

Vol. 3, No. 9

SEPT., 1936



THE COMMUNIST REVIEW

Principal Contents:

THE SPANISH EVENTS
(L. Sharkey)

ABC OF DIALECTICAL
MATERIALISM (Scott
Bennett)

THE FEDERAL CONFER-
ENCE OF THE A.L.P.
(J. B. Miles)

NEXT TASKS (S. Mason)

MARXISM AND ART

PALESTINE (Zimmering)

SEPTEMBER 1936 : PRICE SIXPENCE

The Communist Review

A Magazine of the Theory and Practice of Marxism-Leninism

Vol. 3, No. 9

SYDNEY, N.S.W.

September, 1936

The Spanish Events

By L. SHARKEY

THE great and desperate struggle in Spain between the forces of progress, liberty and democracy on the one hand, and the forces of darkest reaction, monarchism, feudal landlordism, clericalism, together with the military caste and united more or less under the banner of fascism, and aiming at the establishment of a dictatorship and the abrogation of the democratic republic and the crushing of the working class, continues, at the time of writing, with unabated fury and ferocity.

The reactionary forces at the moment have won a number of successes, but not of a decisive character. The reactionary insurrectionists are able to wage a protracted struggle because of the superiority of their military equipment, and the fact that they have better disciplined and trained forces, relying as they do largely on the Foreign Legion and Moorish troops, professional mercenary soldiers with long experience in "colonial" warfare in Morocco. Another factor enabling the counter-revolution to continue the struggle is the assistance rendered by Mussolini and Hitler, especially by way of aeroplanes, which are utilised to transport Moorish and Foreign Legion troops across from Morocco. It was these reinforcements that enabled the recapture of Badajoz.

The government troops, however, are on the offensive in five areas. The government has the enormous advantage of having the support of the masses of the workers and peasants, and it is the workers' militia composed of these that are bearing the brunt of the struggle against the "rebels."

In estimating the ultimate outcome of the struggle between these two forces one can do no better than quote the admirable summing-up by Emil Vandervelde leader of the Belgian Socialists and a prominent leader of the Second International, in a recent article, where he says:—

"Those who in France and elsewhere are secretly or openly in sympathy with the Spanish fascists would run considerable risk of putting their money on the wrong horse if they betted in favor of General Franco. In Russia in 1917 and 1918 Koltchak, Wrangel, and Denikin seemed to enjoy a military superiority,

CONTENTS

	PAGE
THE SPANISH EVENTS, by L. Sharkey	1
THE ABC OF DIALECTICAL MATERIALISM, by H. Scott Bennett	10
THE FEDERAL CONFERENCE OF THE AUSTRALIAN LABOR PARTY, by J. B. Miles	16
THE NEXT TASKS OF THE AUSTRALIAN COMMUNISTS, by S. Mason	25
MARXISM AND ART, by Lunacharsky	31
AUSTRALIA'S FIGHTS FOR DEMOCRACY, FREEDOM, AND PROGRESS, by J. N. Rawling	34
PALESTINE IN UPROAR, by Max Zimmering	45
FINANCIAL UNIONISM, by E. A. Knight	53

and they achieved at the beginning successes which might have been considered as final ones.

"They ended, however, by being beaten less by the regular forces of the Red Army, which was just being born, than by the levee-en-masse of the workmen and peasants.

"These were ill-led, ill-armed, and ill-equipped, but inflexibly resolved to fight to the death in order to prevent a return of the old regime.

"War is going on in the country where Napoleon in 1809 learned to his cost what a bold and unflinching guerilla force of a whole people can do against the finest armies in the world.

"Operations like those of General Franco must succeed at once if they are to succeed at all. As time goes on, their chances of success grow smaller and smaller.

"The fight which is now going on in Spain is but an episode in the merciless struggle pursued throughout the world between democracy and fascism."

Already that is the factor mainly delaying advances on Madrid, this fear of the revolutionary populace in the rear, and also is one of the main reasons (besides the bestial hatred of the toilers which is the hallmark of all reactionaries and fascists from the Thiers butchers of the Paris Commune to Kolchak, Wrangel, Denikin, and Semenov of the Russian Revolution, to Franco), which induces the mass butcheries of the population at Badajoz, Valladolid and elsewhere. Reports of such revolts in the rear of the "rebels" are becoming frequent, from the province of Aragon and elsewhere.

The Spanish masses, by sheer weight of numbers, and providing the Republican Government can be persuaded or forced to arm the whole toiling population, will, in spite of cruel losses, overcome the superior technical and military resources of the counter-revolution. Such seems to be the possibility for a government victory and the correct interpretation of the armed struggle at the time of writing.

The very excellent pamphlet published by Modern Publishers containing a penetrating analysis of the economy and politics of modern Spain, which every Communist Review reader has or should have read, relieves me of the duty of giving the details of these.

The present events in Spain, the present revolt of the counter-revolutionary officers of the armed forces, backed by the R.C. Church and the big bourgeoisie and landowners, represent the resistance to the bourgeois-democratic revolution which in its present cycle commenced in 1930 with the fall of the fascist dic-

tatorship of Primo de Rivera and the exiling of King Alfonso XIII. There have been many "revolutions" in Spain, going back over a century, which have, however, failed to achieve and consolidate the bourgeois revolution, largely because of the weakness of the capitalist class of Spain, because of the historical conditions of its development. The bourgeois democratic revolution is proceeding in Spain when world capitalism is threatened with the world proletarian revolution, when this revolution is already victorious over one-sixth of the earth, when the bourgeoisie in a whole number of capitalist countries has already destroyed bourgeois democracy and resorted to fascist dictatorship. Because of these circumstances, the Spanish big bourgeoisie is, in the main, a counter-revolutionary class, allying itself with the church and the feudal reactionaries and struggling to overthrow the democratic republic, which is headed by petty-bourgeois republicans and only some sections of the bourgeoisie. This situation of the bourgeoisie opposing the bourgeois revolution is by no means unique in the annals of history, but is a replica of the Russian bourgeoisie, which also fought against the bourgeois revolution because of its fear of the proletarian revolution. Lenin described the position as follows: "The victory of the bourgeois revolution in Russia as the victory of the bourgeoisie is impossible. This appears to be paradoxical, but it is nevertheless true." The fear of the proletariat by the bourgeoisie and also the peasantry prevented the bourgeois revolution in these countries being fought to its logical conclusion, as in the classic French bourgeois revolution of 1789, that is, insofar as the bourgeoisie of Russia and Spain were concerned. But, irrespective of the wishes of the bourgeoisie, history moves on, however slowly and however much they may succeed in temporarily retarding its march. The terrible oppression of dying feudal relations in the country, together with the birth of the proletariat in the cities and the commencement of its struggle with the bourgeoisie, inevitably drives forward to the bourgeois democratic revolution in town and village. The proletariat on its march toward the Socialist revolution leads the fight for the bourgeois republic and bourgeois democracy. That was so in Russia and it is being repeated in Spain.

The Communist Party is defending with might and main the republican democracy against the counter-revolution. It is mobilising the working class and poor peasants in the workers' militia to crush the revolt. The Communist Party, which has organised the united front with the Socialist Party, in doing this bases itself four-square on the teaching of Marxism-Lenin-

ism. The remnants of sectarianism here in Australia are to be heard querying the defence of bourgeois democracy and the Republican Government by the Spanish Communists. They did likewise in the Russian revolution. Lenin annihilated them as follows:

"To take part in the provisional government together with the bourgeois revolutionary democracy—they weep—means giving our blessing to the bourgeois society, to the conservation of prisons and police, unemployment and need, private property and prostitution. This is a deduction worthy of Anarchists or of the Narodniks. Social-Democracy [The Bolsheviks were then formally a part of Social-Democracy.—L. S.] does not turn its back on the struggle for political freedom on the ground that that is bourgeois political freedom. Social-Democracy looks from the historical point of view on the so-called 'giving a blessing' to the bourgeois order . . . It has never feared and will never fear to say that it gives its blessing to the republican, democratic bourgeois order in comparison with the monarchical, serf-holding bourgeois order. But it 'gives its blessing' to the bourgeois republic merely as the last form of class-rule, it praises it as the most suitable arena for the struggle of the proletariat against the bourgeoisie, it blesses it not for its prisons and police, for private property and prostitution, but for the sweeping and free struggle against these pleasant institutions."—Little Lenin Library, "The Revolution of 1905."

Marx, in the Manifesto of the Communist Party (1848), declared that the Communists fight with the bourgeoisie against feudal reaction, at the same time instilling into the working class the "clearest possible recognition of the hostile antagonism between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie" so that after the fall of the reactionary classes the fight against the bourgeoisie may immediately begin.

It is on the basis of this teaching that the Communists today struggle for the bourgeois democratic revolution against feudal remains on one hand and for the defence of bourgeois democracy against the fascist dictatorship of the bourgeoisie on the other. Bourgeois democracy presents the greatest possibilities, because it allows the workers the possibility of a press, organisation, free speech, etc. In the advanced stage of decay of present-day capitalism, the victory of bourgeois democratic revolution is the prelude to victory of the Socialist revolution.

Given the defeat of the Franco revolt, what are the prospects of a victorious Socialist revolution in Spain?

Firstly, there is the enormous growth of the organisation, strength and class-consciousness of the workers, expressed in the great number of strikes and struggles over the past few years, their now rich experience of the armed struggle, the fact that the proletariat has been armed and organised in the Workers' Militia and is the driving force in the present struggle against the reaction. The growth of the revolutionary stature of the Spanish working class is best expressed in the growth of the Communist Party from a few hundreds to a party approaching 120,000 members, which has clarified its programme and already has done much towards uniting the split Spanish proletariat, the necessary prerequisite to successful Socialist revolution, which understands the national question and the role of the peasantry in the revolution. The further development of the Communist Party and its ultimate union with the Socialists, headed by Caballero, will be of decisive importance in the future, facilitating the victory of Marxist-Leninist ideology over Anarcho-syndicalism, which has retarded the progress of the Spanish working class. Already, the nationalisation of railways and tramways and factories belonging to capitalists such as Juan March has taken place, there are reports of workers' committees running workshops, whilst workers' committees control Barcelona and other towns, indicating the tendency of the Spanish revolution to outgrow the limitation of bourgeois private property relations. The action of the great landlords in supporting counter-revolution gives the working class the opportunity for pressing forward to the confiscation of the land and thus consolidating the alliance of the proletariat and peasantry.

Secondly, the defeat of the present revolt means the ruin of the reactionary classes, the biggest capitalists, the semi-feudal landowners and the power of the R.C. Church and the destruction of the Gil Robles fascists. Senor Companys, leader of the Catalonians, has declared that the "capitalist bourgeoisie has ruined itself," and the national revolutionaries see the future in an unshakeable alliance with the working class.

Already there are reports of the possibility of a Socialist government, headed by Caballero, replacing the petty-bourgeois Republican government, and in such a government the Communists would participate, as the conditions for such participation, as laid down by Comrade Dimitrov at the Seventh World Congress, would be fulfilled. The tasks of such a government would be the

transference of all power to the proletariat and preparation for socialisation of industry, instead of the preservation of capitalism in the orthodox fashion of right-wing Socialist and Labor governments. In the event of the defeat of Franco, the bourgeoisie could not dominate such a government. This seems to be the probable approach to the transference of power in Spain. Of course, the situation can change fundamentally in the course of a few weeks or even days.

In the struggle there are many illuminating events. One of these is the position in which the leaders of the Roman Catholic Church, including Archbishop Duhig of Brisbane, have placed themselves. They, in Spain, are fighting in the ranks of fascism, screaming that they are defending "Christianity." Roman Catholic Christianity in Spain must indeed be in a bad way, because the backbone of Franco's forces are the Moorish mercenaries, Mohammedans, the "traditional" enemies of Christianity, together with the Foreign Legion, composed largely of cutthroats of all nations, the authors of the butchery of Badajoz, as well as equally terrible atrocities in Asturias in 1934. These are the forces which the holy fathers rely on to destroy the liberty of the Spanish masses, who were equally "traditionally" Catholic. What the holy fathers are concerned about saving was shown when the palace of the bishop of Gerona, who fled, was examined by the government forces and £555,000 in bills and bonds were located. "Lay up thy treasures in heaven, where the moth cannot corrupt," the holy fathers preach to the starving people, but the Spanish prelates do not follow their own advice. The Roman Catholic Church in Spain has for centuries been one of the mainstays of reaction. Linked with the despotic monarchy and the landowners and aristocrats, and later with the fascists, it has trampled and spat upon the liberty of the people. Itself one of the biggest property-owners, the Roman Catholic Church in Spain is indissolubly linked with the ruling class, and its hierarchy is an integral and important section of the reactionary, fascist Spanish robber-class. It is sharing the downfall of the Spanish ruling class.

Despite this, the Communists do not stand for the burning of churches and convents such as are often alleged to take place. The Communist International has specifically condemned church burning in Spain, which is the work not of the Communists, but of the Anarchists. A Spanish Soviet Government would allow liberty of conscience and the right to practise their religion to Spanish Catholics, but it would also end the economic role of the church as one of the biggest exploiters, by socialising the land and factories owned by the church and consequently would

end the political role of that church as one of the greatest bulwarks of reaction and fascism, as one of the chief instruments maintaining ignorance, illiteracy, and backwardness in Spain.

The civil war in Spain is a battle between fascism and democracy. Information to hand shows clearly that the precipitation of civil war by the fascist military officers was prepared in conjunction with the Nazis. The existence of a widespread espionage and provocation organisation in Spain, which all German residents have been forced by terrorist threats to join, was revealed when the papers of Hans Hellemann, chief Nazi organiser in Spain, were examined after his flight. The German and Italian fascists not only assisted to make the counter-revolutionary attempt possible, but it is their dispatch of arms to Franco's cutthroats that has enabled Franco to protract the armed struggle against the Republican Government. Franco has been able to transport reinforcements from the rebel stronghold in the Spanish Moroccan colony across the water, in German and Italian aerial transports, which enabled the capture of Badajoz and the renewal of the fascist threat to the capital, Madrid, itself

Refusing the non-intervention proposals made by other powers, delaying their replies to the proposals, the German and Italian fascists utilised this period to arm and equip Franco. All this assistance to Franco was not given for nothing. Far from it! The price that Franco and his colleagues are prepared to pay for this assistance is the handing over to the Nazis and Italian fascists of Moroccan ports and the Spanish Mediterranean islands. The fascists do not want these points for the purpose of peaceful commerce, but as naval and military strong-points, that is, as part of fascism's preparation for the war which it is plotting to loose upon the world. These strong-points are a menace to both British and French "interests" in the Mediterranean and consequently their passing into the hands of the fascist powers would only aggravate existing antagonisms and increase the menacé of war. Thus the victory of Franco, supported by Hitler and Mussolini, would inevitably strengthen the forces making for war and deal a terrible blow at the forces of peace. The world cannot afford another fascist dictatorship, a fascist victory in Spain.

