

# COMMUNIST REVIEW

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

No. 62.

OCTOBER, 1946

Price 6d.

## LIST OF CONTENTS

PEACEMAKER OR WARMONGER? . . . . .	R. Dixon . . . . .	291
THE FIGHT FOR A FORTY-HOUR WEEK . . . . .	T. Wright . . . . .	293
WHO ARE THE "FRIENDS OF THE PEOPLE"? . . . . .	M. I. Kalinin . . . . .	295
WORK OF THE COMMUNIST COUNCILLORS . . . . .	A. L. Opie . . . . .	297
DEBATE WITH MR. KEON, M.L.A. . . . .	E. F. Hill . . . . .	302
KURDS—EXPLOSIVE FORCE IN THE MIDDLE EAST . . . . .	Norman Freehill . . . . .	304
MARXIST MATERIALISM AND EPISTEMOLOGY . . . . .	L. Harry Gould . . . . .	307
NO MIDDLE PATH FOR THE YOUTH . . . . .	R. White . . . . .	311
NEW DEAL FOR THE PRE-SCHOOL CHILD . . . . .	Daphne Gollan, B.A. . . . .	313
"NEW MASSES" CONTROVERSY ON WRITERS . . . . .	Max Brown . . . . .	315
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS . . . . .	L. H. Gould . . . . .	317
FREEZING AND THAWING . . . . .	Prof. J. B. S. Haldane, F.R.S. . . . .	319

ORGAN OF THEORY AND PRACTICE OF THE AUSTRALIAN  
COMMUNIST PARTY

Editor . . . . L. L. Sharkey

## PEACEMAKER OR WARMONGER ?

R. DIXON

AT the Paris Peace Conference, in one of the numerous lengthy speeches he sought every opportunity to give, Dr. Evatt was reported to have said "the people fought the war and the people must make the peace." We heartily agree. The people should have the decisive say in the peace, as this is the surest guarantee of a durable understanding between nations without which a lasting peace is impossible. It is therefore pertinent to ask—What say have the Australian people had in the making of the policy of Evatt and the Australian Delegation at the Peace Conference? When and where were "the people" of Australia taken into Dr. Evatt's confidence? It is clear, they were not consulted. Parliament was not informed of Dr. Evatt's policy. There was no prior discussion in the press or among the people on his proposals because no one knew what he intended to put forward. It is even questionable as to how far the Labor Government was informed, because none of the Ministers, from the Prime Minister down, could intelligently discuss the issues raised at Paris by Evatt. Dr. Evatt's talk about the "people making the peace" is, therefore, merely a mask to cover his failure to consult the people. It is a democratic pose to hide his contempt for the people and for democratic practice.

The policy Evatt and Beasley espoused at the Paris Conference won the ardent applause of the anti-Soviet fraternity throughout the capitalist world, and with good cause. It was an anti-Soviet policy. It was a policy that was designed not to promote understanding between the nations as the basis for lasting peace, but to drive a wedge between the big powers, between the United States and Britain on the one hand and Soviet Russia on the other.

Prior to the Peace Conference, Dr. Evatt spent months of his time in the United States and Britain, and it was there, in consultation with the reactionaries of those countries, instead of with the Australian people, that his policy was worked out. Dr. Evatt was the stooge, the "Rubber Stamp," of the anti-Soviet interests of the United States and Britain. His self-proclaimed championship of the interests of the small nations would be funny if it did not serve as a smoke screen for his advocacy of the policy of the Anglo-American bloc.

The Paris Peace Conference is concerned with the final peace treaties covering the satellites of Nazi Germany, Italy, Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria and Finland. The draft treaties before the conference were finalised by the Big Four Foreign Ministers after prolonged and bitter controversy, and although they are not all to be desired, they, nevertheless, reflect the degree of agreement that the Big Four were able to reach.

Why was it so difficult to reach agreement? Simply because of the fact that American Imperial-

ism is striving for world domination. World War II brought to a head the most predatory and reactionary trends in American Imperialism. Believing in the power of the almighty dollar to make nations subservient to America, virtual colonies of Yankee Imperialism, the American monopolists are striving to break down all barriers to American sources of raw material for their exploitation. The American Loan to Britain, for example, imposes conditions which will result in the scaling down of Empire tariffs and make the British Empire more dependent upon and subservient to American Imperialism than before. But these methods of the U.S. billions are useless against the Soviet Union and the new democracies of Europe that look to Soviet Russia for support and succour.

We hear very much about the "Iron Curtain" in Europe. There is no "Iron Curtain," American and British press correspondents roam all over Eastern Europe, and U.S. and British representatives, not to mention their secret agents, are established in every country. It suits the monopolists, however, who are exasperated at their inability to dominate the economies of the countries of Eastern Europe, to have their propagandists shout about the "Iron Curtain" and paint lurid pictures of what is supposed to be happening there. It suits them because their aim is to establish a Western European bloc, in which part of Germany will be included, directed at the Soviet Union, a move which runs counter to the decisions of the United Nations Organisation and the agreements reached between President Roosevelt, Marshal Stalin and Mr. Churchill at Teheran, Crimea and Potsdam.

With the connivance of the British Labor Government, the American Imperialists are establishing a new "Cordon Sanitaire" around the Soviet Union and are building air, naval and military bases from which to wage war on Soviet Russia. Thus they are insisting on a U.S. naval and air base in Iceland, which is 3,000 miles from the U.S. and 1,500 miles from the Soviet Union. They have air bases in Saudi-Arabia, 7,000 miles from America and 1,000 miles from the Soviet Union. They insisted on the Red Army evacuating Manchuria while they kept powerful forces in China to bolster up the reactionary Chiang Kai-Shek regime. They are constructing bases in the Pacific from the Aleutians down to the Philippines — all fronting the Soviet Far East. They are backing the semi-Fascist regime in Turkey and are demanding a say in the control of the Bosphorus and Dardanelles, waterways vital to the Soviet Union and other Black Sea powers. They insist that the Danube, which flows down through Eastern Europe, should be free to the ships of all nations and that they be represented on the commission controlling this historic waterway. They refuse to permit Trieste to become a

### Theoretical Literature

Many readers are unaware that small quantities of former Anvil stocks of important titles are still available. Among these are the reports to the 18th Congress of the C.P.S.U. given by the leading members of the C.C. Each one of these booklets contains contributions which cannot be obtained from other sources, yet are a vital addition to Marxist theory, e.g., Stalin's statements on the questions of the withering away of the state and on the intelligentsia, and Zhdanov's witty contributions on many questions connected with Party membership. The following titles in this series are still available and may be purchased at our bookshops or wholesalers from Current Book Distributors:—

Stalin—Report on the work of the C.C. . . . .	6d.
Molotov—Report on the Third Five Year Plan . . . . .	6d.
Zhdanov—Amendments to the rules of the C.P.S.U. . . . .	6d.
Manuilsky—Report of the Delegation of the C.P.S.U. in the Executive Committee of the C.I. . . . .	2d.
Resolutions of the 18th Congress of the C.P.S.U. . . . .	6d.



Yugoslav city although ethnically, historically, economically and geographically it belongs to Yugoslavia. They deliberately violated the Yugoslav frontiers in order to create an incident to enable them to rally American public opinion for war and to increase the pressure on Eastern Europe. They are doing everything possible to combat the nationalisation of industries and land which is the basis for the new democracy that the peoples of Eastern Europe enjoy, and to protect Anglo-American investments and restore the old reactionary regimes which were the source of continual anti-Soviet provocation in the past.

It is in the light of these features of American policy that we must consider the proposals Dr. Evatt brought before the Paris Peace Conference.

Let us consider, first, his demand for all questions to be resolved by a simple majority. The Anglo-American bloc in the Conference of 21 nations could muster 15 votes, whereas the Soviet Union could not count on more than 6 votes on all issues where the vital interests of the Soviet and Eastern European countries conflicted with Anglo-U.S. Imperialism. Thus, Evatt was actually aiming to force the policies of the Western Imperialists on Soviet Russia and the countries of Eastern Europe. It is absurd to believe that such matters can be resolved by a mere vote, they can be resolved only by mutual agreement. If Soviet Russia had commanded the majority of the votes at the Paris Conference instead of the Anglo-American bloc, would Evatt have been demanding a simple majority?

Next, there is the proposal of the Australian Delegation for the establishment of a Court of Human Rights. This Court, advocated by Evatt, is supposed to protect minorities and individuals in the defeated countries. Why only the defeated countries? Why not the Australian Aborigines who are maltreated by Liberal and Labor Governments alike, and deprived of their rights? Or why not the Negroes of America, the peoples of Malaya, Indonesia or India, the Jews or the Arabs in Palestine?

Dr. Evatt's heart bleeds for none of these sorely oppressed people who are enslaved by Imperialism, he has no thought for any but the people of the defeated countries in Eastern Europe or Italy. His Court of Human Rights would be designed to protect private property interests, to assert the rights of capitalists and landlords whose industries or estates have been nationalised, and to bring help and strength to the reactionary political groups of the old regime, who are aiming to undermine the new democracies and restore the old pro-Fascist order of things. It would destroy the independence and sovereignty of the countries concerned and make them dependent upon the decisions of a Court dominated by the Anglo-American Imperialists.

Thirdly, the Australian proposals on reparations to Soviet Russia and Yugoslavia, etc., that they should be scaled down, and, further, that the payments should be made in foreign currency instead of goods, is suggestive of the commercial traveller

approach instead of serious diplomacy. Under this scheme trade would flow mainly towards America and Britain, which can provide the credits, whereas Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia, Poland and Soviet Russia would be deprived of goods they urgently need.

Thus from every angle Dr. Evatt's proposals were designed to bolster the position of the British-American billionnaires and to weaken the independence and freedom of the defeated countries.

The Australian Delegation to the Peace Conference was unsatisfactory not only because their proposals were reactionary, but also because of the way in which they handled the discussion. They made no attempt to hide the fact that their proposals were directed against the Soviet Union. Their hostility to Soviet Russia and the small nations of Eastern Europe was open and blatant.

Australia, which played such an important part in the World War against Fascism, is not only entitled to her place at the peace table, but should make her contribution to the understanding between nations necessary to lasting peace. We can't play that role, however, as the stooge of the Anglo-American bloc as Evatt and Beasley would have us do. Our influence and prestige amongst the peoples of the world will be lowered by their approach. We have only to take the results of the Australian proposals on the Peace Treaty to illustrate this. Evatt's proposal on Finland received one vote—Australia's. His proposal on Rumanian reparations commanded no support from any other delegation and was belatedly withdrawn. On three proposals he submitted to the Italian Commission the voting was two, five and seven.

This voting suggests that the small nations are not rallying very strongly behind their champion. Practically every proposal the Australian delegation has made so far has been thrown out, nevertheless, the press would make it appear that Evatt and Beasley are commanding amazing support. Why? Because the chief function of Evatt and Beasley at the Peace Conference was to develop the anti-Soviet campaign and thereby transform the Peace Conference into a forum for the strengthening of the Anglo-American bloc in preparation for World War III against Soviet Russia and the new democracies of Eastern Europe. This is the "dirty game" that Evatt and Beasley are playing at the Peace Conference.

It is well known that Dr. Evatt is an inordinately vain man, a limelighter, a seeker after publicity. The praise of the foul Hearst Press, the applause of reactionaries like Senator Vandenberg and the cheers of the millionaire enemies of Soviet Russia, all so pleasing to Evatt's ears, seem to have destroyed his sense of proportion and dignity. Even the pro-Fascist Greek stooges of British imperialism know where to draw the line, to hold back in the interests of the country they represent, but not Evatt. He and Beasley are prepared to drag

Australia's name in the mud in order to develop the anti-Soviet campaign.

It must be obvious to everyone that the present anti-Soviet campaign is part of the preparations for a new world war. What will Australia gain from such a war? We will gain nothing but destruction and annihilation. The aim of Australian foreign policy should be to avert the danger of a new

World War, and this means, in the present situation, not only not to join the anti-Soviet war preparations, but to expose and combat them. We must not be the "rubber stamp" of the Anglo-American bloc. Australia must pursue a policy of peace, must combat the threat of war and the sources from which it comes, and strive to promote friendship among the nations.

## THE FIGHT FOR A FORTY-HOUR WEEK

T. WRIGHT

A YEAR has now passed since the trade union movement issued its ultimatum to the Chifley Government demanding legislation to establish a standard forty-hour working week. The Government was given until 15th February, 1946 (six months from V.P. Day) to introduce this long-overdue reduction in hours. The trade union movement through the Australasian Council of Trade Unions, and the metropolitan Trades and Labor Councils also decided to demand legislation by the various State Governments, and to conduct a big campaign throughout industry to prepare the workers for direct action, should the demand for a forty-hour week be refused. In December, 1945, mass demonstrations were held in the various States, as part of this campaign.

The response of the Chifley Government was to plead lack of power under the Commonwealth Constitution—a claim which was in contradiction to the opinions of Government leaders, given earlier, and in contradiction to the best legal opinion available to the trade unions. Even if it is admitted that the power of the Government in this matter could be challenged, there can be no doubt that the attitude of the Government was determined mainly by its opposition to the early introduction of a forty-hour week. This is conclusively shown in its refusal to concede the forty-hour week to Government employees, although urgently requested by the trade unions to do so. The various State Governments have been equally reluctant to concede the forty-hour week to Government employees, or to legislate, although possessing undisputed powers to deal with such matters, within State jurisdiction. A few individual parliamentarians disagreed with the attitude of the Commonwealth Government, for example Ward, who stated that "We are prone to see obstacles, rather than to go ahead with the job and let others find the obstacles." However in the circumstances it is clear that the Government was prone not so much to see obstacles as to actively seek and create obstacles.

