribune of the people.

In this regard the Plenum resolved upon launching a campaign for a district paper. A Communist paper in South Queensland, added to the already extensive chain of Communist publications in the Commonwealth, will in itself be a very effective answer from the workers of this State to the attack of the Lyons Government upon democratic rights, and no stone should be left unturned to speed its production.

electi
The
"work
(Labe

—ano

—whi
experi
spread
conten
any re

At
conclus
inciden
approa
comme
Govern

P
th
I
th
fi
u
m
w

Can
was bu
support
This
District
tion pre
to form
the ma

The Plenum, as stated at the beginning of this article, undoubtedly marks a turning point in the work of the Party in District 3. The optimistic tone of the discussion throughout gives every reason to expect that the achievements already placed on record will be very rapidly surpassed in the near future, that the lagging sectors will overtake the more advanced and the Party as a whole in South Queensland will go forward to uniting the ranks of the masses here under the banner of struggle for improved living standards for peace and for freedom.