The fascists have intervened, and intervened effectively already in the Spanish civil war. The "indignation" campaigns and "protests" to the Soviet and Spanish Governments engineered in Herr Goebbels' propaganda ministry in Berlin, are an attempt to follow up the arming of the Spanish fascists by armed military intervention, especially if the working class commence

the seizure of political power in Spain. The Nazis, taking a leaf from Mussolini's book, follow the line, as in the militarisation of the Rhineland, of attempting to achieve their objective in Spain, the establishment of fascist dictatorship and the consequent turning of Spain into a fascist war base, by threatening the friends of Spain with war, by using this threat to prevent the masses and governments friendly to the Spanish Government rendering effective aid.

The anti-fascists of the world cannot allow themselves to be blackmailed in this fashion by the fascists any longer. "Non-intervention" by anti-fascists, if it allowed the success of Franco, would simply mean that fascism had strengthened its positions for the launching of war, the war danger would become greater and the threats of Hitler more menacing. That is why the lead given in France by the Communists and by M. Jouhaux, the general secretary of the great French trade union confederation, with its 5,000,000 members, is the correct one. The French workers realised this when at a meeting at Lille 150,000 workers assembled and applauded Jouhaux when he declared that French workers could not remain neutral in the Spanish civil war. The loyalists in Spain, he said, were ready to sacrifice their lives to bar the way to arrogant and sanguinary fascism and prevent the Nazis and fascists from turning Europe into a field of slaughter. His hearers cried "Send aeroplanes to Spain" and paraded the streets, shaking their fists, brandishing placards threatening the organisers of neutrality and singing the "Internationale."

The policy of the Right-wing reformists, especially the "inner group" in N.S.W., of "neutrality" in the Spanish struggle, constitutes assistance to fascism. Is it nought to Australian workers that our Spanish class brothers are massacred at Badajoz by the hundred by Moorish mercenaries equipped with German fascist arms? Are not the Spanish Government and the masses fighting for those democratic principles for which we Australian workers are also prepared to fight and die? Does not a fascist victory bring war closer? We cannot remain "neutral" in such a situation, especially as Hitler and Mussolini have already succeeded in one of their main objectives, the equipping and arming of Franco's forces. It is a sacred international duty to aid Spain.

The British Government's embargo on the export of munitions to Spain is in line with all the previous assistance rendered by the Baldwin Cabinet to Hitler's schemes. It tends to prevent the Spanish Government arming the great mass of the toilers, who are its greatest supporters, and thus guaranteeing victory and a speedy end to the civil war. As a result of the embargo by Britain and the attitude of non-intervention by the

Blum Government, against the wishes of the workers of France, the Soviet Government was not in a position to assist the Spanish Government alone. Such assistance from the Soviet Government would have immediately been seized upon by Hitler for the furtherance of the aims of Nazi Germany for war against the U.S.S.R. Assistance could and should be given by all those governments opposed to Spain being transformed into a Nazi war base, all those who support a democratic government, not a terrorist one established against the will of the people by means of fascist violence. The Communists therefore demand that the necessary assistance for the purpose of quelling the fascist revolt should be accorded to the Republican Government of Spain. The victory of the Spanish anti-fascists would be a victory for democracy in Australia, a victory over war and reaction that would make more secure the position of democracy and peace the world over.

Therefore the demand of the Australian Labor movement must be: The embargoes on arms to the Spanish Government must be raised. The Spanish Government has money, it has millions of supporters, it needs arms in order to equip its forces and make doubly sure a victory for the liberty of the Spanish people and a triumph for world peace and democracy over the dark forces of fascist reaction.

The ABC of Dialectical Materialism

By H. SCOTT BENNETT

[Herewith we submit the substance of two interesting lectures on dialectical materialism delivered by Mr. H. Scott Bennett at the Friends of the Soviet Union Hall, Sydney, July, 1936.—Editor, C.R.]

LET us first understand in this short introduction to dialectical materialism the sense in which the words describing the philosophy are employed. Among the Ancient Greeks the term dialectic was used for the purpose of describing their method of disputation. The word in a literal sense really means the art of conversation or argument. But in philosophy it is taken in another sense. As used in philosophy it means that all motion is produced by contradictions. An outstanding feature of the Ancient Greeks' method of disputation is to be found in the emphasis they laid upon refuting an opponent's arguments and assertions by bringing out the contradictions involved in his statements, and they believed that as a result there emerged something of a higher nature. The German philosopher, Hegel (1770-1831), seized upon the word dialectic and used it as a descriptive term for his system of logic. Hegel laid great stress upon the part played by contradictions. It is only, says Hegel, because a thing contains a contradiction within itself that it moves and acquires impulse and activity. Hegel, however, was an idealist in philosophy, that is to say, he believed the world existed in and for the mind. He sought to explain the universal drama of conflict and change as the unfolding of a universal spirit that contained all things within itself.

It was Karl Marx that gave the philosophy of Hegel a materialist setting. "It was resolved to comprehend the real world—nature and history—just as it appeared to everyone who approaches it free from preconceived idealist fancies. . . . To sacrifice every idealist fancy which could not be brought into harmony with the facts conceived in their own and not in a fantastic connection. And materialism means that and nothing more"

Let us note at this stage that, just as the term "idealism," as used in philosophy, is frequently confused by many with high endeavor, the pursuit of ideal aims, so the word "materialism" in philosophy is frequently made, especially by clerical obscurantists, a synonym for "materialism" as used in an unpleasant

ethical sense, as when we speak of a person being "materialistically minded," a person lacking all desire for culture, and who is engrossed in acquiring material comforts. Obviously, between dialectical materialism and the "materialism" here spoken of there is no necessary connection.

Reference has been made to the important part played in dialectical philosophy by contradictions. The term contradictions as used in dialectical materialism is not, of course, to be confused with contradictions that arise from incorrect thinking or an illogical handling of facts. The contradictions are real, that is, contradictions that manifest themselves in the process of development, as they are shown in reality. As an illustration of what is meant when we speak of the part played by the contradictions to be found throughout nature, and also in social development, we can take the hypothesis that the earth developed from a fiery mass. But our earth is no longer such a nebulous body; it has solidified to a very considerable extent. What brought about the change? The contradiction in the mass (heat—cooling, condensation), and without this cooling and condensation the earth as we know it could not have come into existence. Contradictions of this kind are universal, as has been remarked. Dialectics, then, is the name given to the contradictions, the union and conflict of opposites and which are reflected in our consciousness and, it may be added, are reflected in our consciousness because we are part of the world.

There are three principal laws of dialectics, and they are usually spoken of as (1) the law of the transition of quantity into quality; (2) the interpenetration of opposites; and (3) the negation of the negation. The laws as thus expressed do not appear to be very inviting, but, as Mark Twain said of classical music, they are not nearly so bad as they sound. By means of illustrations we may grasp their significance. Let us take the law of the transition of quantity into quality and vice versa. The first illustration can be taken from psychology. The transition of quantity into quality is seen in the case of a crowd. Individuals in a crowd act in a different way and manifest different qualities as contrasted with their acts and qualities as individuals. Under the conditions mentioned, an individual is far more susceptible to suggestion; in a crowd he will accept ideas and rumors as being true that he would not accept if he were not so situated. We are also familiar with the fact that a great difference exists between people living in the country as compared with those living in large cities. We may take a further illustration from another science. J. D. Bernal, M.A., whose work at Cambridge in connection with the structure of

metals, water hormones, vitamins, and proteins is well known. Science says that science is learning more and more that specific qualitative properties of bodies depend on the number of certain of the internal components. And, he adds, "if an atom can only unite with one other atom the result is a gas. If it can link with two or three, the result will be a solid of fibrous or platy character. If with four, a hard crystalline solid like a diamond. If with more than four, a metal."

It takes a million or more molecules to make a substance which can be recognised as a solid or liquid; a smaller number leads to the qualitatively different colloid state. And in reference to the change of quality into quantity Adoratsky cites as an illustration of new quantitative relations coming into effect with the appearance of a new quality, the fact that the Communist Party in the U.S.S.R., thanks to the high quality of class-consciousness, organisation and discipline no longer represents a small section of the workers, but is able to lead a movement of millions.

"Thus in the course of time quality was transformed into quantity."

The law of the interpenetration of opposites plays an important part in dialectics. This interpenetration displays itself as a unity of opposites. As an illustration of what is meant by "unity of opposites," Lenin took the case of a man named Ivan. Ivan, says Lenin, is a man. Ivan is specific; man is general. You and I and Ivan they are in unity. The interpenetration of opposites may be seen in the following instances. In economics production and consumption display a unity of opposites. Without production there is no consumption, and consumption is responsible for production. In that interesting volume, "Marxism and Modern Thought," L. V. Komarov points out that there are no hard and fast lines in evolution. Even the border line, he says, between vertebrates and invertebrates is no longer unchanging. Every day the line between fish and amphibia, between birds and reptiles, tend more and more to vanish. Between the small dinosaur known as *Compsognatus* and a toothed bird of the same origin, only a few intermediary members are wanting, while toothed birds with beaks have been found in both hemispheres, thus illustrating the interpenetration of opposites as seen in evolution.

Those who are familiar with the writings of Marx will remember how clearly he shows in "The Communist Manifesto," for instance, the unity of opposites in capitalist economy. The capitalist class and the working class are indeed opposites, but they nevertheless comprise within the capitalist system a unity; it is however, a unity in a state of contradiction. Each interpenetration of opposites reaches a breaking point and, in society, this is

the time when the new situation may be directed to create a new and higher social order. It should, perhaps, be emphasised that the unity spoken of in a unity of opposites is a real unity in the sense that it is not merely an interaction but, so to speak, an inner growth.

Dialectical materialism recognises that development is not a simple continuity. On the contrary it stresses the fact that there exist mutations, "jumps," breaks in the process of development. In social evolution we cannot have revolution without a preparatory process of evolution, and evolution must reach a culminating point when the break, revolution, can no longer be repressed.

The third law, as has been mentioned, is the law of the negation of the negation. If we had, says the author of "Engels and Science" a word to describe how something in the course of its own inner development can produce something else different and in some sense opposite to it and which in time comes to replace it entirely, that word would take the place of negation. Perhaps the matter may be made clearer by the following illustrations:—

An egg has been used as an illustration of the meaning of this law. Within the egg is a germ which, awakening to life gradually consumes what the egg contains. This negation is not, however, merely destructive, for it has as its outcome the development of the germ into a living thing. The negation being complete, the chick emerges. This represents the negation of the negation, out of which has arisen something organically higher than the egg. The negation, be it noted, does not merely annihilate.

There are also several illustrations of the law in "Anti-Duehring," where in one case it is pointed out that in the normal life process of a grain of barley, if it falls on suitable soil, under the influence of heat and moisture it germinates, the grain ceases to exist, it is negated and in its place appears the plant which has arisen from it, the negation of the grain.

The plant grows and once more produces grains of barley, but as soon as these have ripened the stalk dies, is in its turn negated. As a result of this negation of the negation, we have once again the original grain of barley, but not as a single unit, but ten, twenty, or thirty fold.

In "The Holy Family" and in "Capital" we have instances of the use made by Marx of the dialectic. In the first named work, for instance, Marx points out that the proletariat and capital are antitheses, i.e., oppositions; contrasts. As such they constitute a whole; both are manifestations of the world of private property. To describe them as two sides of a whole is not sufficient. Capital, as capital, is compelled to preserve its own exist-

ence, and along with it its antithesis the working class—the proletariat. Capital satisfied in itself is the positive side of the antithesis. The proletariat, on the other hand is obliged, as proletariat, as a class economically dependent upon capital, to abolish itself, and along with it private property in the means of production which makes it the proletariat. It is a negative side of the antithesis, the internal source of unrest. Within the antithesis therefore, the owner of private property is the conservative, and the proletarian is the destructive party. From the former proceeds the action of maintaining the antithesis, from the latter the action of destroying it. Capital is continually being driven towards its own dissolution, but only by an unconscious development which is independent of it, and which exists against its will and is limited by the nature of things; only, that is, by creating the proletariat as proletariat; poverty conscious of its own physical and spiritual poverty, and demoralised humanity conscious of its own demoralisation and consequently striving against it. The proletariat fulfils the judgment which capital by the creation of the proletariat suspends over itself. And in “capital” he provides a further illustration of the dialectic. “The capitalist method of appropriation, which springs from the capitalist method of production, and therefore of private property, is the first negation of individual property based on one’s own labor. But capitalist production begets with the inevitability of a natural process its own negation. It is the negation of the negation.”

Let us now by means of recapitulation and additions endeavor to obtain a further understanding of the subject. In the first place Dialectical Materialism affirms that there is an objective reality—a real world apart from consciousness and in reply to those who argue that we can know nothing of the world beyond our sensations, Engels replied that, “before there was argumentation there was action.” And human action had solved the difficulty long before human ingenuity had invented it. Truth means the correspondence between our judgments and external reality; and the criterion of that correspondence is practical working. And Marx, in his “Theses on Feuerbach” said: “The question whether objective truth can be attributed to human thinking is not a question of theory but a practical question. In practice man must prove the truth . . . the ‘this sidedness’ of his thinking.” The dispute, Marx adds, over the reality and non-reality of thinking which is isolated from practice is a purely scholastic question. “Matter,” it may be said here, can be defined as being whatever directly or indirectly produces sensations in us.

Commencing, then, with a realistic conception of the world, dialectical materialism affirms that all things are in movement.

Not a mechanical movement, however, but a movement caused by the interpenetration of opposites, such opposites often presenting the appearance of a unity as shown in our illustrations. In this development we find continuity and also breaks. These breaks in continuity are an important part of the process, giving rise to a further continuity of movement. Dialectical materialism is an essentially revolutionary philosophy which accounts in no small measure for its neglect at the hands of official philosophers and scientists.

The outstanding contradiction in capitalist society today is that which exists between the proletariat and the capitalist class and revolution, i.e., the complete transformation of society, is to be achieved primarily by the workers as the outcome of the class struggle. The practical application of dialectical materialism to society is to be found in a recognition of the fact that in the “unity of opposites” breaks occur, and when this break is no longer to be avoided it is by the revolutionary action of the subject class that this newly created position gives rise to a higher form of society. Recognising the general law of social development, the real task, said Lenin, is not to invent plans for the reconstruction of society, not to plead with the capitalists and their hangers-on to improve the conditions of the workers, not to plot conspiracies, but to organise the class struggle of the proletariat and to lead that struggle, the ultimate aim of which is to win political power for the proletariat and to organise Socialist society. The philosophy of Marxism-Leninism is not a contemplative, armchair philosophy. For was it not Marx himself who declared that:

“The philosophers have only interpreted the world in various ways; the point, however, is to change it”?