Concerning the Constitution. It had previously been held by the Labor Party leaders that as the Commonwealth Government had participated in International Conferences recommending the forty-hour week, it had power to legislate on this matter under the section of the Constitution dealing with

external affairs. Dr. Evatt, the legal expert of the Government, had ruled while a judge of the High Court: "It is not to be assumed that the legislative power over external affairs is limited to the execution of treaties or conventions. The Parliament may well be deemed competent to legislate for carrying out recommendations as well as draft international conventions resolved upon by the International Labor Organisation or other international recommendations or requests upon other subject matters of concern to Australia as a member of the family of nations. This power is a great and important one." (Goya Henry Case.)

When the forty-hour week was not an immediate prospect, Dr. Evatt and the Government were confident as to their power to legislate for it under the "external affairs" section of the constitution, but when it became an immediate issue, they were assailed with all kinds of sudden doubts.

Mr. Holloway, the present Minister for Labor, was so convinced of the Government's power to take action for the forty-hour week that as a member of the Opposition in 1936 he moved a vote of censure on the Lyons Government, stating: "If the Government will not adopt this Convention of the International Labor Office, and will not call a conference of State Premiers and ask for power, or, in the absence of power, an assurance that the States will not interfere until the Constitution has been altered to give the Commonwealth the necessary power to introduce working hours, as sure as I am now standing in this House, before the year is ended there will be a general stoppage of work on the part of those engaged in technical trades to get by direct action what they can't get by Constitutional means—a forty-hour week, which is now overdue."

Despite the declared view that the "external affairs" section of the Constitution gave the Government power to legislate for the adoption of the I.L.O. Convention on forty hours, and despite other possibilities under the Constitution, for example, the power to legislate for conciliation and arbitration in the settlement of interstate industrial disputes (not necessarily through the existing Arbitration Court), the Government persisted in its refusal to proceed with legislation and adopted



the tactic of manoeuvring the trade unions into an application to the Arbitration Court.

In its efforts to convince the representatives of the trade unions that it did not have power to legislate for forty hours, and that the unions had no alternative but to approach the Arbitration Court, the Government claimed that further legal review of the position had revealed that it was precluded from using the "external affairs" powers because only one country (New Zealand) had adopted the I.L.O. Convention; that too long a period had elapsed (1); and that in any case the powers in relation to the Convention would be restricted to only four industries. Apparently the Government did not know of the legislation for a forty-hour week adopted in France and Belgium in 1936 and the action taken by the U.S.A. Government in 1936, after an adverse decision by the Supreme Court. However, there is no evidence that the Government really succeeded in convincing the A.C.T.U. representatives that it possessed no power to legislate on hours. It is apparent that the Government succeeded only in convincing these representatives that it had no intention of legislating and that other means must be sought to pursue the forty-hour week. It was in these circumstances that, despite strong left wing opposition, the A.C.T.U. decided to accept the Government's proposal that the unions join in the forty-hour claim to the Arbitration Court already listed for the printing industry unions. To preserve unity in the struggle the unions as a whole were obliged to support the application.

The Arbitration Court hearing, as could be anticipated, has led to a further long period of delay. After a preliminary hearing in March last, the hearing proper commenced in May, and, according to latest advice, several months more will pass before the case is finalised and a decision given.

The hearing has given no encouragement to the belief that the Court will pursue a policy of systematically introducing instalments of a "new order," as the following Court interlude will show:

Judge Kelly: Sooner or later, you will have to speak in realities. What do you mean by a better world? Until now it seems to mean more money and less work.

Mr. Eggleston (A.C.T.U.): I mean increased wages, a hope for increased leisure, improved factory conditions and an improved educational system. The 40-hour week would be the first instalment of the New Order.

Judge Drake-Brockman: This New Order—I have heard it from the public platform, from the radio, and from individuals. I have asked the men who have mentioned it what it is, but I have never received an explanation from anyone.

"They are holding out this vague New Order without explaining what the blessed thing is. Now you come here and tell us we have to implement the New Order.

"I knew some day I would have something to do with it, and I wanted to know what it was all about."

Subsequently a crisis was threatened when it appeared that the general movement for wage increases would be allowed as an argument to offset the claim for shorter hours. This threat was averted at least temporarily.

All the world knows that, in the twenty years which have passed since the standard working week was fixed at forty-four hours, technical innovations, new machinery and new methods have enormously increased the productivity of labor; that the capitalist world went through its period of greatest economic depression and mass unemployment; that the working class and democrats of the whole world are demanding a better life; and yet in the Court it is necessary to submit to prolonged argument and counter-argument and legal flummery, and await the uncertain outcome when a legal decision will eventually be made.

In the meantime unionists are pressing for the earliest possible determination of the case. By earlier decision the A.C.T.U. is to meet within twenty-one days to decide on further action, if an adverse decision is given by the Court.

Not least disturbing to the trade unions is the failure of Chifley, in his recent Policy Speech, to give any promise of legislation for a forty-hour week, although one of the Referendum questions has been loudly proclaimed as ending once and for all, should it be carried, the doubts as to the power of the Government to legislate on standard hours. In view of past experiences there is every indication that, despite a successful referendum, the utmost pressure from the trade union movement will be necessary to secure the desired legislation.

While doing everything possible to speed the hearing in the Arbitration Court, the trade unions must strengthen their demands for immediate action by the Commonwealth Government to introduce a maximum forty-hour week for Government employees and to legislate for a general forty-hour week. The example of the shearers, who were able to establish a forty-hour week very extensively, and subsequently to have it included in a Queensland State Award, will not be lost on the workers. Failing a satisfactory response from the Government a widespread development of actions for the forty-hour week may be anticipated.

## WHO ARE THE "FRIENDS OF THE PEOPLE"?

M. I. KALININ

(Adapted from an article in the January issue of the "Bolshevik," theoretical publication of the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U. This is one of the last articles written by Kalinin before his death.)

FIFTY years have elapsed since Lenin wrote his book *What the 'Friends of the People' are and How They Fight Against the Social Democrats (Communists)*. This period has seen a great advance in the world outlook of Marxism-Leninism. Here it is sufficient to recall Lenin's works on the basic questions of Marxism, which Comrade Stalin has so splendidly expounded in his lectures on Leninism.

The role of Comrade Stalin in the theoretical elaboration and further development of Marxism-Leninism is generally known. His works on the National Question, on the theoretical basis of the industrialisation of the country and collectivisation of agriculture, his works on questions of the form of the socialist State, the war, and other problems of Marxism-Leninism represent in themselves a most valuable contribution to the treasure house of Marxist-Leninist teaching.

On closely analysing the policy and war measures of the Soviet State one may safely say that their correctness is indisputable even for people opposed to Marxism. Comrade Stalin's mastery of the method of Marxism-Leninism has raised the teachings of Marx-Engels-Lenin to a position of authority never recognised before. Comrade Stalin not only demonstrated in theory how to construct socialist society; his work led to its realisation. The synthesis of his great work is the Stalin Constitution. Thereby he laid the foundation of the new civilisation—Communist Society.

What the 'Friends of the People' Are, which brought about the ideological defeat of the Narodniks, was written fifty years ago, but this does not lessen the importance of Lenin's book today. On the contrary, precisely in order to master better Marxism-Leninism, the theoretical principles of Comrade Stalin, his strategy and tactics, our young people (and not only our young people) should study this first major work of Lenin.

Lenin's persistent and uncompromising struggle against opportunism, personified by the Mensheviks, began soon after the defeat of the Narodniks and the Economists—it can be said, from the first days of the Russian Social-Democratic Labor Party. Lenin untiringly exposed the opportunist tactics of the Mensheviks who were drawing the working class into subjection to the bourgeoisie. Clear proof of the correctness of his relentless struggle against the Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries is that in the period of the October Revolution the Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries were found in the camp of the landlords and capitalists.

Lenin's unwavering Marxist policy and his continual exposure of the Mensheviks as capitalist

agents within the working class movement, and of the Socialist-Revolutionaries as in essence petty-bourgeois liberals, as false defenders of the peasantry, assured to the Bolshevik Party the leadership of the workers and peasants in those days of fierce struggle for Soviet power. The Revolution swept aside the Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries together with the landlords and capitalists, branding them as traitors and betrayers of the Fatherland.

Lenin was a passionate champion not only of the happiness of his own people but of the happiness and prosperity of all humanity. With forceful logic he exposed equally the black reactionary forces in all countries and every form of opportunism.

The book *What the 'Friends of the People' Are*, it seems to me expresses thoughts which can considerably facilitate for Russian Marxists understanding of the developments taking place in other countries today. Lenin's irreconcilable stand against the enemies of the people is vividly shown in this early work.

We see how, in combating ideas hostile to Marxism, with the utmost clarity and simplicity, Lenin gives a real understanding of Marxism, teaches sharp vigilance, a distrust of the people who parade under a cloak of socialism and democracy but who are in practice most servile to reaction, out of conviction as much as cowardice. There are such people in other countries at present—more than enough—from real political swindlers to spineless conciliators, who in their words sympathise with the masses of the people but who are in fact ready at a convenient moment to sell the people's interests.

In this early work Lenin outlines the strategy and tactics of struggle of the proletariat, works out the line along which common struggle of all democratic forces against reaction can advance.

In this connection we find in Lenin's works concrete advice to the effect that in certain cases, in certain conditions, it is necessary to come to agreement with, to make certain immediate practical compromises with other progressive groups and parties (of course without ceasing the ideological and political struggle and in every way isolating and sharply dividing the reactionary elements among them).

In *Left Wing Communism* Lenin recalls Chernishevsky's words that "Political activity is not the pavement of the Nevsky Prospect (the clean, broad, smooth pavement of the perfectly straight principal street of St. Petersburg)." He gives examples of how our Party, at different stages of the struggle, resorted to practical compromises with the bourgeois liberals and petty-bourgeois parties



and at the same time continued relentless struggle against them on the main political questions and unmasked their false democracy and socialism.

"Before the downfall of tsarism," he writes, "Russian revolutionary Social-Democrats repeatedly utilised the services of the bourgeois liberals, i.e., concluded numerous practical compromises with them. In 1901-02, prior to the rise of Bolshevism, the old Editorial Board of 'Iskra' (consisting of Plekhanov, Axelrod, Zasluchich, Martov, Potresov and myself) concluded—not for long it is true—a formal political alliance with Struve, the political leader of bourgeois liberalism, while it was able at the same time to carry on an unceasing and merciless ideological and political struggle against bourgeois liberalism and against the slightest manifestation of its influence in the working class movement. The Bolsheviks always adhered to this policy. From 1905 onward they systematically defended the alliance between the working class and the peasantry against the liberal bourgeoisie and tsarism, never, however, refusing to support the bourgeoisie against tsarism (for instance, during the second stage of elections, or second ballot) and never ceasing their relentless ideological and political struggle against the bourgeois-revolutionary peasant party, the Socialist-Revolutionaries, exposing them as petty-bourgeois democrats, falsely masquerading as Socialists." (Left Wing Communism, Selected Works, Vol. X, P. 113.)

The second world war waged by the fascist bloc against the freedom-loving peoples, with the aim of conquering and enslaving the whole world, demanded huge sacrifices and unparalleled straining of the resources of progressive humanity. It aroused the most intense activity in all social groups and developed a deep cleavage between patriots and real champions of the freedom and independence of their fatherland—and traitors—the varied appeasers and conciliators, not to mention Hitlerite agents like Quisling and Laval. And here, during this unprecedented drama of the people, the greatness of the ideas of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin shone forth brilliantly, and Lenin's tactic of the alliance of Communists with all other true patriots and champions of democracy proved itself in practice.

On analysing the process of the struggle of the peoples' forces against fascism in all the occupied countries, every unprejudiced and unbiased observer with his own eyes can see the leading role of the Communists in this struggle. In the years of the most grievous trials and adversities, in the years of deadly struggle against fascism, all those people honestly and selflessly devoted to their Fatherland rallied round the Communists. That is, they, the Communists, took the lead in the sacred war for liberation against the German-Fascist invaders and enslavers, for the honour, liberty and independence of their people. Not one of the existing political parties did or could undertake

responsibility for this unusually difficult and at the same time most noble and sublime task.

The old crude slander that Communists reject patriotism, do not acknowledge the Fatherland and therefore, a priori, are traitors, has been defeated decisively, for all time. But the parties who before that war shouted and bragged most of all of their "patriotism" are now unmasked as the real traitors against their Fatherland, as supporters of the Fascists. Exposed and pilloried also are those socialist "leaders" and "democrats" of different shades who during the period of occupation made appeals for non-resistance to the German-fascist invaders, for abstinence from "illegal" struggle against them on the pretext of preserving the strength of the people and preparing them for opening a campaign against the enemy "at a more favourable moment."

Communists appeared in the role of main organisers and inspirers of the sacred war against fascism, not only in some particular occupied country but precisely in all such countries. This was not accidental but a logical development. In Yugoslavia, Greece, Holland, Belgium, Norway, Denmark, where before the war the Communists did not constitute mass political parties—even in these countries they have developed correct political tactics and become mainly responsible for inspiring unity of all true patriots and democrats in the struggle against fascism. It seems to me it is difficult to find more clear and convincing proof of the correctness of those ideas which Lenin expressed fifty-odd years ago.

Now when the war in Europe and the Far East has ended with the complete victory of the Allies, and the next task of the United Nations is the establishment of firm peace, it is well to recall Lenin's many years' struggle against opportunist leaders of socialist parties and other "friends of the people" in the West; against Kautsky and Scheidemann in Germany, Renaudel and Longuet in France, Macdonald and Henderson in England, Vandervelde in Belgium, who, as Lenin said, were agents of the bourgeoisie within the working class movement. To these opportunist leaders and peculiar "friends of the people," Lenin applied the following neat characterisation given them by one of the French bourgeois newspapers:—

"These Vanderveldes seem to be suffering from a sort of tic. Just as those who suffer from tic cannot utter two phrases without strangely twitching the muscles of the face, so the Vanderveldes cannot make a political speech without repeating in a parrot-like way the words: internationalism, socialism, international solidarity of the workers, proletarian revolution, etc. Let them repeat any sacramental formula they like so long as they help to lead the workers by the nose and serve us, the capitalists, in pursuing the imperialist war and in enslaving the workers."