[Books consulted in the compilation of the lectures and which are recommended for further study: “Dialectical Materialism,” Adoratsky; “Dialectical Materialism,” Radek; “Anti-Duehring,” Engels; “Feuerbach,” Engels; “The Positive Outcome of Philosophy,” Dietzgen; “Moscow Dialogues,” Hecker; “Engels and Science,” Bernal; “Marxism and Modern Thought,” various writers; “Karl Marx,” Beer; Works of Lenin.]

The Federal Conference of the Australian Labor Party

By J. B. MILES

AN examination of the press reports of the Federal Conference of the Australian Labor Party gives rise to comparisons with the reports, discussions, and resolutions of the leading organs of the Communist Party.

The A.L.P. president, Mr. J. J. Kenneally (W.A.), said the conference was one of the most important yet held. This is so not only because it is the first conference following the unity agreement between the Federal Party and the New South Wales section, but because of the serious issues which were reflected in the agenda and discussions—the menace of war, the attacks upon liberty, the economic demands of the masses, and the need to prepare for the Federal elections. Despite this recognition by the president and by the Labor members of the Federal Parliament, who were present in full force as delegates or visitors, the conclusion one draws is that the issues and the conference coincided in time and that the main concern is not yet to understand and have a clear line so as to carry on propaganda to strengthen the party, but to win the elections.

We Communists hope that the Lyons Government will be defeated and, while doing our utmost to bring about that result and with our own candidates in the field, realise that this means a Labor Government. Nevertheless, merely to win the elections is not enough. Was not Andrew Fisher Prime Minister when a Labor Government was faced with a concrete war issue, and was not James Scullin Prime Minister when a Labor Government was faced with the greatest economic crisis? Merely to win the elections is to land in the position of completely accepting the responsibility to carry out capitalist policy as did Fisher and Scullin.

Probably no reformist Labor Party in the world is less interested in theory than the A.L.P., and this typically British aversion to theory reflects itself in the agenda, discussions, and decisions of the A.L.P. Conference. There is no attempt to understand why Lyons and Stevens won the last elections. To do so would be dangerous to reformist illusions if only because Forgan Smith won the Queensland elections for the A.L.P. not long ago with arguments about returning prosperity and the evils of Moore, just as Stevens won the N.S.W. elections for the U.A.P.-U.C.P. with similar arguments, but the bogey man, the previous N.S.W. Premier, was the Laborite Lang. There is no

attempt to understand the economic changes which enabled Lyons and Stevens to delude a sufficient number of electors so that they retained office; to do so would undermine the claims of the State Labor Premiers, as well as Stevens, that they have brought betterment, and would undermine the whole A.L.P. theory about deliberately provoked economic crises and lead on to the dangerous ground for reformism of the limitations of parliament and the need to act outside of parliament. This would lead also to realisation of the need to depend more on unionism and the actions of the masses than on a Labor Party majority in parliament.

On the issue of war or peace there was no examination of the international situation, Australia's relations with Britain, or which are the main forces for war and which for peace. The Federal Conference did not reach the level of the Victorian "Labor's Case Against War and Fascism." Aversion to theory rather than mere lack of interest is the attitude of the majority of A.L.P. leaders. The conflicting interests of the States find a reflection in the views of the A.L.P. State branches, and any fundamental discussion on these issues would serve to bring out the capitulation of the A.L.P. leaders in each State to capitalist influences and give rise in the minds of the masses to sharper questions as to the degree of working-class content in the Labor Party.

Aversion to theory arises also from fear of self-criticism. Fundamental discussion is not encouraged by the A.L.P. leaders because this leads to a recognition of mistakes, to criticism of those responsible and the demand that they recognise their errors. On the issue of war, the A.L.P. has not repudiated its 1914 line; on the issue of fascist tendencies the A.L.P. has not openly recognised that the Scullin Government (1929-31) did not repeal the Transport Act (1928); on the issues of betterment for the masses the A.L.P. responsibility for the "Premiers' Plan" is but incidentally recognised, many in N.S.W. still denying the responsibility of Lang.

Space only permits the suggestion that readers make their own comparison between A.L.P. and C.P. methods and political content. See the supplement to *The Workers' Weekly* of August 7 and subsequent numbers for an estimate of our reports and discussions. The session of the Central Committee of the C.P. begins with the substantial reports of Comrades Dixon and Sharkey; the A.L.P., after greetings from the president and Mr. Curtin, appoints committees, and the first item to be discussed is a motion "That preferential voting be abolished in all Federal elections." This was rejected. Another aspect of

the contrast is in what happens after a conference or important executive meeting. The C.P. continues to utilise its press, and encourages discussion in its organisations about the decisions of its leading organs, reporting also openly to all workers as well as members. The A.L.P. leaves its decisions to the members of Parliament, and holds them in the control of the bureaucracy. Since the close of the Adelaide Conference, the Labor Party press is almost silent. Whether this is accident or design is of little consequence; the main thing is to realise that Communists and members of the A.L.P. who understand the need for mass activity must do what most of the A.L.P. leaders fail to do—encourage discussion in the unions and A.L.P. branches.

In addition to many important programme decisions which reflect the change in the mood of the working class, a tendency is shown by some A.L.P. leaders to recognise the leftward swing of the masses. Already, in *The Westralian Worker* of May 29, after his visit to the State capitals, Mr. Curtin said: "There is a big Labor revival taking place. The party has been ill, but it is recovering and it is full of renewed energy and hope." President Kenneally recognised that the people are looking to Labor, and he is of the extreme right wing. At the conference, Mr. Curtin said, "The stocks of Labor stand higher in Australia than for years past." To some extent Mr. Curtin reflects the differentiation in the ranks of the working class, and his tendency is based on the move to the left and in favor of unity. This, which was already apparent, is strengthened by the fact that, after the A.L.P. Conference, Mr. Curtin gave an interview to our Party paper in W.A., *The Workers' Star*, in which he affirms his intention to repeal anti-working-class legislation and regulations, take steps to make the rich pay, recognise the U.S.S.R. and open direct trade with that country, and in foreign policy to break links which may commit Australia to imperialist aggression. Here it is not a question of what reliance to place upon the intentions of Mr. Curtin. The question whether the tendency of Mr. Curtin will be strengthened or that of the arch-splitter Mr. Fallon, who was nearly president and is a vice-president, will be determined by the degree of unity achieved in the localities and the mass pressure from the unions and A.L.P. branches against the policy of the splitters.

Despite the growth of confidence, which is well based, the outlook of the leaders remains completely reformist; they look forward to an elections victory, to being able to make concessions, but also to a swing of the elections pendulum. Especially in the debates on the Constitution, Curtin, Graves, Fallon, etc., apart from questions of principle, opposed additional powers for

the Federal Parliament because a future anti-Labor Government could use the same powers against the workers. In this there is no recognition of the seriousness of this period and of the immediate perspectives; the Labor Party is merely capitalism's alternate government, essentially a defeated outlook in these days of capitalist decline, of wars and revolutions. Here also is reflected the dependence on parliament and the avoidance of mass activity.

Given the carrying out of the best in the A.L.P. programme, more and better propaganda, improved organisation, better unionism, unity in action by the working class and the unity of the people for peace, liberty, and betterment, why should we not see further election victories? If the enemy in Australia should react as the Spanish fascists have done, will the Australian working class not know how to answer? It will if we can get action outside of parliament, not only in preparation for election victories but afterwards. Such action will strengthen the tendency already evident widely among the rank and file and to be detected in the utterances of Mr. Curtin; and the same action will defeat the line of Fallon, Lang, Monk & Co., bringing together in action the Communists, the members of the A.L.P., the non-party people, and the unorganised.

On the question of wages, it is not easy to determine, from the public reports, whether the conference decided on any precise objective. In the discussions on banking and credit, much was said about purchasing power and a higher standard of living. In the *Westralian Worker* already quoted above, Mr. Curtin also said, "Labor wholeheartedly endorses a better wage standard, equality for the sexes. . . ." Conference endorsed equal pay for the sexes, but there was no discussion as to the responsibility of the Queensland, Western Australian, and Tasmanian Labor Governments to give effect to this decision. That being so, it could not be expected that the Victorian A.L.P. parliamentary group would be called on to secure results from the Dunstan Government or withdraw support. The most important shortcoming on the wages issue, as on all other questions directly affecting the unions, is the total absence of any recognition of the need to organise the masses except for the elections. For the purpose of policing awards there was a decision in favor of "adequate and efficient personnel and machinery for policing and enforcing Federal industrial awards and Acts in conjunction with trade union officials." To draw the officials into this work is good, but there is no indication that it is intended that the unions shall have a voice in setting up the machinery or choosing the personnel, nor is there any indication of the value of job

committees for this purpose. There is the same weakness the attitude to tariffs. Here the A.L.P. expects to be able to juggle with tariffs so as to influence the standard of living, not through prices, but through wages in relation to tariffs; no protection for industries which pay low wages, high tariffs for high wages. It will be a serious mistake if the unions place any reliance on such methods. Without repudiating the possibility of exercising some degree of control as intended by the A.L.P., the policy will fail without mass action to support it.

The difference in outlook between those in office and those in opposition was brought out sharply in the debate on hours. The committee report proposed to request the Queensland, W.A. and Tasmanian Governments to endorse legislation to implement the 40-hour week and to request the Victorian branch to prevail on the Victorian Government to adopt a similar course. Hynes (Q.) and Kenneally (W.A.) opposed this part of the recommendation. Bryan (Brisbane T. and L.C.), Makin and Yates (S.A.), Graves and Martin (N.S.W.) were in favor. A part of the recommendation became a motion which was adopted; to request the governments of Australia to legislate the 40-hour week and that representatives of Labor governments at the coming Premiers' Conference be requested to urge the adoption of a 40-hour week. Not only was there no discussion about the campaign or how to assist the campaigns of the unions, there was capitulation to the Labor governments now acting as the executives of capital and only mild requests. Again it is clear that mass action is the major question of policy, but it would be wrong to repudiate the A.L.P. because it does not recognize this; the leaders must be made to feel it.

The national insurance decisions call for serious and immediate attention by the unions and all workers. The Labor Party is ready to legislate such a scheme as will be recommended by the visiting experts and acceptable to the employers. However much the Labor members of the Federal House may modify details, it is significant that the conference decided to oppose a contributory scheme in connection with invalid and old-age pensions. A good decision in itself, but why the special mention of opposition to contributions from workers for old-age and invalidity? This can only mean that the A.L.P. leaders in deciding in favor of national insurance for sickness, accident, life and unemployment, intend to approve a contributory scheme for these benefits.

Many employers and leaders of capitalist class parties are playing with the idea of social insurance. They think such would be cheaper and easier for them in another severe economic crisis

In other words, while the workers are employed, and always those who have jobs are to pay from their small wages, and the A.L.P. leaders intend to accept the contributory method except for pensions. The demand of the unions and the unemployed organisations, the lead given by the Communists must be pressed so that the A.L.P. members either in opposition or in office will do their utmost to make the rich pay.

The campaign conducted by the unions, the Committees for Defence of Democratic Rights and the Communist Party, a campaign supported by many A.L.P. branches and by leading members of the Labor Party, is reflected in the decisions to repeal the obnoxious sections of the Crimes Act and to repeal the Transport Act. This attitude is strengthened by the emphatic declarations of Mr. Curtin in the interview mentioned above, when he also declared for the removal of postal and customs restrictions on militant newspapers and on working-class books. This is good so far as it goes, but there can be no slackening of activity if there is to be a Labor Government and the repeal of reactionary laws. On the contrary, mass action now and after the elections is essential to ensure that Labor Party leader Curtin and his fellow-members will respond to the interests of the people and not to capital and its agents, the splitters of the Labor movement.

The decisions of conference on the issue of war or peace provide the least to seize upon for unity in action in defence of peace. This is emphasised by the estimate of the daily papers, many of which regard the A.L.P. defence proposals as satisfactory. Messrs. Fallon, Lang, Monk and Co., The Worker, Labor Daily and Labor Call, who so often try to mislead the workers with lies about a unity between Communists and Nationalists against the A.L.P., should be asked to explain why their "defence" proposals meet with U.A.P. approval. Whatever the splitters' answer may be, the facts are that Australia is now committed to British Imperialist policy and the A.L.P. conference did not decide to repudiate this policy; it did not decide to publish the agreements or understandings entered into between Lyons and Baldwin, Lyons and Sir Maurice Hankey. The strengthening of Australian armaments today is not with the object of making Australia independent of British "protection" and capable of self-defence, but with the object of participating in defence of British Empire interests; in other words, to defend British colonial exploitation and to gain more colonies as in the "war to end war."

Conference expressed its abhorrence of war, but did not Andrew Fisher abhor war? Abhorrence of fascism was also ex-

pressed, but on this issue there was at least something concrete on the Crimes Act, Transport Act, customs and postal restrictions. The decision "to constantly endeavor to establish and maintain friendly relations with other nations" is an advance on the N.S.W. A.L.P. position of neutrality and complete isolation. Mr. Curtin has shown that in this connection he includes the U.S.S.R., which is also an advance on The Labor Daily, Trotskyist slander campaign. While abhorring war and fascism, the A.L.P. failed to distinguish the chief instigators of war, the fascist powers, and failed to recognise the peace policy of the U.S.S.R. In place of collective security, to keep Australia out of war by keeping war out the world, the A.L.P. is committed to Empire security. The decisions to further exploit Australian natural resources for defence purposes may provide more work for the unemployed, but in the general setting of today and the A.L.P. defence policy, these decisions are very like the self-sufficiency practice of other capitalist nations—especially the fascist powers.

State control of munitions and the aim "to take the profit out of war" will be capable of even a partial application only if a Labor government will also decide to abolish all commercial secrets within its power and make public its foreign relations. It will also be necessary to comb out of the forces and the civil service all anti-Labor and pro-fascist elements, give full civil rights to the members of the forces and to deliberately institute educational discussions in the forces on what constitutes an aggressor, what is defence, and what should be the attitude of Australian democracy to probable and possible wars.

More sharply than on any other issue the conference approach to the war menace and its decisions serve to emphasise the supreme importance of the independent action of the working class in defence of peace.

The question of unity received much, though wholly inadequate, attention, in the references to the settlement of the conflict between N.S.W. and the Federal Party and on the appeals of several N.S.W. individuals, some excluded owing to past difficulties, and other cases arising from the present N.S.W. situation. Mr. Curtin said "every vestige of disunity—as far as the Federal Parliament was concerned—had been swept away." If this is so, why did he not seek to use the influence of conference in Victoria and N.S.W. against the splitters on the cases of Mr. Blackburn and J. S. Garden? Mr. Keller said, "Unity has been established in N.S.W." No doubt he means that now there is but one A.L.P. in N.S.W., nevertheless, the A.L.P. in that State is split from end to end and Keller is in the forefront of the

splitting process. The leftward trend, partly realised by Mr. Curtin, is being resisted most bitterly in N.S.W. by the Lang executive, which is manoeuvring to increase its organisational hold (Lang's bureaucratic powers, 2KY, and The Labor Daily directorate) to minimise the power of the rank and file.

Despite the efforts to gloss over the facts, there is not unity in the A.L.P., and the conference made no contribution to working-class unity. Only incidentally was there mention of the Communist Party, and then only to maintain the splitting policy, such as the fear lest The Workers' Weekly enter the conference if there was a decision to admit the whole press.

Mr. Kenneally is not blind to the facts—he was recently defeated in East Perth by a "left" demagogue, who played upon the mass discontent with the Labor Government of which Kenneally had been a minister. He said, "If we can't compose our differences and so act as to constitute a party to appeal to the people, we will be swept away, and others will take our place."

Conference handled the evidences of disunity which came before it in a feeble way, showing that the Federation is not a united party, but only a loose grouping liable to break up if the separate State views and interests are brought into sharp discussion. All appeals were referred back to the States and the N.S.W. developments were not discussed.

Unless the N.S.W. split can be overcome in time it is bound to minimise the possibility of success in the Federal elections. At the same time it must be realised that no settlement is desirable which would mean capitulation to the Lang executive. These are the people who must be swept away along with the splitters in all States, so that, not only will A.L.P. unity become a real unity for the fight against capitalism, but that unity between the Labor Party and Communist Party may be realised. At first in action to defeat the Lyons Government of poverty, war and reaction; later, as we get to know each other better, in action on all questions affecting the mass of the people. To work together for common aims will bring to the A.L.P. members the benefit of Communist theoretical training and lead to an ideological unity in the A.L.P. ranks approaching that in the C.P., where there is the widest discussion, and at the same time a unity never yet achieved by the A.L.P.

Affiliation of the C.P. to the A.L.P. would do much to advance the interests of the masses and to unify the A.L.P., at the same time preparing the way for a fundamentally class outlook on

essentials in the A.L.P. ranks, and for a united working-class party for the struggle to end the power of capital, establish a class government of the workers to suppress all counter-revolutionary opposition and go forward to the building of Socialism.

The Next Tasks of the Australian Communists

By S. MASON

SINCE the Seventh World Congress the Australian Communist Party has continued its march forward. It has won further leading and minor positions in the trade unions, connecting itself still more decisively with the mass labor movement. It has participated in the leadership of big strikes and other mass actions. In varying degrees it has reached agreement with Labor Party organisations for the conduct of local municipal elections. In **South Australia** it is united with the Labor Party in a struggle for the maintenance of peace. It has brought into being a mass movement in defence of democratic liberties, extending right throughout the continent.

But these successes are only the beginning of the fulfilment of its immediate tasks. The Australian Communists have by no means achieved the broadest possible united front. Neither can we be satisfied with the results achieved in mobilising the progressive elements outside the working class.

Too many comrades still put the question: proletarian revolution versus war, Soviet power versus bourgeois democracy. Such a conception of our immediate tasks must of necessity narrow the forces which can be brought into the immediate struggle. The question for us at the present moment is not proletarian revolution versus war, but peace or war; not Soviet power versus bourgeois democracy, but bourgeois democracy and its extension or the limitation of bourgeois democracy and fascism. True, the only final guarantee against the wars of imperialism is proletarian revolution in at least the biggest imperialist countries and the only guarantee against fascism is Soviet power, but this is not the point at the moment. What we are concerned with is what are the immediate issues. A correct conception of the latter are of fundamental importance for the success of the broadest possible united action.

The overwhelming majority of Australian people desire peace and can be won to fight for it. But these same people are not yet all desirous or prepared to fight for proletarian revolution. And the thing to remember is that if these forces for peace are mobilised, nationally and internationally, war is not inevitable.

Similarly with bourgeois democracy and fascism. It must be kept firmly in mind that not only rank and file people, but Labor leaders and other influential persons can be won to fight for the maintenance of peace and bourgeois democracy. In present

conditions it is utopian to imagine that a successful struggle for Soviet power can be organised, when the forces which would be required to conduct such a struggle have not yet been organised to fight for peace and bourgeois democracy. With our immediate aims clarified we can go forward more boldly and confidently.

The employers and the reactionary governments are intensifying the attack on living standards and democratic rights. It is only necessary to quote the seamen, the mining, metal and rail industries, together with the attempt to declare our Party illegal. In face of these attacks the workers are becoming ever more resentful and their mood, in addition to showing an ever-increasing desire for united action, also expresses a keen desire for the defeat of the reactionary governments, particularly the Federal Government.

In face of this mood the Labor Party leadership is giving support to many strikes and calling for the defeat of the reactionary governments and the election of Labor governments. At the same time the Labor Party is making many promises if elected to office; particularly does this apply to the New South Wales branch. It is very important to note that the leaders of the latter are concentrating on those industries, such as shipping, mine and rail, where the unions are under militant leadership. The Right-wing leaders, tuning-in to the masses, hope in this way to undermine the militant union leaders, misrepresenting the latter as not wishing the election of a Labor government. The militant union leaders, however, must not only support, but must play a leading role in the campaign to have militant Labor governments elected. In addition to these industries mentioned, the Labor Party has promised to repeal all anti-democratic legislation, the Transport Workers' Licensing Act as applying to seamen and waterside workers, the salary reductions imposed during the years of crisis and to deal with the burning question of a shorter working week.

Our Party has declared its policy to support the election of a Labor government pledged to a militant programme. These specific questions mentioned above are already the basis of a militant programme, and it is now a major task of the Party to be the most active organiser for the defeat of the reactionary governments and the election of Labor governments, pledged to fulfil the above-mentioned promises.

The election of Labor governments, particularly a Federal Labor government, in the present conditions, would strengthen

the economic struggle and be a decided check to the reactionary plans of the Australian finance capitalists, which are leading to fascism

From now on the centre of all of our campaigns relating to economic demands and democratic liberties must be the election of fighting Labor governments.

Further, in every by-election and in municipal elections the Party's forces must lead the way to the defeat of the reactionary candidates. Reactionary candidates must be kept out of the governments and municipal councils and workers' representatives elected, even though the Communists may disagree with these workers' representatives on some questions.

Of course, this is not merely an electoral question, but a part of our whole policy to build the united front struggle against reaction. Such a policy will break down many barriers between the Communist and Labor Party workers, create new enthusiasm for the day-to-day struggle and help raise it to a higher level.

When immediately faced with an election, the Communist Party will seriously consider the raising of finances to help conduct a successful election campaign. At the same time the Party, if unable to reach agreement with the Labor Party leadership, will collect funds to stage its own independent campaign in support of the Labor Party. It is in the workshops and trade unions that the Communists will mainly rally financial support for the Labor Party. But in return for this support the Communist trade union and workshop leaders will demand guarantees on behalf of the workers from the Labor Party. When working for the election of Labor Governments today, we have in mind the growing strike wave and desire for united action. We have in mind the development of this united action to the point where it sweeps the reactionary governments from office and carries into office, on the crest of its wave, a Labor government, a government which on election will give further impetus to the continued offensive of the workers.

The Communist Party does not expect the Labor Party to go forward with a Communist programme, but a broad fighting programme, which all workers, small and middle farmers, city middle-class and other progressive elements will support—a real popular people's front programme to which our Party must make its contribution.

Because the Communist Party sincerely desires to see the Labor Party strengthened as a fighting force we will bend every effort to secure our affiliation to the Labor Party. The Communists will answer with their positive policy and activity every

slander that we are out to "wipe out" the Labor movement. We will get support from every possible trade union, trade union branch, Labor Party organisation, every possible leading and minor trade union and Labor Party functionary for our proposed affiliation. We will give this support the widest possible publicity in order to show the mass support in the Labor movement for unity between the Communist and Labor Parties. This, for us, is no manoeuvre, as often stated by some Labor leaders, but a real desire which we are determined to achieve.

It is perfectly true that the Australian Labor Party leadership is still dominated by Right-wing elements, people who are giving support to mass actions at the present time under pressure of the toilers and who desire anything rather than militant struggle. This is proven by the present attempts in all States on the part of the Right-wing leaders to dominate and split the Labor movement and to drive the militants out of the trade unions. But this is not an expression of the wish of the masses as proven by trade union elections and the voting at important trade union gatherings and Labor Party conferences.

The recognition that the Communists are a sincere force fighting for the unity of the Labor movement is growing at a rapid tempo, while the determination to participate with the Communists in the drive to unity is proceeding in a like manner amongst the Labor Party members.

Our policy will hasten this **Left-wing movement** within the Labor Party and trade unions. At the present time the Left-wing in the Labor Party and those members who are rapidly coming to the Left are as yet uncertain of their position. They are wavering, opposed to the Right-wing, but still distrustful of the Communists.

A strengthening of the Labor Party Left wing will help to ensure the fulfilment of the militant programme if the Labor Party is elected to the government.

Further, our policy will make it easier for both our Party and the Left-wing Labor Party members to combat the dominating, splitting tactics of the Right-wing Labor Party leaders.

It does not follow from what has been written above that the Party will cease to push forward its own independent policy nor forget its ultimate aims. On the contrary, everyone knows that Japanese aggression in China, in addition to conflicting with the interest of the Chinese people, is also conflicting with the interest of American and British imperialism, leading to a war in the Pacific which would threaten Australian independence.

No one is so stupid as to imagine that in the event of such a

war Australia will not be involved; therefore, in relation to the war danger, so long as the official Labor Party policy is "neutrality and splendid isolation," and so long as the Labor Party leadership refuses to recognise that if Australia is to be kept out of war, war must be kept out of the world and out of the Pacific in particular, there can be no basis for unity on this question and the Party must intensify its campaign against the fascist and Japanese militarist instigators of war, and those elements in Australia and Britain who give direct or indirect support to these war instigators, with the aim of winning the Labor Party majority to our position. And this is by no means impossible. Large sections of the Labor Party are in disagreement with the official position, both as between State branches and within the latter. Further, whilst not deserting its original neutrality position, the Labor Party leadership took quite a different attitude to the Rhineland issue in comparison with the Italian aggression in Abyssinia. On the Rhineland issue there was expressed opposition to Hitler's aggression and the previous slanders of the Communists as "imperialist war-mongers" was absent, whilst on a couple of occasions in *The Labor Daily* the role of the Soviet Union as a force for peace was admitted. The Labor Party leadership is becoming uneasy and uncertain as to where its policy of "neutrality and splendid isolation" is leading it.

On the other hand, the reactionary Federal Government is an open enemy of peace. As a junior partner of British imperialism it has helped Hitler to pursue his aggressive, warmongering aims. So it is clear that this government must be defeated.

Further, our Party, by boldly supporting the election of Labor governments, will under no circumstances tail behind the Labor Party. We are a vanguard party, and as such will by independent activity lead the campaigns for such elections. Neither does our policy mean that we will cease endeavoring to have Communists elected to parliaments and municipal councils. We will endeavor to reach agreement with the Labor Party whereby Communists will not be opposed by Labor Party candidates. If this is not possible we may decide to stand a few Communist candidates in opposition to Labor Party candidates, but only on occasions where we have a chance of success and where a split vote will not allow the election of a reactionary candidate.

On such occasions it will be necessary seriously to consider who the Labor Party candidate is, and when we decide to put forward our independent candidate, our election campaign must be dominated by a positive policy, so that the workers will understand why we support the election of a Labor government while

at the same time putting forward a few or even one Communist candidate.

With these tasks being fulfilled, the Australian Labor movement will strengthen. New forces will be drawn into political life. The Labor Party will grow, which will be a good thing, as such strengthening deals a blow at reaction. The Communist Party will grow at a pace unheard of previously. The united fighting forces of the workers and middle classes will be welded in opposition to finance capital, in defence of living standards, democratic liberties and peace.

Marxism and Art

By LUNACHARSKY

ACCORDING to Marxism as a theory of the development of human society, art is a definite superstructure upon the mutual relations between men engaged in productive processes, relations which are themselves determined by the forms of labor prevailing in a given period. Art appears as a superstructure on this economic foundation in two ways: first as part of industry itself, and secondly as an ideology.

Art has played an important role in the life of humanity, from the most primitive times until the present, as a specific tendency in the whole of human production. Perhaps nothing can be found among the products of human labor where every detail—such as color, form, etc., is dictated exclusively by utilitarian motives. If we take any object, be it a book or a building, a cup or a lamp-post, and consider its basic outlines, it will be seen that these outlines cannot be explained merely on the grounds of usefulness. Harmonious proportions without doubt evoke pleasure in the spectator, regardless of utility. This is the simplest aspect of the question; but, even on a more complicated scale, it is impossible to find any human product which does not bear some trace of the desire to beautify—to polish, glaze and color objects of use. It is clear that man has a powerful tendency to combine in the products he creates not only purely utilitarian aspects, but also aesthetic ones. In the long run this tendency is connected with our senses. We know that there are pleasant and unpleasant sounds and colors. Man always attempts to make his productions pleasant, attractive, interesting.

Naturally, aesthetic taste varies from people to people, from period to period. One of the most interesting tasks would be to investigate the roots of all the different styles in art. Why, for example, Chinese art, which evokes such pleasure, is so different from Greek art. It would be interesting to analyse the evolution of French furniture, to discover why the pomp of Louis XIV. develops into the solid severity of the Louis XVI. style; then the graceful austerity of the revolutionary style; then into the harmonious discipline of the imposing Empire style. Only Marxism can discover the true causes of the endless variety of style in art. But for this purpose Marxism must investigate not only the social order of a given period, and the traditions of preceding periods, but also the prevailing technical equipment.

Art, however, is not only an aspect of work, it is an ideology. From the Marxian viewpoint, an ideology is a systematic reflection of all life as it appears to human consciousness, which fills the entire conscious life of mankind. Human consciousness takes form in individual, momentary, isolated thoughts; but when these ideas and feelings begin to crystallise they become ideologies.