Further on Lenin himself writes about them:

"The bourgeoisie needs lackeys whom a section of the working class could trust, and who would paint in fine colours, embellish the bourgeois with talk about the possibility of the reformist path, who would throw dust in the eyes of the people by this talk, who would divert the people from revolution by depicting the glowing colours the charms and the possibilities of the reformist path. All the writings of the Kautskys, like those of our Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries, reduce themselves to such painting and to the whining of cowardly philistines who fear revolution." (Both quotes from Vol. X, Selected Works, Page 49.)

It would indeed be a naive dream to imagine that all that is left from the past has been outlived and overcome. Unfortunately the traditions of the Vanderveldes, Renaudels, Macdonalds and so on are not only alive today but exist in the transition period from war to peace, are active with a new impetus, with the same aims and in the same direction as before.

For example, the contemporary leaders of the German Social Democrats, Stampfer, Grzechinsky, Vogel, etc. In a certain period people of this type set the fashion for all the socialist parties in Europe. And now they are dreaming of becoming the leaders of the international social-democratic movement. A sight for the gods, indeed! The German capitalists, through world cartels and syndicates, attempt not only to save their capital but also to revive German militarism and brigand imperialism. And the German social-democratic leaders of the old type, as their time servers, act with the same motives and aims through the socialist parties in the different countries. The right wing of the French Socialist Party is also trying to follow the old line.

The recent congress of French Socialists revealed deep inner conflict. Rank and file members and local organisations of the party, worried by the growing solidarity of reactionary anti-democratic forces, are striving to rally the working people to the struggle for true democracy, for the extermination of the remnants of fascism and its economic base. The best means of achieving this they see is in unity with the Communist Party, which proved itself during the period of German occupation the real representative of the national interests of the

French people, the true organisers of the whole people's struggle against the invaders for the freedom, independence and prosperity of their Fatherland.

However, the reactionary, splitting activities of Leon Blum and his adherents oppose this patriotic aspiration. This group attempts at any cost to curtail the steadily growing influence of the Communist Party and the rallying of the forces of the French working class on a new democratic foundation.

The reactionary clique of the French Socialists in fact helps imperialism in France to regain its old position. And all of this is, of course, being carried out under the banner of "democracy" and "socialism," and Blum and other leaders of the right wing socialists come forward as "friends of the people" who are fighting for the people and their future happiness.

The scene is similar outside France. Now in all other countries there are more than enough "friends of the people." Even extreme reactionaries from the camp of the bourgeoisie parade as "democrats." Therefore true democrats and patriots have now to undertake the difficult task of unmasking these false democrats and patriots, i.e., they are fulfilling the same tasks which Lenin accomplished at the dawn of the Russian revolutionary movement, but of course on an incomparably greater scale than was demanded at that time.

It is also necessary to take into account the fact that they have to deal with "friends of the people" who have become more cunning in the political struggle against the people and very skilled in different manoeuvres and frauds. It is safe to say that eighty per cent. of these false friends of the people deliberately masquerade as democrats and socialists to make it easier to carry out their reactionary policy. Today, in other countries, I believe there may be a few people similar to our Narodniks of the type of Mikhailovsky, Krivenko, Yuzakov, who possibly genuinely believe that they wish the people well, but there are also many crafty politicians whose aim is to fool the people.

That is why I say that Lenin's book can considerably assist Russian Marxists to understand the social processes now developing abroad, and to estimate them correctly.

## WORK OF THE COMMUNIST COUNCILLORS

A. L. OPIE (Vice-President, Kearsley Shire Council)

(Report to 1st Annual Conference, Newcastle-Hunter District, A.C.P.)

WHO will deny the political significance and the tremendously important lesson to the whole labor movement of this country of our Party's Municipal By-election victory at Cessnock?

In a period of the fiercest orgy of red-baiting campaigns of lies and slander ever conducted against us by big business, reaction and the reactionary right wing of the labor movement, which allies itself

more and more with an insidious, alien clerical reaction, we, as true representatives of the people, triumphed. As such it was a decisive victory for the people.

It is significant that workers and small business men, some small farmers and professional workers with their various shades of religious and political belief, preferred to vote for our Communist candi-



dade, Tom Gilmore, as against the candidate that represented the right wing splitters and reactionaries. The issue was fought on unity and progress, the needs of the people against disunity, disruption and the threat of red-baiting. Of course, there were the usual cheap promises that are brought forward with wearying repetition, year after year, by the "good old" reformist politician, but with which the people are disillusioned as reflected in their seeking the alternative leadership that we, as a Communist Party, are providing.

Already there are signs from those who hold leading Trade Union and other responsible positions in the labor movement in the district, that they are coming closer to our leadership, no doubt realising the precarious position they would be in if they permitted themselves to be influenced by the wave of hysteria whipped up by the capitalist propaganda agencies, the right wing reformist splitters, and the sinister machinations of the Catholic Action cliques. It is indeed a signal lesson for aspiring politicians, Trade Union leaders and others who desire to serve the Australian public. In other words, the coalfields people are beginning to judge their representatives, not on words, but deeds—a definite trend of marked disillusionment towards the Labor Party—the swing of the political pendulum is to Communist leadership. If Communists are fully seized with the need to improve our connections with the people, in effect, if we begin to learn better how to develop and lead the day to day mass work—united front work, work that reflects the real needs of the mass of people, then not only will we fulfil the "£5000 Communists for Canberra Fund," but carry the struggle against the Australian capitalists right onto the floor of Parliament House, by electing the most capable and fearless spokesmen for the Australian people—Communist Parliamentarians.

I do not want to be misunderstood—we would be naive, and committing a serious mistake, if we were to appraise the Cessnock election victory to mean that a huge left wing movement was sweeping right throughout Australia and that it is just a matter of nominating Communists to be elected to Parliament or Local Government, but what I do say is that the general indications are there, and with the deepening of the class struggle, the growing difficulties of capitalism and the failure of the Labor Governments to correctly lead and legislate for the Australian people (for as Lenin pointed out "the Australian Labor Party is the Australian bourgeois Liberal Party" and as such will inevitably seek a bourgeois solution), the conditions are rapidly becoming more favorable for our Party's leadership being accepted as the only real alternative to A.L.P. leadership.

The point I wish to make here is the special conditions operating in the coalfields areas, and some special features about the by-election which serve to illustrate the difference on the coalfields from the situation in general. As most of you know, the coalfields constitute compact industrial com-

munities, and the long years of excellent Communist leadership and activity in conditions that perhaps have been more favorable than elsewhere, must be a factor to be reckoned with. In addition, the very capable leadership of Communists in the major Trade Union organisation reflects itself, but over and above, and by far the most important in this recent period, has been the recognition by the leadership of our Party that shire and municipal work contains the essential elements, or ingredients, for the most successful united front mass work, which pays high dividends to the people and the Party. That is the lesson for our Party everywhere. It is the lesson that we must learn now, if we are to pick up the leeway that exists between the coalfields areas, Bowen with its M.P. Fred Paterson, and the localities throughout the Hunter region, and the rest of Australia.

One important feature about the election which should be mentioned at this stage. A previous success, wherein Comrades Evans and Wilkinson were elected to the Municipal Council of Cessnock, provided an opportunity for them to wage a relentless, fearless campaign of exposure against the right wing leadership, not only inside, but outside the Council Chambers. They took their campaigns to the mass of the people, built local unity on the programme which they fought the right wing on, thus correctly applying the tactics of the united front as taught by our great and inspiring international Communist, Dimitrov.

Evans and Wilkinson did not become, as happens to a good many of our Trade Union leaders, merely "good Trade Unionists" or "good Aldermen," they were good Communist leaders, fighting for and protecting Communist policy and programmes in the name of the Party.

It is significant to note that where the best unity and greater activity was developed, so also was the best voting recorded for our candidate.

Let us understand clearly that local government is the first elementary institution of parliamentary government. You know the old adage "you must learn to crawl before you walk," well, the quicker Communists begin to learn that lesson the quicker we will be walking and doing a lot of effective talking on behalf of the workers, in the Commonwealth Parliament. P.M. Chifley is still a member of a shire council; the percentage of politicians who were former Aldermen and Councillors is great.

I think we have sufficient evidence and experience to reveal that Local Government is a most fertile field for mass political developments. It can be considered by some Comrades that under the leadership of representatives of propertied interests, the Councils have not functioned in the interests of the people, but I think we can show elements, supported by mass movements of the people, then the role of the Councils will grow, expanding in importance beyond our imagination.

I want, at this stage, to give you an illustration of what I mean, and I want you to pay particular attention and note how the role of the Local Government Councils dovetail, or tie-in, not only with the current campaign of the Miners' Federation, but the general objective of the programme set out in the draft resolution.

Knowing, and following very closely, the general campaign of the Federation and the Party for greater Government control of the coal industry, and the speculation forecast that moneys would be made available from the Governments for coalfields amenities, we took the opportunity at the recent annual Shires' Association Conference to secure a declaration, in principle, that in the event of finance being made available from the Governments, Local Government Authorities be recognised as the appropriate instrumentalities to implement any schemes of improved social amenities.

Despite the conservative nature of such a conference, mostly represented by people with propertied interests, and, of course, a little parochial and bitter towards miners, we were successful with that declaration.

Following upon this, we initiated from Kearsley a conference of all Local Government bodies throughout the State of N.S.W. that cover coalfields areas, all local M.L.A.'s and M.H.R.'s covering such areas, Chief Executive Officers of the Water and Sewerage Boards, Regional Councils and the Miners' Federation. The purpose of the conference was to tell the Governments that Local Government bodies know best of all the requirements of their people in respect to Housing, Public Health and Convenience, Public Libraries, Public Recreation, Water and Sewerage and Electricity supply, Omnibus and Rail Transport, etc., and it is rightly the function of local authorities, already constituted and empowered, to administer such functions.

It appears as if this conference will be highly successful both from the point of view of representation and content. Here I incidentally make mention of the fact that Kurri Kurri Parliamentarian, George Booth, who has shown a more co-operative attitude to us than any other coalfields politician, is very enthusiastic about the conference. I have perused a copy of the Joint Coal Bill and it appears that the Authority to be established to administer the provisions of the Bill has power to collaborate with persons and authorities in the establishment and provision of amenities that I have enumerated, also the promotion of the development and diversification of industry and of town and regional planning in the coalfields districts. It is important to note, too, that it has power to take all steps for the efficient and economical use of coal, the development of uses or markets for coal, and the recovery of by-products of coal. Whilst there is no specific mention of an oil from coal plant, it is implied in the clause dealing with recovery of by-products. We should still aim, incidentally, to have the Gov-

ernment establish and operate its own oil from coal plant.

The Act expressly states that a welfare fund shall be established, and it is understood that the annual State grant will be not less than £70,000 subsidised by not less than an equal amount by the Commonwealth. From this welfare fund, the Board has power to apply the moneys as it determines, for the welfare of the employees in the industry and their dependents, and communities of persons in the coal mining areas.

The Bill requires further examination and interpretation as to interpretation before we will be in a position to relate it more fully to the Town, District and Regional Plans that have been developed by the former Newcastle and Hunter Valley District Committees. Apart, however, from the actual provisions of this Bill and all that it implies, from its good and bad features, the aspect that I emphasise is that when we relate the Bill to the policy and programmes that we have developed and fought for, then surely we must see the enormous political significance and advantage that we, as a Party, have. Is it not true that on the initiative of the Communist-led Kearsley Shire Council we are playing a leading part in correctly using Local Government as a powerful instrument, a rallying ground as it were, for a great state, nay a great national movement for the objectives and achievement of Jobs, Homes and Security? This is, as I said, just one illustration of the reasons why we should place proper emphasis on work in the Councils, and why it is so urgently and strongly urged that every member should grasp this fully. The call from this conference is to every Party organ, from the proposed Local Government Committee, District Committee, every Party Branch and Group, to every comrade, to go now, seriously, into the relationship of the Party to the local Council in every area, particularly in close co-operation with Party Municipal Aldermen and Shire Councillors, to find the way to leadership of the people's needs, and to identify our Party and our Party Comrades with the most progressive, the most urgent demands in the Municipalities and Shires covered by our District Committees.

Before proceeding any further, let me emphasise and re-emphasise that it should be obligatory upon every single member of our Party to study and re-study that excellent little pamphlet, put out by our Central Committee, entitled *Outline for Work With Municipal and Shire Councils*. It is an important document because it sets out in simple terms the political aspects of Local Government, and most matters associated with the whole field of Local Government, as provided for in the Local Government and other associated Acts.

In addition to assimilating the things that we should know—and it is surprising how easy Local Government work is, not requiring any immense amount of technical qualifications, or any special qualifications, apart from a bit of sound common sense and courage of our convictions—the best



way to acquire the knowledge is to actually participate in and experience work in public committees. Here Progress Associations, P. and C.'s, etc., are all important, because in some way or other they are tied up with Local Government administration, and usually an opportunity is afforded to assume the leadership of such committees on behalf of the people. So, too, should we note the lack of attention by Party Branches as a whole in not taking up independently with the Local Government bodies the matters that they campaign around, and/or in association with other bodies leading deputations to councils on problems, etc. The Labor Party, in its reporting of the matters it takes up with the Councils and Government, certainly serves to illustrate the serious weakness of our Branches in this respect. Communist Branches do good work in this field which they never inform the public about.