Various sociological schools which existed before Marxism or alongside of it taught that the organisation of thought and feeling is an independent process, and even that this idealistic process is the very essence of human life; they believed that human society first organises its thought and feeling through its great specialists, the thinkers and artists, and then proceeds to organise its environment according to the theories evolved by these intellectual specialists. Marxism, however, has shown that the opposite is true. Ideologies grow out of realities and bear the earmarks of this reality. Every ideology receives its material from reality, the actual forms of reality control the ideas and intuitions of the thinker, who cannot ever free himself from definite social interests. The thinker is always tendentious; that is, he always seeks to organise his material towards a definite end.

More than that: Marxism points out that society is divided into antagonistic social classes, which struggle against each other. In this sense, classes are groups of people, participating in the process of production, who occupy different positions in production, and different attitudes towards production, and therefore have quite different interests, such as, for example, the landowners, the bourgeoisie, the peasantry, the proletariat.

When a Marxist speaks of the class character of ideas, he is not content with merely saying that every system of ideas belongs to this or that basic class, to the ruling class, or to the class struggling for power, or to the class under domination. Marxian analysis goes further: it seeks to determine the relations between various legal theories, philosophic systems, religious teachings and schools of art and the various groups within the basic classes, or even intermediary classes in society. Often a given society is extremely complicated. It is a crime against true Marxism to take ideological phenomena and explain them by the interests of only one of the important classes. The history of ideas is entirely rooted in the history of society, and, as the evolution of human society is varied and complex, ideologies are equally varied and complex. Furthermore, while Marxism

denies that ideologies play the dominant role in the evolution of society, it does not deny the importance of ideologies. When social classes create their legal systems, their religions, their philosophy, their morals, their art, they are not wasting energy. This is no reflection of reality in various mirrors. These reflections themselves become social forces; they become banners and slogans around which the social class gathers, with the aid of which it fights its enemies and recruits among them its agents and vassals.

Art plays a prominent role among the ideologies. To a certain degree it is the organiser of social thought. In itself it is a special medium for apprehending reality. Science, which seeks to be accurate and objective, helps us to apprehend reality in another way. But scientific knowledge is abstract; it says nothing to human emotion. In order to understand any aspect of reality thoroughly it is not enough to have merely an intellectual concept of it; it is also necessary to have an emotional attitude towards it. This attitude finds expression in ethics and aesthetics. It is possible, for instance, to know something about the Russian peasants from statistical reports; but it is quite another matter to become acquainted with the Russian peasants through the works of a novelist like Uspensky.

[CONTINUED ON PAGE 59]

Australia's Fights for Democracy, Freedom, and Progress

By J. N. RAWLING

XII.—Australia's First Socialist

THIS series does not aim at being chronological. So we now jump from the 'twenties to the 'eighties and 'nineties—from the struggle for free speech and trial by jury to the dawn of Socialism in Australia. In 1893 there left Australia a shipload of people recruited from all over the country, bound for Paraguay, in South America. That band of pioneers was under the leadership of William Lane, whom I have called Australia's first Socialist, and who was so active in the 'eighties and 'nineties in building unionism and founding Socialism and the Labor movement in Australia—especially in Queensland. In 1893 he led the abovementioned group to South America, with the aim of setting up a model Communist settlement. It is with him and the background behind him that our story has to do.

William Lane was born of Irish parentage at Bristol on September 6, 1861. His father was by no means a radical, and had been a Roman Catholic before leaving Ireland. From Catholicism he went to the opposite extreme and became an Orangeman! In Bristol he was chairman of one of those incongruous bodies, which I understand still exist in England, a Conservative Workingmen's Association! But the environment and traditions of Bristol could not leave the sons at the stage which the father had reached. William was a radical before he came to Australia and settled in Brisbane in 1883.

In Brisbane he worked as a journalist, first of all on a small evening newspaper, *The Observer*, and then on *The Courier*. He was a leader writer and contributor on the latter paper. One who was an associate with him on *The Courier* says that "he had an intense faith in human nature, in the glorious gospel of mate-ship—not as we know those things today, but as they would be existent in a communal settlement, where nothing was known of business competition, the struggle for food and shelter and the cursed lust of gold." (Spencer Browne: *A Journalist's Memories*, p. 76.)

St. Ledger, in his "Australian Socialism," finds it impossible to trace the origins of Socialism in Australia. It had no origins! "It fell like a bolt from the blue; like a comet unheralded" (p. 5). In Australia, he says, there was "absolute class equality." "At the ballot-box all men were not only equal, but had an equal right

to go there, and equal power when they went there." While, economically, the people were "living at a standard of general comfort the highest in all past history," and "in facilities for treading the upward rungs of every ladder in every walk of life, Australia was not only the 'Paradise of the working-man,' but apparently had uttered democracy's last word" (p. 5). So, says St. Ledger, Australian Socialism had no origins—there was no basis for it, there was no necessity for it. It "sprang full-armed from the brain of one man—William Lane" (p. 6).

But, of course, St. Ledger is mistaken. The basis of Socialism was here—in the conditions of life, the poverty, the sweating, the increasing exploitation of labor—none of which the ballot-box had been able to better or to abolish. The 'eighties and 'nineties, too, were decades in which the workers in the older countries were awakening—politically and industrially. Labor and Socialist parties were being formed. In England, the new unionism with its militancy and policy of struggle was superseding the respectable, benefit-society unionism of the 'fifties, 'sixties and 'seventies (e.g., the Dockers' Strike, 1889). In U.S.A. the workers had inaugurated May Day—itsself a challenge, and recognised as a challenge, to capitalism's existence—and baptised it with their blood. In Europe, Marx and Engels had analysed the old society and showed the way to the new; in U.S.A. Bellamy had attempted to picture the new. All this had its influence on Australia. Lane was merely one of the vessels, but a most important one, to bring and pour the theoretical yeast from the old world into the flaccid social mass in the new, to leaven it and give it shape.

Australia, says St. Ledger, "had uttered democracy's last word," and yet—! This is what the *Melbourne Age* (10/4/22) said of the period:

"Thirty years ago the workers' lot was hard and cheerless. Sweating was then an evil that flourished in the land. Wages were low. Hours of labor were tedious. Equality of social place and opportunity was an unrealised ideal. We had a Europe in Australia then."

Thirty years back from 1922 brings us to 1892. Eight years before (March, 1884) the Royal Commission on Working-class Conditions, appointed by the Victorian Government, reported as follows:

"1. Children of eight and nine years of age are employed in our factories.

"2. Many have never seen the inside of a school.

"3. These children are worked ten and twelve hours per day.

"4. Hundreds of young girls are worked ten to fifteen hours per day.

"5. In many places young girls are kept working all night without extra pay.

"6. Eighteen children were found working in one room 11 feet square.

"7. Tailoresses work fourteen and sixteen hours per day for a bare livelihood.

"8. In many places employees are obliged to work for periods beyond the limits of human endurance.

"9. Labor is carried on under physical and moral disadvantages, resulting in premature debility and disease.

"10. There are 20,000 persons now working in Victoria subjected to grievous hardships, working under a system of forced labor, repugnant to every sense of justice and humanity."

These were our fathers and mothers! One employer told the Commission that he paid 1/3 for coats, 8d. for trousers, 8d. for vests—2/7 for making a suit! Shirt makers were paid 2/10 per dozen and "had to provide their own machines and cotton." The Commission took evidence in other States. It was the custom then for clothing stores and factories to employ girls **without** wages—simply for the experience! Inspector Burkett (N.S.W.) told the Commission:

"I have been in this district (Newcastle) nine years, and know firms that have never paid a penny in wages. As soon as a girl asks for wages she is dismissed."

Conditions were bad in every industry. The influx of Chinese and of government-aided immigrants had brought down wages. To most workers in the 'eighties these two factors were the cause of all their ills and the anti-Chinese agitation was so great that the various governments were forced to pass Chinese-exclusion acts. Unemployment was rife and immigration was increasing the amount of unemployment and lowering the wages of those who had work. For example, in connection with one boat-load of immigrants in 1883, it is reported that "engagements were made at wages from £30 to £45 a year, with rations and lodgings (S.M.H., 18/12/'83). The amount of unemployment in Sydney may be gauged from the fact that, from January to October of the same year, there were 3000 applicants, "**other than immigrants,**" from unemployed men for free passes to go to the country to seek work. And the population of Sydney then was not a quarter of a million. Reckoning the immigrant unemployed and those who did not apply (surely at least as many again), we reach the conclusion that in 1883 there was an amount of un-

employment which would be proportionately equivalent to our unemployment figure of 40,000 or 50,000 in the Sydney of today!

And those who did work worked long hours. Butchers' hours were 17 per day for six days a week—a 102-hour week! (S.M.H., 4/12/'83.) Sydney butchers' shops were opened on Sunday mornings!

In the country conditions were worse. With bad food, heavy fines for "bad" work, inhuman sleeping accommodation, high prices for food bought at the stations, the shearer was little better off than a slave. And in the off season he had to seek employment elsewhere—seek but not always find.

All this, says St. Ledger, was democracy's last word! No, it was not. Democracy had many more words to say and was preparing to say them—the awakening democracy of the organised workers, as well as the "democracy" of the Parkes and the Griffiths, which disguised the actual dictatorship of capital. Trades and Labor Councils were set up. Inter-colonial union congresses were held. The 'eighties were a decade of strikes and struggles—and of naked class struggles: Parkes' Nordenfeldt guns guarding scabs in Newcastle and police and troops in action all over Australia!

This, inadequately sketched, was the background of Socialism in Australia, and of Lane, too. Socialism **did** have a background.

Lane was influenced—was saturated with the socialistic thought and literature of Europe. He knew his Marx. He published Bellamy's "Looking Backward" in serial form, commencing with the very first issue of **The Worker**. His imagination was captured also by the communal settlements and Communist experiments that had been made in America (he had lived there) and elsewhere. He advocated the establishment of village settlements in Queensland long before he went to South America.

As a result of his enthusiasm, his ability as a writer and his magnetic personality, Lane soon gathered round him a group of people and "succeeded . . . in establishing the best organised band of workers in Australia and probably in the world." (St. Ledger, p. 11.) Poets and journalists, artists, workers and devoted disciples. Fearless and honest, he was prone to expect the same honesty in everybody else. Fierce hater of tyranny and oppression, he was often moved by impulse rather than reason. The story is told of his receiving a telegram from Brisbane while he was at a congress in Sydney during the 1890 strike, and of his hurriedly calling a friend to leave the congress with him. They strode up George Street and went into Lassetter's store. Lane led the way to the rifle and gun department and began inspecting samples preparatory to ordering some. When he had

cooled down and realised the impracticability of the scheme he had formed in his mind, he showed his friend the telegram, which was to the effect that the Queensland Government had ordered the troops out against the strikers!

Associated with Lane both on *The Courier* and on the two radical papers established by him was **Francis Adams**, the English revolutionary poet. He also was a leader-writer for *The Courier*. Adams, whose songs of protest and revolt are known all over the English-speaking world, was delicate in health, suffering from consumption. He suffered so much that he shot himself in circumstances probably unique. Resolved to end his life he asked his wife for his revolver, which she gave him and then turned her back . . . After the shot, this strong-minded woman tended the lifeless body of her husband and then sent for the doctor and the police! So Francis Adams faced death as bravely as he would have wished. He had written already the couplet that could have served as an epitaph:

"Bury me with clenched hands
And eyes opened wide,
For in storm and struggle I lived,
And in struggle and storm I died."

Lane saw his way clearly before him and set about carrying out his programme. He saw the necessity of winning the unions to Socialism. The unions for the most part claimed to be non-political and the majority were conservative, craft unions. The unskilled and unorganised workers would also have to be won. When all this was done the way would be clear for the return of Labor members to Parliament who would nationalise capitalism out of existence. To carry out the programme he printed and distributed thousands of pamphlets, circulated his paper, *The Boomerang*, and established reading clubs and debating societies. In the pamphlets were contained the fundamentals of the teaching of Marx, of Bellamy, and of other Socialist writers.

His paper, *The Boomerang*, was a great success—journalistically and financially. Reading through its files today we see names that have become famous in Australian literature: Brunton Stephens, Henry Lawson, and so on. *The Boomerang* was filled with a healthy Australian nationalism and was bitterly anti-imperialist. In a cartoon, at the time of Griffiths' Naval Defence Bill, we see an Australian with a blue-flag with the Southern Cross on it and a British naval officer with the white ensign. They are standing at the foot of a flagpole. Says the Australian: "Blow yer White Ensign, we'll have this or nothing." In *The Boomerang*, too, Lane, who always wrote over the

name of John Miller, wrote his series, "*Brisbane Saturday Nights*," in which he portrayed the life of various sections of the population. For future historians and sociologists this series will be invaluable. A cartoon at the time of the centenary celebrations in 1888 struck a sharp note of contrast with the jingoistic boastings of the official celebrants. It showed Justice drawing a curtain over events in Australian history. The caption reads: "For heaven's sake, hide our past." It was a paper such as it described itself: "A live newspaper—racy of the soil."

A One Big Union was desired by William Lane. Capitalism, wage slavery, was the enemy—and unity could defeat it. The first motto on *The Worker* (which made its first appearance, as the "Monthly Journal of Associated Workers of Queensland," on March 1, 1890) was: "**Socialism in our Time**." In one of the earliest issues, Lane outlined the plan for capturing the Queensland Parliament. It was his disillusionment with the Parliamentarians, after he had worked so hard to make Labor representation in Parliament possible, that partly led him to make the experiment of a new Communist settlement in South America. St. Ledger tells a story to illustrate the character of Labor Ministers—how, going outback to their constituencies; they left Brisbane in frock coats, but arrived home in badly-cut sac suits. Their old associates and supporters met them on the station—and lo! the Labor Ministers were still Labor men; they had not changed—they were still "Jack" or "Bill" or "Tom." "Lane was not built that way," says St. Ledger, "and because of that he was suppressed by the very party which he created" (p. 22). The episode, says St. Ledger, "is exactly typical of the whole public attitude of the Labor representatives to Parliament. On the platform he is the raging lion of drastic reform; in Parliament he is a mixture of the sucking-dove in debate and the serpent in tactics. On the platform his predicates are all couched in the categorical imperative; in Parliament they are all confined to the subjunctive indefinite future."