If we are fully seized with the importance of the draft resolution before Conference, not only as to the brief re-statement of policy, but the programme, both organisational and political, then we can readily see the need for a Party Local Government Committee. The incoming District Committee will be charged with the immediate responsibility for the formation of such a committee to give direction to policy, co-ordination of programmes and work of all local government bodies in the amalgamated district, and the hammering out of an all-embracing regional scheme for the Hunter Valley region. Whilst it must be gratifying to this conference to know that we have four Communists on the Lake Macquarie Shire, three in the Municipal Council of Cessnock and five on Kearsley, it is, nevertheless, important that we not only co-ordinate the work of these comrades and the programmes already being implemented, but lift the level of work to a much higher plane, in order that the whole of the District will gain as a result of our experiences, and thus facilitate the early election of more Communists and progressives to Local Government.

When we view the historic development of Local Government in our region, taking into consideration the common identity of interests, the great potentialities that the region still retains, then we can see quite clearly the lack of vision, the parochial self interest of the proprietised class which has retarded proper planned development. Functions regional in their nature, and dependent on joint action and control for their initiation and success, have been and are sadly neglected by our local authorities. Today, public interest demands action to end this state of affairs, and, since we have assumed the responsibility for actual leadership and administration of policy in Local Government, we should aim for joint action on district schemes, or by means of County Council control, bring about co-ordinated development of public utilities in the interests of the public.

It should be noted that a start in this direction has been made with the Kearsley Shire's proposal

to the Cessnock Municipal Council to amalgamate and/or discuss conjointly such schemes as joint control of electricity, housing scheme, abattoirs, council unity hotel, etc. It is very true that because of lack of unity and failure to agree on matters where dual control exists, the working people have suffered. Despite the limited financial capacity of local government to implement urgent major social amenities, mainly because the only means of revenue is local rating on lands, there are many matters that can be successfully commended as revenue-producing projects, provided joint action and control is brought about. From a recent circular sent to Local Government bodies by the Prime Minister, it is obvious that the Commonwealth-State post-war plans do not make any generous provision for local government agencies, hence the emphasis to what I have just related about the joint control and the need for the Party to recognise that Local Government can be an important agency through which popular public opinion can be aroused. There can be no doubt as to the value of local administration for the winning of civic reforms, health matters and public utility.

If we are going to make our draft resolution the live pulsating charter of a better way of life for our people—striking back with mighty blows against the reactionary imperialist war-mongers, strengthening our Party so that it will ultimately lead the working class to final and successful struggles for socialism—we must have clearly in mind that the success of our struggle will require the utmost solidarity of the labor movement throughout Australia.

The lessons of our success in Local Government elections must be driven home. First, in the earlier elections, there existed in our district a great degree of unity—unity of all sections of our coalfields communities, as a matter of fact unity, or common cause, was made through our "New Deal" Committees with former Councillors, elements which were defeated in the elections. There was great activity by Communists, almost 100 per cent. branch participation in various phases of work. Thirdly, large numbers of non-Party people, A.L.P.ers, small business people and others, were drawn into activity. It should be remembered that with the end of the war there has taken place a sharper differentiation in the line-up of class forces and there is now considerably less unity and less activity. By a vigorous exposure of those against the interests of the people and a vigorous struggle by Communists to build unity, we will have more victories.

Election success only arises when we formulate a policy and programme that reflects the requirements of the people, and is backed by the unity I have spoken about, and this means thorough organisation by Communists.

I think a recent illustration I gave is worth repeating. Recently I attended a meeting of the Kurri Business Men's Club, and what did they raise with us? About a dozen local matters which

Kearsley Council gave 70 per cent. satisfaction to. They were matters of public importance. Why was it that the Kurri Branch did not write or have a deputation to the Council on such matters? Why have the Business Men been actually regarded as progressive, public-spirited men, taking up the people's requirements, when we can be? Is it any wonder we cannot gain large numbers of recruits, Tribune customers, and get cash?

Other bodies, not in any way working class, are raising matters with our Council and every other Council. Bernie Tonner recently led a deputation to Council on road improvements and other matters on behalf of the A.C.P. We gave great satisfaction. Is it not obvious that Bernie, as a Party member, will have a greater opportunity of selling literature, getting more finance and recruits? Bernie has shown us the way we want Branches to work. We should ensure that we select the appropriate issues round which we can develop full local unity, intensify all this work and combine it with increased sales of Tribune, a greater drive for cash—not being afraid to put forward the independent policy of the Party.

I have been asked to specially mention the work of Kearsley Council. Suffice it to say that Kearsley's programme includes such matters as public ownership and reticulation of electricity, and we have reached the stage of negotiating with the colliery companies and approached the Loan Council (Commonwealth) for a loan of £117,000. Plans and specifications have been approved by Council for the construction of public baths at Kurri, at a cost of £30,000—the financing of this is tied up with an approach to the Governments, perhaps through the Coal Board's Welfare Fund and local town improvement rate. We have spent £4,000 on new road machinery in the last few weeks to improve roads, streets and drains, and a further sum of £1,000 is to be spent in this direction. Seven play centres will have been established by the end of next week towards our total of 21 to be established in our 21 towns and villages at a cost of £2,300. Recreation and Park improvements totalling an approximate expenditure of £3,400 will most likely be approved at the next Council meeting; included in this amount is a grant of £1,000 from the State Government, only secured after a constant campaign by Council. Road construction works to the extent of £25,000 have been approved by Council. The modern Kurri Kurri Baby Health Centre will be started within a period of a few weeks at a cost of £3,000. A uniform garbage system will be introduced by the end of the year with no extra cost to the ratepayers and the fee of 8/8 per annum is one of the lowest in the State. A town beautification scheme, starting with the plantation of hundreds of trees, will be commenced as soon as possible. Water reticulation service for the townships of Greta and Braxton is now under way, for the first time in the nearly 100 years' history of these townships.

Because of Council's action in bringing some colliery companies into the street lighting area, which they previously escaped, a number of our townships' street lighting rates have been reduced. This in some instances has more than offset the increase that we were compelled to levy due to the previous Council's neglect, and enormously increased costs of administration.

Council donated £100 to the Lake Macquarie War Memorial Convalescent Home and has set aside a sum for the construction of an appropriate War Memorial in the district to those who sacrificed their lives in the fight against fascism for democracy and human liberty. It is likely that Council will expend £500 for the repair and construction of pavements in Kurri Kurri. Small additional items of expenditure have been made available to football clubs, park committees, etc. In the last two months we have made available £175 to four bodies.

We are the only Council in the State that has granted an exemption to pensioners of payment of their general rate. In respect to transport—in conjunction with Communist Aldermen Evans and Wilkinson, we have conducted a vigorous fight against the Rover Motor Bus Monopoly and in some instances adjusted fares to the interest of the travelling public, secured an almost complete system of bus seating accommodation, better timetables and routes. In the process of this campaign we exposed the right wing who lined up with the bus company.

In respect to Council's employees, suffice it to mention that the officials of the Shire Employees have stated that they have received better treatment from our Council in 12 months than any previous Council. Complete harmony between the employees and the Council exists. Adequate round table machinery exists, without fear of intimidation, for the ventilation of grievances.

Child welfare is a feature of our work. "Be Tidy" campaigns, education in the schools, etc., is undertaken by Council's officers. We have protested vigorously against the high prices for fruit and vegetables; demanded enactment of the 40 hour week and £1/10/0 increase in basic wage; protested about repression of democracy in Greece, against the vicious daily press campaign against the Soviet Union, and passed many other appropriate resolutions, such as demand for nationalisation of mines, etc.

We have participated in the work of "New Deal" Committees, Council Conferences—deputations to Government on the campaign for Cockle Creek-Cessnock rail link, etc.; participated in drafting and endorsing a programme of economic and social requirements for the district to the Regional Committees; given support to hundreds of other minor yet vital matters that affect the people, their everyday needs—a seat here, a water fountain, Christmas vacation play centres, etc.



October, 1946

Is there need for further comment on the significance of Local Government, particularly under the leadership of the Communist Party? I don't think so.

The threat of Imperialist war, looming capitalist crisis and impending class battles confronts our Party with world historic tasks, and corresponding heavy responsibilities. On the shoulders of the world parties of Communism rests the future fate of humanity.

## DEBATE WITH MR. KEON, M.L.A.

E. F. HILL

ON July 22, Mr. S. M. Keon, Labor M.L.A. for Richmond, debated against Mr. B. Flanagan, Secretary of the Ironworkers' Union, the proposition—"That the Communist Party and its subsidiary the Ironworkers' Union are a menace to the Trade Union movement." How such an extraordinary title to the debate came about is known only to the tortuous minds of Mr. Keon and his advisers. In the course of a week, Mr. Keon three times changed the title of the proposition that he was prepared to debate. Originally his challenge was—"That the activities of the Ironworkers' Association constitute a menace to the Trade Union Movement" (Herald, July 10, 1946). After he had challenged Mr. Flanagan to debate, Mr. Keon refused to discuss the conditions of the debate, refused to discuss who would be chairman, refused to discuss a title acceptable to both parties. Mr. Keon clearly wanted to stage a demonstration against the Communist Party.

Briefly, Mr. Keon's challenge arose out of the action taken by Ironworkers' Union members against a breakaway group from the union led by Mr. W. T. Lloyd. Ironworkers at Nobels went on strike against the tactics of Mr. Lloyd. Their action was upheld and supported by the Trades Hall Council Disputes Committee, and subsequently, by an overwhelming majority of Nobels' workers in a secret ballot.

On July 8, 1946, Victorian trade unionists were astonished to wake up and see in Melbourne's Argus ("the fascist headquarters in Melbourne") to borrow a phrase from Mr. Calwell) a double column heading "A.L.P. Silence Criticised—Communists Attacked" and underneath it: "An attack on the part played by Communists in the dispute at Nobels' Deer Park explosive factory and the extraordinary silence of executive officers of the A.L.P." was made by Mr. S. M. Keon, M.L.A. (Richmond) last night." Mr. Keon, as one might well imagine after such an auspicious opening, graduated in Melbourne's reactionary press to a 3 column heading in Sir Keith Murdoch's Herald: "Labor Party Has Had Enough of Communist Terrorism—Mr. Keon Hits Out," (Herald, July 10, 1946). Mr. Keon reached such importance that he pushed the atom bomb off the front page of Sir Keith's Herald and there he was—photographed drinking a milk drink!

Only a Party of the Leninist type, a disciplined Party, firmly based in Marxist-Leninist theory, and strongly rooted in the masses, can acquit itself in adequate, Bolshevik fashion.

In greeting the Central Committee of our Party and its leaders, Comrades Miles, Sharkey and Dixon, we pledge ourselves to fulfil our tasks with honor.

Forward to a more active, more powerful Bolshevik Party!

If there were any doubt as to who would be Mr. Keon's allies, they were quickly dispelled. Leaders of the Victorian Liberal Party (the ineffectual Mr. Hollway) sprang into action. Melbourne's Argus, of July 16, ran a heading "Liberal Leader Says Labor Must Support Mr. Keon." Mr. Hollway had no doubt about the correctness of Mr. Keon's policy—"The A.L.P. executive must decide whether it was going to support Mr. Keon, or repudiate him and swing further towards the Communists. . . The stand taken by Mr. Keon was a courageous one. Had it been taken by leaders of the Labor Party—preferably Mr. Chifley or Mr. Cain—some real service might have been done to the community."

At the debate in the Richmond Town Hall, Mr. Keon made one of his typical red-baiting attacks. He resorted to the worst form of demagoguery, including anti-semitism and anti-alien tactics—"get back to Carlton you refugee scum," he referred to his opponents as "dingoes," "thugs," "scum" and other similar terms. When he entered the hall thugs obviously armed with weapons of various kinds crowded round him. He draped the Australian flag around himself; his supporter Mr. Mullens (ex-M.L.A., Footscray) withdrew it when Mr. Flanagan (veteran of two wars) spoke. Mr. Keon did not raise one positive point in his speech: not one mention of the 40-Hour week or the A.C.T.U. policy of £1 increase in the basic wage. His ranting and raving were in the true tradition of General Franco: the vast majority of the audience ironically and spontaneously raised their arms in the fascist salute. And there is no doubt that this spotlighted the real purpose of the whole business: it was a real Franco demonstration against the Communist Party organised and promoted by the Catholic Action movement.

But what went wrong? Only one small thing went wrong. That was that Melbourne's workers recognised the meeting for what it was. Far from it was a vigorous anti-Keon demonstration. Mr. Melbourne complained that people came from all over Mr. Keon, that is precisely what did happen. Men and women came from far and wide to defend genuine working-class principles. The narrow basis

of Mr. Keon's "movement" was demonstrated. Although Roman Catholic priests endeavoured to whip up Richmond Catholics to attend the meeting, the vast majority of Catholics, by not turning up, showed their contempt for this barefaced attempt to use their religion for reactionary political purposes. Despite all the conditions in his favor, despite all the frantic whipping up, Mr. Keon's followers were outnumbered by about 4 to 1: they were reduced to impotent fury as was Mr. Keon himself. Mr. Keon's followers quailed before the mass demonstration against them. But we may expect Mr. Hollway's darling, the "courageous" Mr. Keon to skulk behind the safety of parliament and to make his pronouncements through the press of the millionaires.

It would be naïve to think that Mr. Keon is playing a lone hand in this crusade. Although the Catholic Action movement regretfully reported that the late H. M. Creman would be impossible to replace (p. 17 Secret Report), Mr. Keon is making a desperate effort to establish himself as "leader" of the . . . Movement. He carried out faithfully and to the letter the ideas of the Movement. On pages 13 and 14 of the Movement's secret report is a deprecation of the failure of Labor politicians and Cabinet Ministers to condemn Communism.

"With one or two exceptions it is notable that no Catholic Labor member, be it of the Commonwealth or the State parliaments, has shown any enthusiasm for the fight against Communism. In almost every case they are disposed to 'play it down.' They condemn the enthusiasm of those who are sacrificing themselves in this fight as misplaced zeal. They call on the authority which their position gives them to advise priests and even bishops that their 'inside' position makes them certain that Communism is no danger. What did Mr. Keon do? He commenced by condemning the silence of the A.L.P. Central Executive. He developed his argument into a sharp criticism of the Federal Minister for Labor (Mr. Hollway). "Mr. Hollway is apparently paying the price for immunity from Communist opposition in Melbourne Ports at the next election. . . There can be no other explanation of his request that the management of Nobels comply with the ironworkers' demand for the victimisation (read "dismissal") of loyal A.L.P. members (read "breakaway groups") who refuse to pay money for the support of ironworkers— to be used in turn for the support of Communist candidates against the A.L.P. . . Fortunately, after Labor's victory in the Federal election in September, there should be ample new Ministerial talent available." (Argus, July 10, 1946). So speaks the "mights" Mr. Keon at the behest of the Catholic Action so-called "movement!"

Mr. Keon belongs to a party the tradition of which is one man one job, and yet Mr. Keon is a member of Parliament and still retains his job as secretary of the Public Service Association.

Mr. Keon has gone out of his way to tender good advice to the Liberal Party about the anti-

Communist campaign. In the Victorian Parliament, he said: "If opposition members desire to help the Labor movement in its fight against the Communists, they should remain quiet." Mr. McDonald (Opposition leader) interjected—"As the government remains quiet." Mr. Keon continued: "Neither the government nor I have been silent; but it is not helpful when the case for the employers is presented as it was by the honorable member for Toorak, for instance. (This refers to an attack by a Liberal politician on Communists.) Opposition parties must realise that, because of their past records, they are suspect in the eyes of the workers of this State. . ." (Hansard, 1945-6, No. 13, p. 1838). In other words, Mr. Keon says, because of the Labor label I wear I am able to do this job much better than he who wears an anti-working-class label.

Such an attitude is not surprising from one who led a deputation to have the Soviet flag banned from the official State Victory Day dinner nor from one who rebuked Dr. Evatt for a mild anti-Franco statement, nor further from one who secured the removal from the menu of a Melbourne cafe of a dish known as Russian steak. (The management subsequently served the dish under the name of Bismarck steak.)

Mr. Keon's stand was condemned by trade union after trade union and by thousands of workers at factory meetings. Even the extreme right wing were getting a little uneasy. Mr. G. Hayes, right wing A.L.P. President, was forced to utter a mild rebuke. But with lime-honored technique, the Labor Party leaders allowed the heat to go out of the fight and finally a majority of the Central Executive said that "Mr. Keon had acted within the terms of a recent A.L.P. conference decision." So the policy of this clique on the A.L.P. Central Executive is decided outside the Labor Party and inside the minds of the worst elements in the Roman Catholic Hierarchy. Even this clique had to warn Mr. Keon that the time was not ripe for him to rush so wildly into the press. And what of the section of the executive who were for some action against Mr. Keon? The fact that they wanted action against Mr. Keon is praiseworthy but their courage and their conception of tactics are conspicuous by their absence. Whilst these men allow Mr. Keon to get away with things like this and allow the Labor Party's policy to be determined by the so-called "movement" then they deserve all the kicks they get. When they fight Mr. Keon and the Catholic Action movement in the open, then they will win, and utterly rout these plotters.

A word needs to be said on A.L.P. industrial groups. If we turn again to the Movement's report (p. 5), we read: "Most important of all, was the formation of Labor Party 'discussion groups' within the factories. . . It is impossible for us to exaggerate the importance of this change for our activists. Previously in the battle against Communism in the factory they were compelled to act individually. Wherever they concentrated in groups it was obvious



that the groups were Catholic. Hence the sectarian argument could be raised against them often with decisive force. Today they have the cover of the Labor Party. They carry on the fights as the executives of these factory "discussion groups" and none can effectively question their bona fides." Thus the "Movement" openly recognises that their bona fides are open to question, but tactically it is estimated that the A.L.P. cover makes it difficult to bring this into the open.) Easter Conference of the Labor Party supported the settling up of these groups. The prime movers for this were Messrs. Broadby, Maxwell, Peters and Cousland—3 of them members of the "Movement" group in the Tramways Union and the other (Peters) a well known right wing leader. Now, the Movement has succeeded in carrying this policy one step further by getting rules for the formation of these groups adopted. The only purpose of these groups is to split and divide the workers: to carry on the work of the reactionary Roman Catholic Hierarchy against the real interests of all workers—Catholic, Communist, Labor Party and non-party alike. Where does our hero Mr. Keon stand? "The A.L.P. decision to form Labor groups in every union means that Labor's battle against Communism has extended from the political to the industrial field and that the fight is now on. . . .

"Labor groups would fight all future union battles on definite Labor tickets. But even with the

election of Labor men the war would not end, because Communists, in the guise of Labor, would still try to whitewash the unions." (Argus, August 14, 1946.) Again, not a word about the pressing problems of the workers—only the fight against Communism — the same fight as the daily press conducts day in and day out.

It is all the more dangerous that these activities of Mr. Keon come at just the same time as the big monopolists are putting all they know into the fight against the working class and the Communist Party. The Catholic Action movement forms an essential part of the campaign to destroy the working class movement — it is but one flank of the offensive of reaction.

Let us summarise some of the important lessons to be learned from this experience of Victorian workers. The struggle against the right wing clique must be intensified as never before. Mass demonstrations of the kind against Mr. Keon are medicine these gentlemen cannot take. They must not be allowed to set up their A.L.P. industrial groups because these groups are designed for disruption. Within the A.L.P., opponents of the Keon line need to take a more courageous and open stand. Communists need to intensify the struggle for unity and the realisation of the urgent demands of the working class.

## KURDS—EXPLOSIVE FORCE IN THE MIDDLE EAST

NORMAN FREEHILL

If you draw a sickle on that portion of the Middle East map which stretches from Syria to Iran (Persia) you will have covered an area which has no name on any map, but which is Kurdistan—land of the Kurds. It stretches over Syria, Turkey, Iran and Iraq.

If to the sickle you add a hammer you might be making a political prophecy, because the Kurds are stirring in their mountain fastnesses.

The area inhabited by the Kurds sweeps from Aleppo Province on the Mediterranean well into Turkey north of Lake Van; continues up to Erivan, in the Armenian Socialist Soviet Republic; then runs down through Iran near Lake Urmia (now in the new independent Iranian province of Azerbaijan); curves inward to Iraq at Khanagin and on to take in the Kirkuk and Mosul oilfields.

The spread of the Kurdish population indicates what potential dynamite is stacked in the Middle East. And, as if the human factor was not inflammable enough, the fabulously rich Mosul and Kirkuk oilfields are in the area and there are additional unexploited oil lands.

Altogether, Kurdistan covers about 100,000 square miles. Of the population of the area per-

haps 5,000,000 are Kurds, the rest being minorities of Arabs, Armenians, Azerbaijanis, Iraki, Lebanese, Syrians — all representing oppressed nationalities.

More than one and a half million Kurds are in Eastern Anatolia in Turkey, a million in British-ruled Iraq, 700,000 in seething Iran, 300,000 in British-controlled French Syria, and smaller numbers scattered in other areas. A number estimated at 20,000 are in settlements over the border in the Soviet Union.

On the matter of Syria and Lebanon it may here be noted that Britain has intrigued against France in both countries and the present controllers of those countries are the best British money could buy.

Before developing the political theme let us take a look at recent history — at least so much of recent history as bears on the Kurdish problem.

After World War I, under the Treaty of Sevres, the Kurds were promised their independence. That promise went the way of others made to economically and politically powerless national minorities in the cold-blooded huckstering after the 1914-18 war, when the League of Nations handed Palestine,

Lebanon, Syria and Iraq to Britain and France and the big oil monopolists.

Lord Curzon, bitterly anti-Russian, in feverish haste to marshal any and every country against the young workers' and peasants' Soviet Republic, contemptuously threw the Kurds, and what the Turks had left of the Armenians, into the discard in return for Turkish opposition to the Soviet. To supreme aristocrat Curzon, the Kurds were, after all, merely uncivilised mountain fighters of no political importance.

Thus it was that, for Turkey's opposition to Russia, Curzon tore up the scrap of paper written in the Luxembourg Palace (the Treaty of Sevres), and did not even bother to mention the Kurds in the revised treaty of Lausanne in 1923. He washed his immaculately dirty hands of them. And the Kurds in the mountains saw their promised independence vanish into the thick, conspiratorial air of the diplomatic bargain shop.

One has always heard much of the Arabs and the Jews, because of British Imperialist interests in the area which bears so vitally on the Suez Canal, on oil, on India.

On the other hand, all but students of international relations rushed for their atlases when the Azerbaijan problem was thrust before an astonished reading public. The Bevin-Byrnes gangling up against Russia at least added to the geographical knowledge of the peoples.

But the Kurds never even "made" cable brevities until recent weeks.

In the "Daily Mirror" of August 3 came mention of "fear of a rising of Kurds in both Persia and Iraq." Out of the muddled picture presented by the cable, which confused Kurds with Assyrians, Persians and Azerbaijanis emerged these points:

"For a long time large Kurdish minorities in both countries, have been vocal about oppression and neglect by politicians.

"Iraq appointed a Kurd as Minister for Kurdish Affairs in 1942 after an abortive rising. Amelioration of conditions was promised, but nothing has been done."

"Several revolts in the Mosul and Kirkuk regions have been crushed in the past two years."

A brief A.A.P. cable on July 17 said martial law had been "imposed in South Persia following a strike of 100,000 workers in the Anglo-Iranian Company's oilfields."

The cable went on to say that Persian troops had seized trade union headquarters and workers' clubs. The "Persian" troops are controlled by the Anglo-Iranian Oil Co., as is naively disclosed by the same cable, which said the "strikers and (democratic) Tudeh Party leaders have issued a manifesto demanding that the Anglo-Iranian Oil Company cease interfering with Persian political affairs." And "interfering" does not mean kid-glove action. It means force and murder and ruthless suppression.

Later came a cabled report of British warships moving up to the head of the Persian Gulf and British

troops being landed. The British Government has a majority holding in Anglo-Iranian oil—it being one of the Foreign Office's investments.

Trouble in the British areas where the oil workers are sweated at wages which give them a bare existence was inevitable. In North Persia, Russia's oil agreement is on a fifty-fifty basis with the Persian Government (Russia supplies the technical experts and equipment). And the Soviet not only pays the Iranian workers hitherto unheard of wages but looks after them in other ways — gives them hospitals, schools; treats them as it treats the Russians who work alongside them. Such a violent contrast to the slave conditions on the British- and American-controlled fields must inevitably, sooner or later, have provoked moves by the Iranian workers. And, of course, any move by workers of oppressed nationalities for improved conditions is labelled "Communist."

An even wider and more troublesome outcome is likely so far as the Oil Monopolists and their Governments are concerned. Practically all the oil areas of the Middle East are owned or controlled by Anglo-American oil companies. Thus Governments of Middle Eastern countries are likely to ask for upward royalty revision of existing oil agreements with Britain and America to bring them into line with the Russo-Iranian agreement.

Since that message re the strike — and a strike of 100,000 "slave" workers is no small item—there has been dead silence except for the cable (3/8/46) about British troops being sent to Basra (Persian Gulf) to safeguard British and Indian capitalist interests in South Persia and, of course, "to protect British and Indian lives, if necessary."

Look again at that sickle you drew across the map. You can see just how the Kurds can throw the whole of the Middle East into ferment once they decide that the time has arrived for the 1920 promises to be fulfilled.

Intent upon anti-Russian propaganda over Azerbaijan, the cables in the Australian Press forgot to record that the Kurds moved with the Azerbaijanis. Early in May the Kurds in Persia set up their own National Government (thus far not recognised) with Ghazi (or Quazi) Mohammed as Prime Minister, and entered into a military alliance with the Persian Azerbaijan National Government. Mohammed is an outstanding figure, cultured, a linguist.

The demands of the Iranian Kurds are—(1) Autonomy, (2) Kurdish language, (3) Kurdish officials, (4) Land reform, (5) Increased education, (6) Higher living standard, (7) Proportional representation in Iran Parliament.

Even while the Azerbaijanis were negotiating for their independence the Kurds were making similar demands. Also at that time (May) the Azerbaijan radio announced that Azerbaijan having won its freedom, it was its duty to help free other national minorities oppressed by the brutal feudal landowners of Iran.



The fierce nationalism of the Kurds is allied to a fighting tradition. The people are virile mountain folk for the most part, used to hardship.

The Kurds did not accept the variety of masters under which the Curzon agreement placed them—Turkey, Syria, Iraq, Iran. They fought the Turks many times.

The nationalism of the Kurds has been cemented in revolt against their oppressors. They have risen ten times in the past 20 years.

During the perilous war years they refrained from revolt, although the German agents early in the struggle could count on pro-Nazi Governments in Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, Greece, Egypt, Turkey, Syria, Iran and Afghanistan.

The Turks have been trying to wipe the Kurds out, just as they wiped out the Armenians by massacres which shocked the world. Whole Turkish armies have moved against the Kurds. Turkey conducted major military operations against the fighting mountain folk in 1925, 1930, 1937, and 1938. After the 1925 attack, the Turkish Government reported the Kurds as "wiped out." And after the 1938 operation the Turkish Minister of the Exterior, Jلال Bey, announced that "the mountain bandits have been liquidated." The 1938 statement was as ill-based as that of 1925.

In March last, Turkey and Iraq signed a treaty to which (according to several foreign correspondents) was attached a secret clause which provided for joint struggle against the Kurd tribes.

Doubtless the shrewd heads among the British Imperialists, their ears nicely attuned to the muffled clink of golden dividends from Kirkuk oil, will go through the gestures of granting hearing, at least, to the Kurds in territories dominated by Anglo-Persian and Royal Dutch Shell. But the time, they will find, has passed. Curzon left a legacy that has shattered the faith of the Kurds for all time.