The story of the 1890 strike will have to be told on another occasion. Here we have to state that Lane put body and soul into the struggle and afterwards into the defence of the class-war prisoners. To raise funds for the latter, he wrote and published a novel, "*The Workingman's Paradise*." But he bewailed the cost and suffering of strikes. His alternative was a federation of unions which would present an ultimatum to all employers on a given day and thus, by a mass unity, gain what they wanted. In July, 1890, he put forward the "Slate" proposal. All unions and employees were to prepare "slates" of claims. Then representatives of unions and representatives of employ-

ers were to meet and agree upon the claims. Having made agreements, the workers, upon their honor, were to undertake to stand by them for a certain fixed period. Lane's aim was to clear the way for the consummation of the real task: the abolition of the wages system. Instead of frittering away their strength in periodical strikes, the workers would be able to concentrate upon organising to capture political power. The unions turned down the "Slate" proposals

The first issue of *The Worker* deserves special notice, I think, because of the inspiring note of working-class nationalism that was struck. For that first issue, Francis Adams wrote that fine poem, "Fling Out the Flag." The "Flag" was the Southern Cross—the same Southern Cross raised by the Diggers at Ballarat in '54. The poem deserves to be resurrected and to become more widely known than it is today. Here it is:

FLING OUT THE FLAG!

Fling out the Flag! Let her flap and rise in the rush of the eager air,
 With the ring of the wild swan's wings as she soars from her swamp and her reedy lair.
 Fling out the Flag! And let friend and foe behold, for gain or loss,
 The sign of our faith and the fight we fight, the Stars of the Southern Cross!
 Oh! blue's for the sky that is fair for all, whoever, wherever he be,
 And silver's the light that shines on all for hope and for liberty,
 And that's the desire that burns in our hearts, for ever quenchless and bright,
 And that's the sigh of our flawless faith and the peerless fight we fight!
 What is the wealthiest land on earth, if the millions suffer and cry,
 And all but the happy selfish few would fain curse God and die?
 What are the glorious Arts, as they sit and sing on their jewelled thrones,
 If their hands are wet with blood and their feet befouled with festering bones?
 What are the splendid Sciences, driving Nature with a bit of steel,
 If only the Rich can mount the car and the Poor are dragged at the wheel?
 Wealth is a curse and Art a mock, and Science worse than a lie,
 When they're but the gift of the bloated spawn of the leeches that suck men dry?

Nay, brothers, nay! it is not for this—for a land of wealth and woe,
 That we hoped and trusted all these years, that we toiled and struggled so.
 It is not for a race of taskmasters and pitiful cringing slaves,
 That our strength and skill raised up happy homes and dreamed of fearless graves.
 It is not for a cause that is less than all's, that is not for Truth but a lie,
 That we raise our faces and grip our hands, and lift our voices high,
 As we fling up the Flag that friend and foe may see, for gain or loss,
 The sign of our faith and the fight we fight, the Stars of the Southern Cross!

As the sky above is fair for all, whoever, wherever he be,
 As the blessed stars on all shed their light of hope and of liberty:
 So let the earth, this fertile earth, this well-lined Southern land,
 The fair to all, be free to all, from strand to shining strand!
 Let boy and girl and woman and man in it at least be sure
 That all can earn their daily bread with hearts as proud as pure;
 Let man and woman and girl and boy in it forever be,
 Heirs to the best this world can give, equal, fearless, free!
 Fling out the Flag! Let her flap and rise in the rush of the eager air,
 With the ring of the wild swan's wings as she soars from the swamp and her reedy lair!
 Fling out the Flag! and let friend and foe behold, for gain or loss,
 The sign of our faith and the fight we fight, the Stars of the Southern Cross!
 Oh! Blue's the sky that is fair for all, whoever, wherever he be,
 And Silver's the light that shines on all, for hope and for liberty;
 And that's the desire that burns in our hearts, forever quenchless and bright,
 And that's the sign of our flawless faith, and the glorious fight we fight.

One flaw in Lane's philosophy was his over-much stressing of the part conditions play in determining the actions of men. As a result, he blamed conditions for everything and man became a mere automaton. With such an outlook one is apt to regard the struggle against capitalism as merely one to alter conditions instead of a dynamic war between classes that are made up of individuals with hates and passions, ideals and emotions. We have

to consider capitalism not statically as the mere existence of a particular social and economic order, but dynamically as the active rule by a capitalist class over the mass of the people. Said Lane once:

"It is true that capitalism is heartless and brutal. It is true also that in its development it has produced creatures well-nigh as heartless and brutal as itself, creatures who care little more than it does itself for human flesh and blood, for the moaning of men and the weeping of women, who only live to make profit and whose only pleasure is that which tastes of gold. Yet these creatures are but the product of the infamous system which produces them as it produces likewise thieves and prostitutes; they are as guiltless as the black snake is or the centipede; they are but the effect of conditions, which conditions we workers, because of our brutal ignorance, permit to exist. Let conditions but be changed and the selfish profit monger would go, . . . just as the thief and the prostitute and the rent-robber all would go. If conditions were but favorable we should have a community of brother-men and sister-women working harmoniously together, each endeavouring to do his best . . . It is conditions that are wrong, only conditions at the root" [his emphasis].—The Worker (Brisbane), April, 1890.

As a result of such an outlook he put his faith in Parliament. "In one year," he said, "a people's parliament will give Queensland workers more justice than can be wrung from capitalistic parliaments in a generation." Disillusion with parliament, and disappointed by the defeats on the industrial field, coupled with the utopian tinge to his social philosophy, led him to seek a way out of the impasse to which he had been brought. The way that he chose was not that of re-forging the blunted weapons of unionism and industrial action, nor that of fighting the reactionary Labor politicians for the control of the Labor parliamentary machine, which he did so much to create. Instead he fled—fled with good intentions—to found a new world. He was to be a new Noah. The old world was dead. He and his ark-load of fellow-survivors set sail on July 16, 1893. The new Ararat was a strip of land given to them by the Government of Paraguay, where they founded their "New Australia."

"New Australia" and its offshoot, "Cosme," failed as Communist experiments and many causes are given for their failure. But the real cause lies in the unreal and unscientific character of the attempt. It is quite possible for a group to withdraw themselves from the world and live a communal life. It has been done. But its success depends to the greater extent upon the

character of the participants. The commune can soon and easily be wrecked by a few. So dissensions soon broke out in New Australia and some had to be expelled, with the aid of the Paraguayan police. Then Lane was deposed from his position as leader and, together with 46 others, he founded "Cosme." And, after all, would not the appeal to leave the stress and storm and disillusionment in order to find a haven of refuge be an appeal to selfishness? In any case, it was proved to Lane that it is not merely the conditions that have to be taken into account, but the people as well. The conditions in Paraguay were equality and a new country to be pioneered. The conditions found the people wanting, the "communism" failed—but the individualist colony that succeeded it flourished and still exists.

But the attempt to found a Communist settlement was unscientific and therefore doomed to failure. Going back to a peasant commune was turning the clock backward, not forward. Communism means something else besides mere idealistic longings for sweet brotherhood and Quakerish sentimentalism. Communism is that form of society in which the machinery of production and its products belong to all the people in proportion to their needs. On a small stage you can have Communism in a primitive community. But the existence of Communism is impossible on a wide scale until the means of production, of transportation, of communication, of distribution have been developed on a mass basis. The work of development to that stage is the work of the modern industrial working class, as they are organized in the factory system. The whole apparatus may be socialised almost at any point in that development; but Communism cannot come, even after the seizure of power, until the industrial life of a country becomes automatic—until the struggle for existence has ceased and our life as human beings really begun.

So the trip to Paraguay was a trip backward in history! I want here to quote two criticisms of the project that were published at the time, both very apt. The first is from *The Revolt*, an Anarchist paper published in Sydney at the time and probably written by J. A. Andrews, the Anarchist:

"NEW AUSTRALIA

"Here we have much that is instructive. First, a number of folk join a scheme of Socialist colonisation, having but a passing acquaintance with the principles to which they are giving adherence. Next, devoid of inspiration themselves, they run after Lane and his promise of a better land like a flock of cows after a hay waggon, leaving the new society to his manufacture, in-

stead of recognising that it is an affair of expressing their ideals in their relations with each other. Then his personal influence having to do duty for their initiative, he drops into the easy error of forgetting that their personal needs and purposes must be the basis of operations, and aims rather to make them actors in a mere drama of society. Then influence becomes constituted authority, and they blame Lane on finding themselves mere puppets!" (*The Revolt*, May, 1893.)

The other is from the pen of no less a person than Peter Kropotkin, and was republished in the same issue of *The Revolt*. The great Anarchist said:

"The fact that men and women, who have made Australia what it is, are compelled to migrate from it speak volumes in itself. 'Make the land, be the dung that renders it productive, build the centres of civilisation which render it valuable—and go away!' That is a true picture of modern capitalist management." If New Australia succeeded, he said, it would merely become "a refuge for those who have abandoned the battle which has to be fought face to face with the enemy."

With that we can leave New Australia.

But Lane himself was dead! The old militant Lane was killed in 1893. What went to Paraguay was a dreamer, an enthusiast, a zealot. What came back to Australia was only a shell. The Lane that went to New Zealand was no longer a Socialist—but an ardent imperialist, an editor of a capitalist newspaper. The real Lane died many years ago—the William Lane who took his place died in 1917, in the middle of the Great War, in which his son was sacrificed on behalf of the same British imperialism which he so fiercely denounced twenty years before. Let us simply remember the Lane of *The Boomerang*, of *The Worker*, of "Brisbane's Saturday Nights"—the man with a vision!

And the message of that man of vision rings as true and with as clarion a call as when he uttered it:

"The only political action Labor can take is directly to attack the competitive system, and openly commence a campaign which will not cease till capitalism, that is, the private holding by a few of the means whereby all must live, is no more."—*The Worker* (7/8/91).

"Together, you are all powerful, workers of Queensland, workers of Australia, workers of the world. Together you can be free men and women, citizens of a free land, never needing to crave from a fellow-man permission to earn a bare living, by making somebody else richer; never needing to feel the bitterness of unemployment; never needing to shrink at the thought that those you love may want." (To be continued)

AGAINST COLONIAL OPPRESSION

Palestine in Uproar

By MAX ZIMMERING

FOR over two months now the heroic insurrection of the Arab people has been proceeding. For over two months a whole people has been in almost complete general strike against its imperialist exploiters and their Zionist allies. Almost no day passes without news of bloody collisions between the native Arab inhabitants on the one hand and the British and Zionist military and police forces on the other. Despite all the measures of repression adopted and despite the rejection of the Arab demands by the imperialist government of the London negotiations, the Arab movement shows no signs of dying down and insists now, as before, upon its rights.

Palestine, which was conquered during the world war by the British forces, with the assistance of a Jewish volunteer army, was formerly in the possession of the Turks. When the world was redivided after the war, it fell to its conquerors as mandated territory. For the British Empire, Palestine means not only an important strategical basis for the domination of the East but also an approach to Iraq and its oil which is being sent across the desert to Haifa through a pipeline which was completed in 1935 and which is indispensable to British imperialism in the event of war: without adequate supplies of oil there can be no victory. Iraq oil is therefore one of the most important, perhaps the most important, sources of strength for British imperialism in case of war. Partly in order to win the sympathy of certain influential Jewish circles, but chiefly in order to counteract the steadily increasing danger of an Arab revolt, the British Government issued the famous **Balfour Declaration**, opening Palestine for Jewish colonisation. British imperialism promised itself, not without reason, a strengthening of its hold on Palestine in this fashion, whilst many Jews, ruined by the crisis and persecuted on account of their race, believed that at last they had found a national home, or, as the Basle programme of the Zionists put it, "an internationally recognised and guaranteed national home." Necessity often blinds its victims to factors they would otherwise recognise quickly enough, and the Zionist Jews refused to recognise the impossibility of peaceably colonising an area in itself small and barren and occupied to the last acre by native Arab inhabitants, very many of whom were themselves land-

hungry peasants. Palestine is a country of 24,000 square kilometres, of which the half is mountainous land which cannot be cultivated.

Thanks to the Balfour Declaration and the widespread Zionist colonisation which followed it, which was justly resisted by the native Arab population, the Zionists were from the beginning bound to the chariot of British imperialism. The tension between Jewish colonists and native Arabs was therefore present from the very beginning.

The colonisation period from 1918 until 1932 was not very successful, either economically or politically. Despite the investment of enormous sums, the Zionists did not succeed in raising the Jewish population in Palestine to more than 200,000. Even according to Zionist statistics 80 per cent. of these people lived in the towns and their social stratification was not much different from that which prevails amongst the Jewish population of the Eastern European countries. In short periods of prosperity the immigration figures rose, but in the following years of crisis it often fell below the emigration figures. Following on the disturbances in 1929 the influence of the Zionists in the countries outside of Palestine decreased also very considerably, on account of the fact that the Jewish working youth and a section of the Jewish intelligentsia tended more and more strongly towards the revolutionary working-class movement. It was the accession of Hitler to power in Germany which gave Zionism a new lease of life. Owing to the growing anti-Semitic movement in Germany and a number of other countries, the nationalist-chauvinist movement amongst the Jews received a new impetus. The economic harrying of the Jews in Germany caused many tens of thousands of German Jews, both toilers and capitalists, to seek a haven of refuge in Palestine. The Jewish emigration from Germany to Palestine also brought enormous sums of capital into the country, which had to be invested. Houses and a number of factories were built. Palestine experienced a boom-period without parallel and it lasted almost three years. And this boom-period, which was chiefly a building boom, had its effect in attracting thousands of new Jewish immigrants, chiefly from the Eastern European countries. The annual immigration figures rose to over 50,000. By the end of 1935, 300,000 Jews were already in Palestine. Whilst the Zionists were doing their best to increase the Jewish population figures as quickly as possible, the native Arab population, which still represented over 70 per cent. of the population of the country, was not idle, and Palestine became the scene of a permanent little war between

Arab felaheen and the Zionists. The felaheen, who are for the most part only leaseholders, were compelled to observe the Arab landowners selling the land they, the Felaheen, had cultivated very often for hundreds of years, to the Zionist land speculators at usurious prices. Mostly the British police had to interfere to drive the landless leaseholders from the land and make possible the settlement of the new Jewish colonists. However, this little war threatened to extend to greater proportions, and every few years insurrections and bloody collisions took place. Eighteen years have passed since the end of the world war, and in this comparatively short period the Arabs have revolted five times.