The Empire of the Oil Kings in the Kurdish areas is enormously rich. Oil from Mosul is piped to Tripoli and from Kirkuk to Haifa. The Khan-agin field, near the Iranian frontier, is worked by the Anglo-Iranian, which owns the big southern Persian field.

Turkey is the Kurds' chief problem. Turkey's ruling class—the large landowners (Agas), money-lenders and a growing industrial bourgeoisie have most to fear from a resurgent Kurdish nationalism.

Although Turkey's population is three-quarters peasant, so grasping are the almost feudal landowners and so primitive the farming methods that Turkey still has to import foodstuffs. Even the recently strengthened Turkish bourgeoisie and the Turkish middle class are beginning to revolt against the dictatorship of the landlords and a few big capitalists.

The virtual serfdom under which the Kurdish peasants work in Turkey will look a miserable thing beside the freedom of their fellows in Azerbaijan and Russia.

Just as the freedom and incalculably better conditions of their brothers in the Azerbaijan Republic of the Soviet Union finally inspired the Azerbaijanis in Persia to fight for and obtain their independence, so the Kurds in the area near Azerbaijan are the spearhead for the fight for freedom for all Kurds. These Persian Kurds, under the command of Mulla Mustapha, clashed with Iranian troops in the northwest, near the border of Iraq, at the time of the Azerbaijan revolt. And the Kurdish National Army of 30,000 inflicted defeat on the Iranian forces.

Even greater is Iraq's problem. Given a Kurdish National Government in Persia a Kurdish move in Iraq will be beyond quelling. The cables tell nothing of the present position in Iraq in which practically the whole of Iraq's army and air force ("advised" by British experts) plus its "police" force of 7,000, are deployed along the line which marks the north-eastern Kurdish areas. The army and air bases are (by sheerest coincidence!) near the Kirkuk oilfield.

Actually Iraq has already been served with notice of pending trouble. A year ago (August, 1945) the Kurds in Iraq revolted. Kurdish tribesmen, chiefly irregulars, defeated the numerically superior Government troops. Only when independent chiefs had been bribed to assist the Government forces did the Kurds retire. But they retired undefeated. The Kurds were led in that revolt by Mulla Mustapha, already mentioned for his part in the Persian fighting.

The Kurds have not deep roots in Syria, and have been quieter than their mountain brothers. But if Britain ignores the 250,000 Kurds in Syria because of the game it is playing with the Arabs, the picture may change. The Syrian Kurds are part of the Kurdish family and it is not without significance that the Secretary of the Syrian Communist Party, Khalid Bagdache, is a Kurd and the Secretary of the Communist Party of Lebanon, Fara Jella El-Helav, is also a Kurd.

Azerbaijan made the front pages because it was a pawn in the anti-Russia war-hate being created by Bevin and Byrnes.

Just as Britain was against the democratic Tudeh Party in the Azerbaijan Iran dispute because that Party was friendly with the Socialist Soviet Union, so it must be against any democratic force which threatens its dominance (shared, in some areas, with American Oil Companies) of the oil-fields of Persia, Arabia, Iraq.

If the Kurds rise over the whole of the Kurdish-occupied area, or bit by bit from Iran to the Mediterranean, Britain will find that it will have to cross borders to instal its police, armies and air force openly, inexcusably, insolently. And Greece cannot be duplicated indefinitely!

When the Kurds move in earnest they will make the headlines in the papers and headlines in the British Foreign Office and U.S. State Department. And they will shatter more than one Imperialist dream in the Middle East.

## MARXIST MATERIALISM AND EPISTEMOLOGY

L. HARRY GOULD

(Paper read at the Congress of the Australian and New Zealand Association for the Advancement of Science, held at Adelaide, August 21-28, 1946.)

THE struggle between materialism and idealism is, for Marxists, the basic question of philosophy. As the subject is rather new for gatherings of this kind, I shall devote the first part of my paper to a brief exposition of the principles of Marxist, i.e., dialectical, materialism and the Marxist doctrine of truth. The second part will consider other philosophies, including the latest views of Bertrand Russell as presented last November in his Henry Sidgwick lecture on "Physics and Experience." As well as defending the materialist standpoint, my purpose in this second part will be to show that these other modern philosophical trends are far from original; they are mere restatements of traditional, classical idealist philosophy.

First, then, Marxism affirms that matter, objective actuality, exists independently of sensation. Matter is not a product of mind, but mind itself is only the highest product of matter. Mind is matter at a high stage of development, matter organised in a special way: it is matter with its crowning achievement—consciousness. Matter is universally homogeneous in essence, and with all its changes, however vast the qualitative differences, it remains eternally one and the same matter, whether non-thinking, so-called "inert" matter or matter endowed with a definite faculty of sensation.

Marx and Engels, co-founders of modern Communism, stated: "The premises from which we begin are not arbitrary ones, not dogmas, but are real premises from which abstraction can only be made in the imagination. . . . These premises can thus be verified in a purely empirical way."

In the imagination anything of course can be abstracted, posited or related. Abstraction in imagination is absolutely indispensable for thought; imagination is never forgotten that imaginary magnitudes, such as 1/-1, or imaginary qualities or nitudes, such as wings, are always referable back to prototypes of the external world, to apprehensible objectivity.

Marxist materialism thus rejects the assumptions of the hundred-and-one varieties of epistemologies of idealism. The world, being, things are not logical idealism. The world, being, things are not merely ideas or "complexes of sensations." As the idealist, solipsist or empirio-critic, understanding, but independent of understanding.

"Materialism," said Marx, "is the natural-born son of Great Britain. Already the British schoolman, Duns Scotus, asked whether it was impossible for matter to think." Stating that Bacon was the real progenitor of British materialism, Marx went on: "Hobbes shatters the theistic prejudices of

Baconian materialism; Collins, Dodswal, Coward, Hartley, Priestly similarly shattered the last theological bars that still hemmed in Locke's sensationalism." Materialism is thus native to Britain and British science.

Second, the world is a process, is matter developing in a historical process. What is dialectics, the especial feature of Marxist materialism? It is defined as the science of the general laws of motion, both of the external world and of human thought. The dialectical method of apprehending nature is by "taking things and their perceptual images essentially in their inter-connection, in their concatenation, in their movement, in their rise and disappearance"; nature reveals eternal movement and change, renewal and development. The essence of dialectics is the internal contradiction which provides the inner impulse for movement; that is, all things and phenomena of nature have their negative and positive sides, a past and a future, something dying away and something developing; the struggle between these opposites constitutes the internal content of the process of development.

The ancient Heraclitus was perhaps the first to present this viewpoint, saying: "The world, the all in one, was not created by any god or any man, but was, is, and ever will be a living flame systematically flaring up and systematically dying down" (also translated, ". . . in due measure self-enkindled and in due measure self-extinguished"). Lenin commented: "A very good exposition of the rudiments of dialectical materialism."

Third, Marxist materialism asserts that the world and its laws are fully knowable, that man acquires authentic knowledge of the world through science and social-historic practice. Rejecting scepticism, Marxism emphasises that truth is discoverable within, and only within, the process of cognition itself.

The unknown "thing-in-itself" becomes, through science and practice, the known "thing-for-us." Criticising the agnostic Huxley and his followers for their "shamefaced materialism," and their denial of the validity of sense perceptions, Engels said of the ungraspable "thing-in-itself": "One after another these ungraspable things have been grasped, analysed and, what is more, reproduced by the giant progress of science, and what we can produce we certainly can consider knowable."

A few further statements on practice as the criterion, and also as the basis, of knowledge—From Francis Bacon: "Human knowledge and human power meet in one; for when the cause is not known the effect cannot be produced. Nature to be commanded must be obeyed; and that which



in contemplation is as the cause, is in operation as the rule."

From Marx: "Social life is essentially practical. All the mysteries which seduce theory into mysticism find their rational solution in human practice and in the comprehension of this practice."

Engels: "The success of an action proves the agreement of our perceptions with the apprehensible objective truth of things."

Lenin: "Practice is higher than theoretical knowledge, because it has not only the property of generality, but also of direct actuality."

The method of epistemology, therefore, inquires not only, What can man know?—but also, What does man do? Man never "stands in theoretical relationship" with the outside world. He eats, shelters and clothes himself. He is not passive; he acts. Hence, man reaches truth, he establishes truth, by uncovering the secrets of the law-governed processes of nature, and by his own operations on nature. Contrast man's extremely limited practice in, say, mining in primitive times with mining experience today, i.e., after millennia of ever-improving practice, new techniques, and the capacity for theoretical generalisations in mechanics, geology and a hundred other related sciences. The most recent example of practice as the test of truth is the manufacture by physicists of elements prior to their discovery in nature.

We must also contrast Marxism with pragmatism. The latter recognises truth (what it regards as truth) only post factum, only after it has passed into history. Within understandable limits, Marxism can make confident predictions of the future, of the truth that is to come, through the further unfolding of present processes, and by man's conscious intervention to shape the world to desired ends.

A final point in this exposition, Marxist materialist philosophy, dialectical materialism, is the world outlook of the Communist Party. What precisely is the connection between materialism and the theory of social revolution? Specifically, why is Marxism so irreconcilably opposed to epistemological idealism? Because Marxism proposes not only to interpret the world, but to change it; it is integrally bound up with, indeed, is synonymous with, science, with scientific endeavour, practice and verification. The pre-Marxist materialist, the mechanist materialist, had already correctly noted the relation, arguing that if man constructs all his knowledge from the world of sense and his experience in the world of sense, then it follows that man can, and should, he must change externality. Philosophical materialism, when translated into social practice, becomes critical and revolutionary. We may note in ancient times and revolutionary, of Plato against those who sought to restore Ionian materialism. Materialism to restore Ionian materialism of the victorious bourgeois revolution of 17th century England and 18th century France. In America, there is the acknowledged debt of Jeffersonian democracy to Epicurus and, of course, to

France of the Encyclopaedists. Today materialism, enriched by all the scientific achievements since 1789, is the instrument of the working class revolution of this century. Idealism, with its doubts and denials of the authenticity of man's knowledge and relativism and subjectivism, its demiurges and absolute spirits, its a priori sanctions and ex-cathedra judgments, has always been the protector of the status quo, the handmaiden of privilege in class-divided society. "Philosophical idealism," said Lenin, "is a road to clerical obscurantism."

I now come to other philosophies.

Examination of the various modern trends reveals, as I said, their lack of originality, of newness in contribution to philosophical thought. The old idealism is repeated, but merely with some refinements of expression, and garnished at times with the weirdest terminologies; it is traditional idealism concerned with "thought entities and heavenly things"; if a departure is attempted, it is only in the direction of deducing relations between things by analysis of relations between concepts, or through juggling with the meanings of words—and then you are usually told that the things don't exist anyway. This aspect of modern philosophy was already discussed in Lenin's *Materialism and Empirio-Criticism*, published in 1908. Commenting upon what he termed, the "uprightness, clarity and precision" of the classical idealists, he demonstrated with many examples that the inventors of the supposedly new schools—empirio-critics, recent positivists, neuromonists, pragmatists, empirio-symbolists, empirio-monists, immanentists, etc.—were repeating in one form or another the views expressed earlier by Berkeley, Hume, Kant and Fichte.

This is also true of philosophy since Lenin's day.

Who used such expressions as: "the framework of space and time"; "space and time are . . . the world enter the gateways of knowledge," our senses, and in terms of which they are classified"; or, "what enters through the gateways of knowledge (is) appearances rather than reality"? Anyone familiar with the literature of philosophy would say, Immanuel Kant. Kant did express himself that way, but these quotations are from Sir James Jeans. Sir Arthur Eddington says: "The whole subject-matter of physics consists of pointer-readings and similar indications." Earlier scientists and philosophers had seen in scientific theory only symbols, signs or hieroglyphics. I quote from a 19th century giant of science, Helmholtz, in his address in 1878 on "The Facts of Perception": "Inasmuch as the quality of our sensation gives us the evidence of the properties of the external cause by which sensation is produced, the sensation can be regarded as its sign, but not as its image." Of course, whether sceptical distrust of the perceptive faculties is original or not, the objection remains. If industry and science provide a test (and what else is there but faith?), then perception does give a more or

less true picture of the objective world; with only signs or symbols, true knowledge would be impossible; signs may be representations of anything.

A few words on the school of Scientific Empiricism. Runes' *Philosophical Dictionary* states that one of its main sections, the Vienna Circle, founded in 1924, ended with the death of its founder, Prof. Schlick, in 1936. Here is something else, pathetic, yet gorgeously funny, when one ponders over the flood of books, articles, lectures, which made their noise for a dozen years, and then passed on out of the world—testimony to the inconsequentiality of thinking which turns inward and feeds upon itself, seeking for truth with little or no reference to the outside world.

I take one statement, characteristic and significant, from Hahn's *Logic, Mathematics and Knowledge of Reality*: "If we can affirm apodictically that 2 plus 3 is universally equal to 5, if we are able to affirm, prior to all observation, that 2 plus 3 will never be observed to be equal to 7, for instance, the reason is that by 2 plus 3 we think of exactly the same thing as by 5." There is nothing new in this. My reply is also unoriginal, but as it is verifiable, I have more right to speak apodictically, and say: "Two sticks, or two fingers, added to three sticks, or three fingers, will make five sticks or five fingers. Two drops of water added to three drops may make four or six drops, or only one drop; in some cases, such as by combining two drops and three drops in an operating siphon or atomiser, the number may reach thousands of drops of water."

Now, Bertrand Russell.

The dictionary speaks of Russell's flirtations with realism, neutral monism, positivism and behaviourism. He offers a clue for his inconsistency in his *Sceptical Essays*, saying: "I am a British Whig, with a British love of compromise." However, few idealists can really afford to ignore materialism completely. The classical idealists set the fashion; thus, Hume, idealist indoors, but materialist outside his study; or Leibnitz, compelled to distinguish between "truths of reason" and "truths of fact." What is good for daily life is unavailable for speculation. Note this inconsistency: in *Mysticism and Logic*, Russell says: "The actual data in sensation, the immediate objects of sight or touch or hearing, are extra-mental, purely physical, and among the ultimate constituents of matter." This is, for Russell, a bad lurch to materialism. But he soon becomes frightened at his own temerity, and hastens to add: ". . . it is probably wrong in supposing that it continues to exist when we are no longer looking at it."