Although the Arabs clearly demonstrated their hostility to Zionist colonisation in their country, and, although innumerable innocent Jews, misled by the Zionist leaders, were sacrificed on the altar of Zionism, the leaders of Zionism refused to abandon their imperialist course. The Zionist leaders were not content with expropriating the Arab felaheen, but they also conducted an aggressive struggle against the Arab workers. This struggle is conducted under the slogan "Kibbusch Avodah," meaning the winning of all work for the Jews by the Histadruth, the general organisation of Zionist trade unions, which also numbers employers amongst its members, and which occupies a monopolist position on the Jewish labor market in Palestine. Apart from propaganda to force the Arab workers out of their jobs, open terrorism is also used. Each member of the Histadruth must take part for at least two days in the work of the Zionist Kibbusch terror groups or contribute two days' wages to the Kibbusch Avodah funds. The Histadruth uses two arguments to cloak its terrorist activities: first of all it declares that the Arab workers depress wage levels, and secondly it calls for a struggle against "the Horans." The Horans are members of a semi-Nomadic tribe from Transjordan, and prior to the Jewish colonisation they lived for a time in Palestine. The arbitrary frontiers, fixed by the imperialists, first made their right to live in Palestine disputable, but, even assuming that the Horans are really "foreigners" in Palestine, the Zionist argument has still no weight because, according to the statistics of the pro-Zionist "Bourse Egyptienne" (which are in any case exaggerated), there are only 10,000 Horans in Palestine, and in practice the Kibbusch Avodah makes no distinction between the Horans and the ordinary Arab workers. The argument that the Arab workers depress wages standards is also valueless because, instead of assisting the Arab workers to fight for higher wages, the Histadruth

ruth uses the Kibbusch Avodah funds in order to make possible the undercutting of the wages of Arab workers by Jewish workers. The Histadruth then pays such workers a subsidy from the Kibbusch Avodah funds.

In order to carry through their annexionist plans without let or hindrance, the Zionist leaders have been successful in sabotaging the appointment of the "Legislative Council," demanded by the Arabs. Only in 1935 the British government agreed to the appointment of such a council, and even then it agreed only under the pressure of the awakening national-revolutionary movement in Palestine, which received new impetus from the heroic struggle of the Abyssinians for their national freedom. This so-called "parliament," which has been thrown as a sop to the Arabs, is to consist of 24 members: 12 Arabs, 7 British representatives and 5 Jews. This composition effectively prevents the adoption of any Arab demands against the will of the British representatives and the Jews, because the casting vote will lie in the hands of the president of the Council, who will, of course, be appointed by the British. However, in order to make certain double sure, the powers of the proposed Legislative Council are to be subjected to further limitations. Such important questions as immigration, land transfer and the Budget will not lie within the competence of this "Legislative Council." All the decisions of this body will be no more than proposed drafts of laws. The final decision as to whether such proposals become law or not will lie in the hands of the High Commissioner Wauchope. The proposal to found such a powerless pseudo-parliament naturally caused much indignation amongst the Arabs. But the Zionists also opposed the idea with their old argumentation: so long as the Jews in Palestine represent a minority of the population the country should not be given normal parliamentary institutions. This argument demonstrates clearly the intentions of the Zionists to exclude the Arabs from any say in determining the fate of their country.

Whilst the discussions on the proposed Legislative Council were exciting the populace, whilst the Italo-Abyssinian war was having its effect on Palestine, which is not far removed from the seat of war, and intensifying the beginning of the economic crisis tremendously, a new event occurred: the Jaffa police discovered traces of a great "mysterious" conspiracy for the smuggling of arms. It is noteworthy that the arms in question came originally from Germany. They represented a value of over £30,000 sterling. The police found the weapons, but they were

unable to find the owners, though the accompanying circumstances gave rise to the suspicion that they were intended for the Zionist defence organisation, "Haganah," which was at that time still illegal.

The Arab national movement answered this smuggling of arms with the proclamation of a **general strike**, which was, however, recognised by only very few workers, and those mostly in Jaffa. Following on this rather unsuccessful attempt on the part of the Arabs came a period of apparent quiet. However, a series of economic strikes, conducted by the Arab workers, indicated their growing social and political consciousness. During the course of 1935, the Arab workers conducted a series of successful strikes, including the strike of 600 workers of the Iraq Petrol Co. in Haifa.

Despite the apparent quiet, it was clear to everyone who was acquainted with the conditions in Palestine that it needed only some outside incident to produce a new explosion. On April 16, 1936, a Jew was murdered by Arabs, but as on the very next day two Arabs were murdered and their bodies robbed, it was quite clear that the crimes had been committed by some Arab robber band. This opinion was also generally held amongst the Jewish population. Whereas the Arabs buried their two dead in private and without any great pomp, the Zionists suddenly declared that the murder of the Jew was a political act and turned his burial into a chauvinist anti-Arab demonstration. The Hebrew newspapers then began to whip up a campaign against the Arab "shame" in Tel Aviv, and naturally the consequences were not long in making themselves felt. Near the famous Jewish orange colony, Petach Tikwah, two Arabs were murdered. In Tel Aviv a campaign, carried out an anti-Arab pogrom: Tel Aviv was cleaned of Arabs, Arab drivers and shoe cleaners were beaten up and the shops of Arabs plundered and their goods and equipment destroyed. The answer of the Arabs was the famous **demonstration** between Jaffa to Tel Aviv on April 19, which led to bloody collisions between the Jews and the Arabs, and both and the British forces. Eleven persons (Jews and Arabs) were killed in the first collision and over fifty wounded.

The first blow of the Arabs was naturally directed against the Jews, because for the politically untrained and mostly illiterate Arabs, Zionism is the visible expression of imperialist oppression. Although the illegal **Communist Party**, which recruits both Jewish and Arab members, has always conducted a steadfast struggle for fraternisation between the Jewish and Arab toilers,

and sought to direct the attention of both to the chief source of oppression, namely British imperialism, the Zionists of all shades have always done their utmost to counteract these efforts of the Jewish and Arab Communists. Despite the misrepresentation of the Zionists, the general strike was proclaimed not by the reactionary landowners grouped around the Mufti and the Naschaschibi, but by the Left-wing **national-revolutionary Istaklall**, which has its headquarters in **Nablus**. The leaders of the feudal strata of the Arabs, who are allied with the imperialists who have sent their fortunes to Egypt or placed their money in Jewish banks for fear of confiscatory measures on the part of the revolutionary movement and who have sold the land on which the Arab leaseholders work to the Zionist colonisers, joined the movement only under mass pressure, a fact which they have admitted fairly openly in public declarations. The Arab insurrectionary movement is directing its forces more and more clearly against the mandate government. Every day police stations and barracks are being stormed. Telegraph lines have been destroyed for miles. Railway tracks have been destroyed, attacks on railway trains are daily occurrences, bridges are flying into the air by explosions, and barricades are increasing on the streets to stop the movement of troops. Mass demonstrations have taken place in Jaffa, Nablus, Asa, Barsebag, Ramalah, Nazareth, Tiberias, Tulkarem and Sefeth, and tens of thousands of Arabs were present at them. However, demonstrations and acts of individual terror were not all. The struggle quickly began to take on organised forms, and even the government communications speak of battles with the Arabs which lasted for hours and in which not always the better-armed English troops were the victors. The use of armoured cars, tanks and aeroplanes speaks volumes.

A most important feature of the present struggle is the widespread guerilla struggle which has now taken on organised forms. However, today these guerilla groups are recruited chiefly from amongst Felaheen, who have felt the pressure of Zionist colonisation directly, and therefore their struggle is directed chiefly against the Jewish colonies. Amongst the urban population the struggle is being conducted on a more mature stage: for instance, at their last conference the **students** adopted clear anti-imperialist slogans: national freedom, the right of self-determination, a democratic people's parliament, no imperialist taxation, a boycott of imperialism and Zionism, and freedom for all political prisoners. In **Akko** the whole town demonstrated under the leadership of the mayor. The maturity of the Arab revolutionary movement is also beginning to show itself in the increasing class

differentiation. At the preparatory conference for the Arab Workers' Conference, not only the Communists, but also the Left-wing National Revolutionaries under the leadership of **Chamdi Hussein**, spoke in favor of class organisations for the workers, whilst the organisations under the influence of Naschaschibi and the Muftis demanded joint organisations of the workers and the employers. School children are also being brought into the anti-imperialist struggle. In Jaffa the school children demonstrated in front of the government buildings, armed with wooden rifles and shouting anti-English slogans. Only after brutal intervention on the part of the police could they be dispersed. The clear-cut attitude of **the Communist Party of Great Britain** and the questions of **Gallacher** in parliament have done much to enlighten the Arab masses and extend the influence of the Communist Movement. Another evidence of the increased maturity of the Arab national movement is the disappearance of the religious differences between the Moslem and Christian Arabs, who have taken part jointly in the political meetings into which the religious services in the mosques have developed.

The persistent and united struggle of the Arab people has shown British imperialism that a force is growing up which represents a serious danger to its position in Palestine. British imperialism is therefore not content to crush the insurrection with force of arms, but it is also showing its unyielding attitude by exerting economic pressure and by making further concessions to the Jews, such as the legalisation of the Zionist immigration quota and the opening of a harbour in Tel Aviv, which will ruin Jaffa economically. Further, various villages are being burdened with collective fines, and all employees and officials who have taken part in the general strike are regarded as dismissed, whilst shopkeepers, etc., who take part in the strike are being threatened with imprisonment and the loss of their licences. The police terror has also reached a pitch of fury unparalleled in Palestine. **Three concentration camps have been established.** Over 2000 Arabs have been arrested and the number of arrested Jewish Communists is already several hundred. National revolutionaries and Communists are being banished to remote villages, tortured and beaten to death. Even women are being tortured in the most disgraceful manner. Lately, also, the death sentence and imprisonment for life for terrorists have been threatened.

Although British tanks and aeroplanes are still victorious over

Arab rifles, the Arab anti-imperialist movement cannot be held up. Even the Arab police are beginning to let themselves be misused against their fighting brothers. In Haifa the Vice-Governor, Hodgkin, has resigned and declared himself publicly in solidarity with the Arabs, and is now negotiating with lawyers for the defence of arrested Communists.

Palestine is in revolt. The revolutionary movement is increasing, not only in size but also in clarity, whilst the Zionists are still persisting in their imperialist course. In Jaffa leaflets are being distributed, declaring: "For every murdered Jew we shall kill three Arabs." In Haifa, a leaflet in Hebrew, German and Polish has been distributed. We quote literally:

"Any Jewish woman who has relations with an Arab, or is seen in public with an Arab, will be held up to public contempt. Jewish women showing themselves with Arabs in public will be photographed and called to order."

Who does not think immediately of the campaign of race hatred pursued by the Nazis against the Jews in Germany? And now let us compare that with an appeal issued by the Tel Aviv Communists.

"Workers, the Communist Party has always pointed out that the Zionists are turning the masses into a force to suppress the movement of the Arab people for freedom. The Communist Party has always fought for the fraternisation of the Jewish and Arab masses for a joint struggle against imperialism. We appeal to the Jewish masses for a struggle against Zionism and against the Kibbusch Avodah. This joint struggle will give the Jewish masses the rights of a national minority in a Palestine freed from imperialism. The fascists are making a mistake when they think that they can place the blame on the shoulders of the Communist Party by their provocations. With proletarian courage we shall prove to the masses who are the real culprits responsible for the recent race riots. The main responsibility rests on the imperialist and Zionist policy in Palestine."

Two leaflets and two languages. Imperialist reaction and anti-imperialist movement for freedom are facing each other. Let them abuse the Arabs as bandits and the Jewish Communists as pogrom inciters, because they tell the truth about the situation and demand a united front between the Arab and Jewish toilers in order to save the Jews in Palestine from a catastrophe, but the struggle for the emancipation of Palestine from imperialist oppression cannot be crushed.

ORGANISATIONAL NOTES

Financial Unionism

By E. KNIGHT

The following is an extract from a speech recently delivered to a meeting of Party functionaries in District 1:

THE question with which I want to deal is that of financial unionism. While there has been an improvement in many respects regarding this, there is still much to be done. A review of the financial status of many members of the trade unions shows there is still a huge unfinancial membership running into many thousands. In addition, there are many workers—male and female—who are not organised in any union whatever. This is of tremendous importance to us as Communists, because, after all, do we not recognise the political necessity of organising the workers? Do we not agree that the trade unions provide the base for uniting the workers? Marx classed the unions as organising centres for the working class, and he also taught that the political party of the proletariat must define the economic tasks and lead the trade union organisations.

Without strong trade unions, organisation of the workers to destroy capitalism and establish Socialism becomes an impossibility. Therefore we must see in the organising for financial unionism that we are preparing the workers—not only for the struggle to improve their economic conditions—but also for the final struggle against capitalism.

Marx also taught that the tasks for the unions were the complete emancipation of the working class—the support of every social-political movement and drawing every worker into their ranks.

Let us read what Engels has to say on this: "The active resistance of the English workingmen has its effect in holding the money-greed of the bourgeoisie within certain limits, and keeping alive the opposition of the workers to the social and political omnipotence of the bourgeoisie, while it compels the admission that something more is needed than trade unions and strikes to break the power of the ruling class. But what gives these unions and the strikes arising from them their real importance is this, that they are the first attempt of the workers to abolish competition. They imply the recognition of the fact that the supremacy of the bourgeoisie is based wholly upon the competition of the workers among themselves, i.e., upon their want of cohesion. And precisely because the unions direct themselves

against the vital nerve of the present social order, however one-sidedly, in however narrow a way, are they so dangerous to this social order. The workmen cannot attack the bourgeoisie and with it the whole existing order of society at any sorer point than this. If the competition of the workers among themselves is destroyed, if all determine not to be further exploited by the bourgeoisie, the rule of property is at an end. Wages depend upon the relation of demand to supply, upon the accidental state of the labor market, simply because the workers have hitherto been content to be treated as chattels, to be bought and sold." And Engels goes on to say that, having once started, "necessity compels them to go farther, to abolish not only one kind of competition, but competition itself altogether, and this they will do." Here we see that the trade unions should be a lever in the hands of the workers in the struggle for political power.

In this quotation, we see what should be considered to be the very basis of trade unionism. Even a recognition of this is not sufficient. The basic task is to build the unions. Consequently the development of financial unionism assumes greater and greater importance.

To merely treat 100 per cent. financial unionism as an abstract slogan will not improve the organisation of the workers, nor will it bring about a true recognition of the real value of the unions. To merely shout "Every worker a financial unionist" and "You owe a duty to your class, your wives and children" savors too much of the talk of insurance salesmen, and has a tendency to promote the feeling that the unions are like the tradespeople—something that has to be paid; whereas the idea that should be promulgated and sunk deep into the minds of the members is that the unions are their organisations, a part of their lives. To rely on the slogan "100 per cent. financial unionism" is ineffective. Organisation is necessary to make it a reality.

I want to give a few experiences to illustrate the effectiveness of organisation and demonstrating to the workers that the unions can secure an improvement in their conditions.

At C—, the percentage of financial membership in the A.R.U. sub-branch was very low until the advent of a militant secretary. This comrade set about to improve the position. He did not depend on just appealing to the members to make themselves financial, but instead commenced an investigation into conditions.