Rev. Dodgson's account of the Cheshire Cat sounds equally authentic; it certainly is a hundred times more artistic—you remember, the cat's smile that continued to be visible after the animal itself had disappeared.

Also unoriginal is the following statement of his quoted by Prof. Stebbing: "A piece of matter has become, not a persistent thing with varying states, but a system of inter-related events. The old

solidity is gone, and with it the characteristic that, to the materialist, made matter seem more real than fleeting thoughts." This is rather common now; a number of physicists postulate that we may consider an electron only as a "probability function" existing in the mind of the mathematician. One of the chapters in Lenin's work is entitled, "The Crisis in Modern Physics"; another, in quotation marks, "Matter Has Disappeared." Dealing with the claim that science had reduced atoms to energy, Lenin argued that the phrase "matter disappears" meant only that matter in the form of the limit which we have known up to now vanishes, as our knowledge penetrates deeper. So again, the fundamental epistemological problem remains: Does the atom, now picturesquely described as an infinitely small solar system within which negative electrons rotate around the positive nucleus, does the atom exist outside our cognition? The atom bomb—do we deny its objective existence merely because description of the sub-atomic particles may be possible only in terms of formulae? I don't doubt that, as science probes still more deeply into nature's processes, we shall have new "crises" among some of our physicists and physico-idealists, and that matter will "disappear" once again, i.e., matter will "dematerialise" to energy, energy to mathematical formulae.

A few points from the Henry Sidgwick lecture, with brief comments. Quote: "Here is a peculiarity: physics never mentions percepts except when it speaks of empirical verification of its laws; but if its laws are not concerned with percepts, how can percepts verify them?" I reply: First, there is an obvious petitio principii (begging of the question) here, but we may pass that. Verification is possible only with the aid of man's perceptive faculties. The whole process of cognition—the first approach of knowledge, every step in verification, the further expansion of knowledge—is based on the "raw material" of thought, percepts, whether perception be by the unaided eye, ear, etc., or with mechanical aids to perception, such as the microscope, stethoscope, prism or cyclotron.

Quote: "We cannot adhere completely to common usage as regards the 'mental' and the 'physical' if we adopt William James' view that there is no difference between a perceiving and an object perceived (meaning by 'object' that which is given in perception as opposed to what is inferred). I share this view, and therefore cannot wholly adhere to usage." Comment: I use this quotation mainly to contrast it with the next. This statement of Russell's is of course pure subjective idealism, a restatement, minus the literary charm, of Bishop Berkeley's presentation.

Quote: "The table that I see is outside my body as I see it in perceptual space, and the physical table is outside my physical body in physical space." Reply: This is a materialist formulation. However, he continues: "But sometimes the correspondence fails. I dream, say, of a railway accident: I see



the train falling down an embankment, and I hear the shrieks of the injured." Reply: Does Russell consider the experience of seeing trains in a dream epistemologically identical with seeing them in physical space? If he doesn't, his argument is quite pointless. But, frankly, I think he tends to regard them as identical, despite his remarks later on. There is, first, the connecting sentence ("but sometimes the correspondence fails"), and secondly, among anti-materialists differentiation between the experiences in the dream and the waking states is a most perplexing problem.

Quote: "Why, for example, when a number of people see the sun, should we believe that there is a sun outside their percepts, and not merely that there are laws determining the circumstances in which we shall have the experience called 'seeing the sun'?" Comment: One of the characteristics of idealism is the confusion between experiencing the objective world and having experiences. Russell depreciates practice, at times to the point of ignoring it altogether, and that is his great difficulty. One might suggest that he study the story of the Bikini test, or, more simply, watch the mechanic repairing his wireless set. Russell, who likes to poke fun at the theologian, falls himself into fideism and mysticism, because if subjective experience, if the "elements of consciousness," are the only reality, then mystical, occult or religious experiences are as valid as those of science. But if practice, if science, leads to objective truth, as it does, then there can be no room for fideism.

There is also an irresistible impression of mechanism in this lecture. To Russell, a percept is a percept, rigid, immutable, given with fatal finality. This is true, by the way, of his thinking in other spheres. One critic notes this staccato in Russell's recent *History of Western Philosophy*, in his handling of the problem of state power. A ruler is a ruler, whether it be Hammurabi or Hitler, Augustus or Elizabeth. I noted the same failing in *Education and the Social Order*, where he deals with courage, sensitivity and other human characteristics or attributes. The failing is due to operating with the logic of fixed concepts. Russell lacks dialectics. Fixity of conception is the very last method with which to examine the processes of the world.

This is very important. The Marxist theory of perception speaks not of signs or symbols, but of copies, images, mirror-reflections of things. But Marxism emphasises that human consciousness is not a lifeless reflecting surface; it is a consciousness that develops with experience, with the whole past experience of society. Reflection is an active moment of historical, evolutionary social practice. "The five senses," said Marx, "are the product of universal history."

It should be stressed, too, that practice is a continuously-expanding interactionism between man and nature; the changes which man has wrought on his environment react on man himself.

Further, in reply to Leibnitz, the materialist Feuerbach asked: "Is it possible I see only leaves and not the tree also? Is it possible that there is no sensation of identity, of uniqueness, of difference?" But in Russell there is little conception of movement of thought from lower to higher levels. Along with his mechanism, and indeed merely another facet of it, Cartesian rationalism, which holds sensations to be untrustworthy, is implicit in the lecture.

This is how Lenin describes the movement, the development through different moments or gradations, by which knowledge attains greater and greater depth: "At first—impressions, as in a flash, then—something is distinguished, then—ideas of quality are developed (leading to a definition of a thing or a phenomenon), and subsequently, ideas of quantity. Then study and reflection direct the thought to questions of identity and difference—basis—essence. All these moments or steps of knowledge are directed from the subject to the object, verify themselves by practice and proceed through this verification to truth."

I conclude this second part on the social-historical aspects.

In the large of history, philosophical idealism made its great contributions to the advancement of human thought and culture. But it is anachronistic today. The flood of "new" philosophies is not unconnected with the chaos of the modern world—its 65 wars since 1918, its economic crises, the cultural decline, the new terrors in the atomic bomb, and, as so gleefully announced, inventions for spraying pneumatic plague in bacteriological warfare, or, erasing cities and depopulating countries at a single blow. The hundred-and-one philosophical fads aid warmongering because they subvert human reason.

Take one of them, the Fictionist school, whose tenet of knowledge is that pure fictions, lacking objective truth, are yet useful instruments of action. One wonders how the Fictionists assess what is truthful, what fictive.

In his *History of the Later Roman Empire*, Prof. Bury speaks of so-called philosophers infesting society in the period of Byzantium's decline: "skilled monkeys in oratory," he called them. They are the concomitants of every dying civilisation. We too have philosophers in our epoch who will find their niche in future history books for their negativism, bizarre, mysticism. If it be objected that Fictionism is not so very important, I remind you that we have had five editions in English of Vaihinger's *The Philosophy of "As If."* All these schools provide a philosophical correlates for those tremendous fictions plaguing mankind, the fiction which helped bring fascism to power, and today the fiction of the British government, labelled "labor," but shoot Indians, Indonesians, Egyptians, Greeks, Jews, Syrians, Chinese, Annetimes, Burmese, Malaysians, Persians—all in the name of "democracy" and

"preparing the colonial peoples for self-government."

The rifles used were objects of the understanding of these colonial patriots, but existed independent of their understanding.

[My main references are: Mark and Engels,

## NO MIDDLE PATH FOR THE YOUTH

R. WHITE

THE honourable R. G. Menzies is today famous for his inaccurate statements—but the statement made by him at the official debut of the young Liberals in Victoria is worthy of serious consideration. In opening his address he said:—

"In my opinion this is the most important gathering I have attended during my political career."

This approach to the question of youth marks a new highlight for reaction in this country. Already sixteen branches of the young Liberals have been formed in Victoria; there are branches in New South Wales and South Australia and at the recent Liberal Federal conference a decision was made to form a national organisation.

The Liberal Party leadership is giving a large amount of attention to its organisation, the concentration points being the middle class and rural youth.

One of the important reasons for its coming to life is the Federal elections. An article in the *May* issue of their paper "Now" stated:

"First steps in the forward march of Liberal youth was the training of committeemen as shock-troops to fight the opponents of freedom before and after the Federal elections."

Mr. Edmunds, Liberal M.P., has suggested that the opponents of freedom are the Communist element prevalent in the Australian community. This of course links up with the Liberal party policy of outlawing strikes and Unions, and speed up of the workers, couched in the fancy words of "Australia needs a high production."

Up to date no attempt has been made to win the working class youth, and the Liberals' present policy is certainly not cutting any ice amongst them yet, as their Editorial says:—

"Liberalism as a philosophy is based on high ideals of a free life rather than cold spiritless materialism."

Or as Mr. Anderson, Vic. Liberal party President, told them in an address:—

"One condemning feature of socialism and Communism is the concentrated attention that they pay to material well being to the exclusion of spiritual values."

From the working class youth point of view, eating assumes a great importance and as their struggles

for higher wages and better conditions show, is an important question occupying their minds.

The membership of the young Liberals in Victoria of some hundreds shows that they are making some inroads amongst the middle class youth whom they are grooming to be shock-troops in the coming elections. An article in their paper on tips for polling days, supposed to be funny, says:—

"If your opponent on the other side of the pavement seems to be making a hit with his vote for Boob and security line, it is advisable to gag him with a mouthful of rotten apple or any other garbage that may be lying around. This can best be done by getting a friend to tell him a joke while you ram in the gag from behind when he opens his mouth to laugh.

"The opposition having been disposed of you can carry on happily in the knowledge that you've at least done your part towards a successful election. . . ."

This undoubtedly is supposed to be terribly funny, but who is to deny that as the Liberals' election campaign gets filthier and filthier as it already shows signs of doing, the joke may become a reality and the young Liberals become young bashers.

While their country organiser reports that the youth in the provincial centres seem to be leaning towards labor, he goes on to say:—"outside the centres, either on farms or in small hamlets, the majority of young Australians I talked to seemed to have some complaint about the present Government's handling of things."

It is no accident that they are basing themselves on the middle class and rural youth, for they understand full well that they can only get support for their policy amongst the more conservative sections of the youth. This does not mean that they tell them their real policy.

To these youth they say that there can be only one solution, a political party which seeks to pander neither to the right nor the left, but which marches down the glorious middle path — this they say is the Liberal party. The policy of this party is allied with sports, socials, clubs and all forms of recreation.

Well should ask the Liberal youth to measure up the spiritual values of the Liberals, who as the U.A.P. sent scrap iron to Japan—appeased the fascists—banated youth parliaments and democratic



organisations and seized books like the gestapo in the middle of the night.

There is nothing very spiritual in their refusal to increase the inadequate basic wage or reduce hours. Who was it that assisted middle class youth by subsidising University Students, the Liberals or the Labor Government—did Mr. Menzies help the rural youth with organised marketing and stabilisation of the wheat industry? Of course not, again it was a Labor Government.

The real friend of the middle class and rural youth is the labor movement which fights in their interests for a better life.

#### "The Liberals and the Labor Youth movement."

When Mr. Butrell, Chairman of the N.S.W. Liberal Youth, announced the results of an essay competition he added—

"That the club had been organised for the express purpose of combating the Eureka Youth League, for the Communists were their natural enemies."

As it is quite well known that the Eureka Youth League is not a Communist organisation, but is the youth organisation of the whole of the labor movement, the real sense of the statement is that the Liberal youth have been organised to combat the Labor movement and that their first bite will be the Labor youth organisations.

Right throughout Australia the labor youth movement is helping to lead large numbers of youth in the struggle for a new deal and this is the reason for the attacks of the Liberals.

The intolerable conditions facing the working class youth have given rise to a real militancy which reached its highest peak in the stop work meeting of 1000 Victorian Building Trades Apprentices. All forms of intimidation were used to prevent them attending the meeting, but of no avail. The most concrete result of this campaign is the Act passed by the Victorian Parliament introducing full day-time technical training for apprentices. This victory is the result of years of work by the Eureka Youth League, Melbourne Apprentices' Committee and the Trade Union movement. This was one of the twenty points of the Victorian Trades Hall Council programme for youth that was formulated after decisive action and demands of the apprentices.

With day time tech. now law, the struggle will be to put it into effect. The policy of the Trade Unions on this question is quite clear. The Building Trades Charter for apprentices states:—

"That until such time as day time training is established, all time spent in technical training outside the ordinary hours of working shall be counted as time worked and shall be allowed as time off on the following working day."

The Unions most active in Victoria around the problems of youth are those of the Building Trades Federation. They have formulated a special charter

which aims at uniform pay and conditions for all their apprentices. They are fighting for the following uniform scale—

First year . . . . .	£1 12 8
Second year . . . . .	2 16 0
Third year . . . . .	3 19 4
Fourth year . . . . .	5 2 8
Sixth year . . . . .	6 6 0

So far they have been successful in winning the following—

An increase in painters' apprentices first year rate of 12/- per week. All other years received an average increase of 5/- per week.

The Secretary of the Building Trades Federation, Mr. Don Thompson, publicly thanked the Eureka Youth League for valuable assistance and advice.

Apprentices and Shop Committees in the metal trades lost no time after the lead given by the Building Trades Federation. Meetings were called on the job, resulting in the Metal Trades Council announcing a meeting of all metal apprentices where a metal trades charter for youth will be presented.

Now that the Trade Unions have won demands for their apprentices and are in the process of winning more, they should utilise these gains by making a big effort to recruit all of these youth workers to the Unions. Special rates should be allowed, with the calling of special quarterly meetings where their special problems can be raised and discussed.