By securing improvements first in one place and then in another, he was able by practical demonstration to show the

value of the union; and as a result, a number of those who were unfinancial commenced to make themselves good on the books. The outcome was a decided improvement in the financial percentage. Later the success of this was demonstrated when an appeal was made to the A.F.U.L.E. for closer unity. The example of efficient unionism had been given and consequently the active A.F.U.L.E. members desired to have close contact with it, and so a closer unity committee was established.

At White Bay, on the initiative of the Party unit, the shop committee decided to conduct a campaign for financial unionism in the power station. Arrangements were made for the secretaries of the A.R.U. and Ironworkers to address a meeting of the whole of the employees. At this meeting instances were given of the work of the unions.

The demands that had been secured, such as the 44-hour week, awards, compensation payments, etc., were stressed. Then it was shown how finance and organisation were necessary to the unions. The shop committee followed this up by calling a meeting of all shop stewards to formulate plans to carry on the campaign. The main points of the speeches delivered at the meeting were noted and these were used to bring home to the workers what the unions were able to accomplish, and stress laid on the fact that, with all united in the unions, still greater successes would be achieved. Reports from White Bay state that there has been a marked improvement in regard to the unions, and many of the unfinancial members have commenced to pay off their arrears.

Another good organisational move which might be noted and similarly utilised in other shops, depots, and workplaces was the initiation of unity between the representatives of two unions. It is a well-known fact that a keen competition has existed between the A.R.U. and the Ironworkers for members in the railway workshops. This has led to "body snatching" and other similar evils. The shop committee specified that it wanted every man in a union other than the N.U.R. It did not name the unions to which the men should belong.

The difficulty of "body snatching" by reps. of the two unions mentioned was quickly overcome. In recruiting, the workers were asked to join a union. The Ironworkers' rep. carried tickets for his union and also A.R.U. tickets. If he had reservations concerning the Ironworkers, then the rep. of that union asked him to join the A.R.U. Similar action was taken by the A.R.U. rep. Here was a classical example of two lower functionaries

carrying on a campaign for financial unionism, and at the same time initiating closer unity on an elementary scale.

We have another example of good work by a Communist shop committee secretary in this campaign for financial unionism. Carrying the campaign and the decisions of his fraction into his shop committee, he was instructed to write to the different unions, outlining the proposals of the shop committee, and inviting assistance. One of these eventually reached the Ironworkers' Union. So well did he put his case that the union declared in favor of the shop committee and instructed all its delegates to take part in shop committee activities. In addition, one of the members of the union stated that he knew the writer of the letter was a Communist, but he was also a good unionist, and the speaker was prepared to work with him on all shop committee and trade union matters. Here was an example of a Communist, while being regarded as such, raising the prestige of both himself and the Party by his trade union work. Such examples as I have given go to prove that where the question of financial unionism is tackled in a practical fashion, then there will be a response from the workers. However, there must be no separation of the daily economic problems from that of financial unionism.

Comrade Dimitrov, at the Seventh World Congress of the Communist International, said: "What is and ought to be the basic content of the united front at the present stage? The defence of the immediate economic and political interests of the working class, the defence of the working class against Fascism, must form the starting point and main content of the united front in all capitalist countries.

"We must not confine ourselves to bare appeals to struggle for the proletarian dictatorship, but must also find and advance those slogans and forms of struggle which arise out of the vital needs of the masses, and are commensurate with their fighting capacity at the given stage of development.

"First, joint struggle really to shift the burden of the consequences of the crisis on to the shoulders of the ruling classes, the shoulders of the capitalists, landlords—in a word, to the shoulders of the rich."

Lenin taught us that the economic questions were of vital importance in developing the political education of the workers. The Eleventh Congress of the Australian Party laid down as one of our tasks the building of committees in work places for the purpose of compiling information concerning speed-up, rationalisation, and displacement of labor.

Here I want to propose some organisational measures which may be put into operation, particularly in places where shop committees exist and where our fractions are able to exercise an influence:—

(1) The shop committees to call all job stewards together to plan the campaign for 100 per cent. union shop.

(2) To propose to the job stewards that they, in conjunction with the shop committee, shall conduct a show of tickets on a certain date.

(3) The names of financial, unfinancial and non-unionists to be tabulated for the purpose of posting them in the shop at a later date.

(4) The assistance of leading trade union officials be sought in conducting propaganda meetings in support of the campaign for financial unionism.

(5) The establishment of committees as outlined by the Eleventh Congress.

Shop committees do not exist in all work-places, so then dependence must be placed on the shop stewards or job reps. In such cases, a Communist shop steward should, in the event of there being reps. of unions other than his own on the job, propose the following:—

- (a) That a joint meeting of all shop stewards be convened to review the position of the unions on the job.
- (b) After this review, a definite campaign of systematic dues collection be initiated.
- (c) Union reps. to make themselves conversant with the successes of the unions in relation to wages, compensation, awards, etc. Fullest publicity to be given to these.
- (d) To make use of successes of other unions such as the Miners' case at the Privy Council to show the value of well-organised unions.
- (e) To utilise such meetings for the purpose of bringing about closer unity among the different unions.

Where there is no Communist shop or job delegate, then the Party members should make representations to those operating on lines already proposed.

Much difficulty is often experienced with reps. who do not take the position seriously. Steps should be taken to have such removed.

The foregoing are put forward as organisational proposals which have proved successful in a number of instances. The militancy of the workers can be aroused in the campaign

for financial unionism. It is our task now to build and strengthen the unions. The struggle against the "Dog Collar Act," the Transport Bill, deregistering of unions, the campaign for the 40-hour week and increased wages must be the signal for mass recruitment to the unions.

Here again it is necessary to bring home Marx's teaching. At all times, he pointed out that the unions were a weapon in the struggle against the capitalists, and he welcomed the formation of trade unions as a step forward for the working class. Losovsky shows us in his book, "Marx and the Trade Unions" that Marx always kept level with the movement of his time and always put forward the actual slogans of the day. This shows how necessary it is that we should respond to everything happening. Marx laid the basis for our present and future work in the trade unions. Lenin carried out and developed Marx's teachings. Comrades Stalin and Dimitrov speak and teach as Marxists-Leninists. The C.I. and the C.C. of our Australian Party apply the teachings of Marx and Lenin so that when our C.C. calls for a strengthening of the unions it bases itself on Marxism-Leninism. The fact that Lenin paid so much attention to the trade unions was precisely because he understood the teaching of Marx better than anyone else. Lenin was able to apply the principles of Marxism under new conditions. The organisational advice and guidance which is given to us by our C.C. are based on the teachings of Leninism which Comrade Stalin describes as constituting the science of the revolutionary struggle of the proletariat. So that when our C.C. calls for a strengthening of the unions by developing financial unionism, we must recognise that the principles of Marxism-Leninism are being applied to the Australian trade union movement. Obviously then, it is our task to carry this into the mass movement of the working class.

MARXISM AND ART—Continued from Page 33.

However we know that statistical reports may be distorted, either deliberately or unconsciously; similarly the artistic reflection of life may also be deliberately or unconsciously distorted by class interest. But it is precisely this factor which makes art so powerful. It is not merely an instrument for apprehending reality; it is also a weapon for propagating definite viewpoints, definite approach to reality. In so far as art organises thoughts it organises them together with feelings. Sometimes art organises only the feelings. Music, for example, and architecture (considered as art and not as engineering) are incapable of expressing thought. It takes a great deal of trouble to translate their language into the words which express our concepts; and the result is crude. Nevertheless, the effects of music and architecture are colossal.

In fields where living facts express themselves directly in ideas, it is easy to trace ideologies to the social groups which evolve them; but where it is a matter of organising feelings, which is the essence of art, such a process becomes difficult. That is precisely why the history and theory of art have defended themselves so successfully hitherto against Marxism. But of late great progress has been made in this field. Several works by the German Marxist historian and art theoretician, Hausenstein, are forward steps in this direction. Hausenstein has been successful in developing the weakest sides of the Marxian theory of art.

These are principles of Marxism in so far as Marxism is a theory of human society and its evolution. But Marxism is more than such a theory; it is a definite programme; it is itself the ideology of a definite class—the proletariat. Marxism is the only ideology which does no violence to reality. This is due to the fact that the proletariat is the class of the future; it is to the interest of the proletariat to base itself on that science which points out what actually exists and indicates the tendencies of the future. Similarly, the tendencies of the proletariat are good for the whole of humanity. The proletariat is the last oppressed class; in emancipating itself it emancipates all humanity from a social order based on classes. There has never been so far a more important or liberating social change than that which the proletariat will bring about. It is for this reason that the aims of the proletariat are at the same time the aims of mankind.

The theoreticians of the proletariat must do more than point out with real objectivity how this or that aspect of art springs

out of the social order; they have the right to adopt a critical attitude towards works of art, both past and present. The proletarian theoretician can designate those art works of the past which are clearly dominated by the monstrous spirit of exploitation; those works which are expressive of the passive sufferings of the masses or their slavish submission; or which are permeated with the spirit of compromise, evasion, surrender, and scepticism. The proletarian critic can spot those works of art which deliberately avoid all living content and resort to an empty play of intellect or vaporous dreams, in order to escape reality or to evade all responsibility for it. On the other hand, the proletarian critic can find certain valuable elements in old works of art, which, while often belonging to the ruling classes, are nevertheless full of the spirit of vast organisational plans, of man's faith in his own powers, of aspiration for knowledge and a just life; or works whose main tendency is that of revolt against evil, which proclaims the rights of the oppressed sections of mankind.

Endless are the voices, the complaints, the laughter, the songs which sound in the artistic works of the past; and if they were analysed from beginning to end it would be possible to find a definite social value in each work. Some would turn out to be acceptable to the proletariat; they would have a friendly ring, like the voices of men who in one way or another were the prophets or precursors of the proletariat; other works would turn out to be doubtful in their tendency but interesting because they reveal unique social situations; still others would be found to be repulsive or inimical.

In addition to evaluating works of art according to their contents, the proletarian critic can also evaluate them on the basis of form. Marxism, for example, teaches us that those classes which are interested in expressing new ideas, in organising great feelings, will always create art works rich in content; on the other hand, decaying classes, which have no ideology, which have no hope of defending their rights, abandon themselves to purely formal art, which serves the purpose of making their life a little less monotonous and more acceptable. In the field of artistic form it is possible to develop the most varied evils; it is possible to develop extreme aesthetic licentiousness; or colossal, stupid pomp; or the sensuous refinement of a landowner.

There are epochs—as a rule those in which some social class is in full bloom—which are characterised by striking ideas and whose emotional content finds the proper formal expression.

Then art is calm, precisely because of this harmony between content and form. The artist is sure that his work is significant, that it will be accepted by certain elements of his people. He is self-confident; he knows precisely how this or that content must be transmitted to the society of which he is a part. He is master of the requisite form. Under such circumstances, we have a classical period. But until the arrival of such an epoch, there must be a period in which ideas and feelings are as yet unable to find their proper embodiment. Such a period usually coincides with the rise of a given class to power, and not with its highest point of power. During the period when the class is striving to find a political form for its class interests, its art is characterised by storm and stress, and its forms are restless. The artist of such a transformation period strains his imagination to find the form which he is as yet unable to grasp. Even the ideas which do arise in his mind are not yet entirely clear to him. His feelings, however, are very turbulent; and thus there arises the romantic tendency in art. Finally, when a given class has passed its apex of power, when it is no longer useful to society; when new forces oppose it, it loses self-confidence. It has squandered all its ideas, and its feelings have become more and more inconsequential. Its former unity breaks up into individual atoms. This condition also finds its reflection in art. The soul of art (its ideas and feelings) begins to shrivel up and is soon entirely lost; it retains merely a cold formal knowledge which soon degenerates into academicism. But even this beautiful corpse does not long remain static. It soon begins to decay. The artists of such a class begin to neglect even form; they seek extravagance; or exaggerate one aspect of art to incongruous proportions. Art begins to rot.

This is a rough outline of the main ideas of Marxism on the art of the past. It should be pointed out here that by a proper analysis we can obtain the most useful results from the most negative works of art; first, in so far as they are symptoms of certain social phenomena and increase our historical knowledge; secondly, in so far as they contain various positive aspects. It is possible to find a decadent work of art a marvellous combination of color, line or sound; it is possible to find in a degenerate work of art something which is very useful from the technical point of view. Similarly, in a monumental building permeated with the slave-holding spirit of some despot, we may find magnificent proportions, which are the product not only of despotism, but also of the mightiest forms of mass organisation. The

Marxist can thus learn something from every work of art of the past and transmit that knowledge to others.

But Marxism is not merely a method of understanding the real roots of art; it is also a method of criticising them and using them. Proper enjoyment of past art, its proper development is useful for contemporary art.

Marxism faces the task of developing a history of literature, a general theory of literature, and a theory of literary, artistic creations. We are only at the beginning of these tasks. Of course, the last of these tasks, that of literary artistic creation, already leads us from Marxism as a social theory to Marxism as a living social force. A Marxist, a representative of this force, can appear in literature either as a critic or as a creator.

A Marxist critic must have a sufficient amount of theoretical experience; he must be able to approach every work of art objectively, without prejudice, discovering its social roots, explaining its place in society, its connection with the social forces of a given period, especially his own period. Criticism, as distinguished from literary history, must be understood to be a living reaction to the art of our own epoch. If for a Marxian historian of literature it is permissible and even desirable to exhibit some passion in the final evaluation of a work of art or its elements as useful or harmful for the Communist cause, such a passionate evaluation, such a fighting approach is simply a DUTY for a Marxist critic. The critic must be a Marxist theoretician in his strict scientific objectivity; at the same time he must be a fighter.

As a creative writer the Marxist is intimately acquainted with theoretical Marxist works. It is ridiculous to think that culture can harm a Marxist artist, that his talent will suffer if he seeks to clear up for himself questions of literary history or of literary technique. On the contrary, it can only help him. However, science can be useful to a Marxist writer only when he is a real artist. No theoretical tricks and no theoretical equipment, however rich, can serve as a substitute for genuine talent.

What is the difference between a Marxist talent, a Communist talent in literature and other kinds of talents? A Marxist talent distinguishes itself by the fact that the acuteness of its reactions is specifically colored. Such a talent reacts with particular sensitivity to everything which has a direct connection with the great contemporary struggle; it will react sharply to everything directly or indirectly connected with the world's axis, the outstanding social phenomenon of our times, the struggle between labor and capital.

The internal recreation of this material proceeds in the Marxist writer under the main centre of his thinking and feeling; a really great Marxist writer carries within himself an enormous arsenal of idealism, a colossal mass of bitterness and contempt for the evil sides of life, a tremendous amount of fighting spirit. He will seek clarity and monumentality of form. Such a writer will above all be interested in finding a wide democratic audience. Under such conditions, the monumental clarity with which he expresses his experiences will triumph over all other tendencies in art.