Another interesting development in Victoria has been the organisation of a Labor Youth Parliament, consisting of representatives from Unions, Eureka Youth League Clubs and thirty four factories.

The first session of Parliament formulated a New Deal for Youth Bill. Since then two youth enquiries were organised and three more are under way. The Youth Parliament organised a protest meeting when fifth year apprentices received the £2 wage cut and are busily preparing for their second session.

Attention must now be turned to the needs of youth in the light industries. Low wages and dead end jobs are the lot of these young workers and with the help of the whole labor movement programmes for these industries must be worked out.

Young workers are showing that by organisation in the labor youth and trade union movement they are winning a new deal.

The Labor Government must answer the Liberal Party's move to form a nation-wide organisation with the launching of a concerted drive to build and strengthen the Labor movement.

The Labor movement must set out to show the youth joining up with the Liberals that in their desire to tread the so-called "middle path" they have been snared to the right.

## NEW DEAL FOR THE PRE-SCHOOL CHILD

DAPHNE GOLLAN, B.A.

AMONG teachers and parents in New South Wales at the present time there is widespread dissatisfaction at the deplorable conditions under which the children in State schools are educated. A vigorous movement sponsored by the Teachers' Federation and the Parents' and Citizens' Federation for a New Deal in education has arisen with a demand for the immediate granting of £25,000,000 by the Commonwealth Government to the State to build new community centre schools, bring old ones up to date, and provide them with modern equipment, canteens, sanitary conveniences and spacious playgrounds. The New Deal campaign has revealed that our State schools are a collection of ramshackle and antiquated institutions with amenities far inferior to those of the average modern factory, and that the whole process of education is incredibly hindered by the lack of modern equipment and tools of the teaching profession.

In one field in particular, that of nursery school education, development is not so much retarded as practically non-existent. Our backwardness in respect of nursery school education is clearly seen when we consider the remarkable advances which have been made in Britain during recent years with the setting up of wartime nurseries and the passing of the Education Act of 1944.

Before the war in Britain nursery classes taking children from the age of three years were attached to some elementary public schools, and there were a number of day nurseries for babies of working mothers, usually operated by private philanthropic organisations. Day nurseries were still regarded as institutions to alleviate the worst effects of the industrial system upon the children of the workers, and the idea of providing nursery school or Kindergarten education for all children under the age of five was still just an aim of the educationalists.

This was all changed during the war. The mass evacuation of the blitz disrupted patterns of social life and the urgent demands of war industries brought thousands of mothers out of the home. The desperate need for planned construction of nurseries on a large scale to give adequate care to the children of working mothers became obvious and so the wartime nurseries were set up under government authority.

By 1945, 1,555 of these nurseries caring for children from a few weeks old to the age of five were functioning throughout Britain.

The Education Act has been described as "imaginative and great in design, strong in inspiration and vision . . . recognising the essential principle that education is a continuous process . . . one of the greatest measures of social reform ever passed in Britain and providing for every child opportunities as never before." The main underlying reason for the passing of this progressive legis-

lation by a Conservative Government was probably the recognition in Britain that the traditional education system had produced a people, millions of them barely literate, of low technical efficiency, lacking in the necessary training and skills to engage effectively in modern mass production or mechanised warfare. This, of course, became particularly clear during the war, when the British came into contact with the high mass efficiency of the Americans.

But whatever its motives the Act embodies a whole new philosophy of education which places it far in advance of the Australian system. It now provides for the education of children from the age of two. "A local education Authority shall . . . have regard . . . to the need for securing that provision is made for pupils who have not attained the age of five years by the provision of nursery schools or, where the authority considers the provision of such schools to be inexpedient, by the provision of nursery classes in other schools." Nursery schools are defined as "primary schools which are used mainly for the purpose of providing education for children who have attained the age of two years but have not attained the age of five years."

Since the compulsory school age in England is 5 years, attendance at nursery schools is purely voluntary, but under the Act it is the duty of the authorities to provide these schools wherever the parents want to use them. The White Paper on Educational Reconstruction of 1943 states the Governments' attitude on nursery education very clearly.

"It is now considered that the self-contained nursery school, which forms a transition from home to school, is the most suitable type of provision for children under five. Such schools are needed in all districts, as even when children come from good homes they can derive much benefit, both educational and physical, from attendance, at a nursery school. Moreover, they are of great value to mothers who go out to work, and also to those who need relief from the burden of household duties combined with the care of a large family. It is, however, in the poorer parts of the large cities that nursery schools are especially necessary. The authors of 'Our Towns,' in describing the conditions which were brought to light by the evacuation of 1939, said that nothing had impressed them so often or so deeply as the need to multiply these schools in the poor quarters of the towns, from which they should spread and be provided for the children of all parents who desire to use them. There is no doubt of the importance of training children in good habits at the most impressionable age and of the direct value of the nursery school in influencing the parents of children. There is equally no doubt of the incalculable value of the



schools in securing medical and nursing care, and the remedial treatments of defects which may be difficult to eradicate if they are left untreated until the child enters school in the ordinary way at the age of five."

Unfortunately the Government's aims were somewhat nobler in concept than in fulfilment. Because as soon as war production tapered off in 1945 and women began to leave industry, the Government closed many of the wartime nurseries. Immediately there was a loud outcry from the people and strong representations were made to the Ministry of Health to maintain the wartime nurseries as temporary nursery schools at least until such time as the nursery schools envisaged in the Education Act could be built.

The amazing position the wartime nurseries occupy in the lives especially of working class mothers may be seen in the report of a deputation to the Ministries of Health and Education in November, 1945, organised by the London Women's Parliament. This deputation, which included representatives of local authorities and nursery campaign committees, matrons, nursery teachers and mothers, strongly urged the retention of the nurseries and making the provision of nursery schools compulsory on local authorities. Two of the delegates, one a doctor, reported that in Lancashire and Cheshire a questionnaire circulated by their committee had produced 4,660 replies; 99.7 per cent. of the mothers questioned considered the nursery necessary in peacetime; 76 per cent. had to support their children, either totally or partially; 97 per cent. thought their children had improved in the health, habits and happiness since being in the nursery; and the same percentage wanted residential nurseries for their children when they were ill or having another baby.

While the extraordinary unanimity of feeling in regard to the nurseries may be due to the fact that in conditions of acute housing crisis, shortage of food and clothing, and disruption of family life, the nurseries with their balanced dietary, routine and spacious playing areas are even more necessary than in normal times, nevertheless the figures still indicate a remarkable recognition of the value of the work of wartime nurseries.

In its reply to the deputation the Government agreed that nurseries had come to stay and the Minister for Health stated that from April, 1946, a grant of 50 per cent. would be made to local Welfare Authorities on all expenditure on facilities to provide nursery services. The Ministry for Education was not so satisfactory in its assurances and was not prepared to state definitely when the plans for building new nursery schools would be put into effect. But in spite of the hesitations and inadequacies which can certainly be expected from the Government, it is now generally recognised in Britain that day nurseries provide the most efficient means of caring for children under the age of 2 of working mothers, that the nursery school

is an integral part in the process of education for every child, and that the provision of both is the responsibility of the community.

When we turn to the position in Australia the outlook is disheartening. In Australia the movement began as philanthropic work, and to this day has hardly progressed beyond that stage. In New South Wales the two main bodies which provide nursery services are the Kindergarten Union and the Day Nursery and Nursery Schools Association, both of which are voluntary organisations deriving their funds in part from charitable effort, and largely from an annual grant of £10,000 each from the Government.

The Kindergarten Union provides for about 1,500 children between the ages of 2 and 6 in 21 kindergartens (taking children between 4 and 6) and 16 nursery schools (taking children between 2 and 6). The Day Nursery and Nursery Schools Association takes about 650 children (of working mothers only) in 11 nursery schools (2-6) and 6 day nurseries (0-2). The total number of children provided for by these two organisations is something over two thousand. When one realises that in New South Wales there were, in 1943, 284,000 children under 6, and add the fact that there were more on the waiting lists of many of these institutions than there were enrolled, one can get some idea of the scarcity of nurseries and the need for the extension of facilities.

The New South Wales Department of Education has made hesitant steps to enter the field of nursery education by establishing special kindergarten classes in infant schools for children from the age of 4½ or 5. By 1943 it had also set up two special nursery demonstration schools at Blackfriars and Canberra, and in 1945 five more were added.

A report issued in 1944 on the pre-school child by the Child Welfare Advisory Council of New South Wales urgently recommended the extension of nursery facilities, the co-ordination of the activities of existing organisations, the setting of a minimum standard of nursery school teacher training and the compulsory registration of nursery school teachers.

The fact that these elementary steps are still necessary in New South Wales (and the position is as bad, if not worse, in other states) is an eloquent commentary on the extent of Government neglect of nursery education. It is true that in New South Wales and Victoria there was some expansion of nursery services as a result of the war. In New South Wales the annual grant of the Government to the Kindergarten Union and Day Nursery Association was raised from £1,500 to £10,000 each in 1943. And in Victoria the Women of the University Patriotic Fund established small nurseries at Kew, South Yarra, Camberwell, Elsternwick and Hawthorn for children of working mothers. In 1943 these were subsidised by the Federal Government. A difficult situation has now arisen with the

end of the war because the University Patriotic Fund can no longer support the nurseries. All those connected with the nurseries are anxious to continue the service and the Victorian Day Nursery Development Association has been formed to campaign for their retention.

It is obvious that an immediate extension of pre-school education services in Australia is necessary. The notion which persists that nurseries are send their children to be minded while they go to work, must be overcome. The reason for this attitude of course is that in Australia pre-school education is in fact still confined to children from a gratifying field of charitable endeavour where the distress of the wealthy labor to relieve the distress of the children of the poor. As long as this attitude remains and as long as the burden of maintaining pre-school services falls in the main on the shoulders of voluntary philanthropic organisations, it is hopeless to expect an increase in the number of nursery schools to cope with the thousands of children needing them. The provision of nursery school education is the responsibility of the community, not of charity.

Day nursery services also for working mothers should continue and be extended by the Government to wipe out the abuses which exist in regard to many of the private child-minding centres, but the provision of twelve hour care daily for the children of working mothers is not the primary aim of pre-school education.

The nursery school plays a vital part in the health and educational programme of every child from the age of two. Certainly it does not take the place of the home in the life of the child, but the child benefits most by a combination of a good nursery

school and a happy home. All children have to learn to become social beings, to live in society, and it is in the surroundings of the nursery school that this can best be learnt.

"By the time the child is five . . . he has developed, to a remarkable degree, social habits which will stand him in good stead during later life. Nursery school children are seldom shy, timid, or retiring towards other children. On the other hand, they are seldom cruel, bullying, or unkind. The co-operation with adults which the child learns in the nursery school rests on the basis of the relationship between authority and conformity. He learns that the adult in authority never misuses it. He learns that he cannot use the difference in size between himself and others unfairly to gain an advantage. He must earn his status in the community and not expect it to be granted without effort." (Blatz, W.E.—Understanding the Young Child).

Only the most persistent pressure by all sections of the people will induce the Government to extend its responsibility, through the Education Department, to the education of the child from the age of two.

Since the State Government already spends on education more than half of the total of £15,000,000 a year allotted to it by the Commonwealth for all purposes, the only way to bring about the radical changes needed in the system is for the Commonwealth itself to enter the field with direct financial aid.

Neither the State nor the Commonwealth Governments will move in this direction unless they are pushed. The pushing must come from the people, in the form of organisation and agitation to demand the immediate implementing of the Parent-Teacher programme.

## SUMMARY OF THE "NEW MASSES" CONTROVERSY ON "WHAT SHALL WE ASK OF WRITERS?"

MAX BROWN

IN February and March this year the American leftist weekly, *New Masses*, published several articles and many letters concerned with certain issues raised by novelist Albert Maltz in an article, "What Shall We Ask of Writers?" Left writer Howard Fast declares: "whether or not we like it, the position of Marxist writing in America must be stated in terms of the Maltz position." The controversy, extending over many pages and many writers in several issues, is relevant to Australian conditions and is summarised here.

Maltz commences his argument by defining its limits. He says, "the left wing has also offered a number of vital intellectual assets to the writer . . . Schneider enumerated these assets and I take them

here for granted."

Within such limits Maltz states a case which I approve by the following selections:—

1. "To the degree that works of art reflect or attack these values (i.e., class values), it is broadly—not always specifically—true to say that works of art have been and can be weapons in men's thinking and therefore in the struggle of social classes."

2. ". . . as interpreted in practice for the last fifteen years of the left wing in America, it (i.e., the concept 'art is a weapon') has become a hard rock of narrow thinking . . . the nature of art—how art may best be a weapon . . . has been slurred over. I have come to believe that the accepted under-



standing of art as a weapon is not a useful guide but a straitjacket. . . . Finally in practice it has been understood to mean that unless art is a weapon like a leaflet, serving immediate political ends, necessities and programmes, it is worthless or escapist or vicious.

3. ". . . under the domination of this vulgarized approach, creative works are judged primarily by the formal ideology."

4. ". . . from this type of thinking comes the approach which demands of each written work that it contain 'the whole truth' . . . This . . . demand rests upon the psychological assumption that readers come to each book with an empty head."

5. "A creative writer . . . works intellectually in an atmosphere in which the critics, the audience, the friends he respects—while revering art—actually judge works on the basis of their immediate political end. If the end is good, it would be absurd to say that this may not be socially useful . . . but he is led by his goal into idealistic conceptions of character, into wearing rose-colored glasses which will permit him to see in life that which he wishes to find in order to prove his thesis."

6. "I am convinced that the work-in-progress of an artist who is deeply, truly, honestly recreating a sector of human experience, need not be affected by a change in the political weather."

7. "In his appreciation of Balzac Engels understood two facts about art: First, the writer qua citizen making an election speech, and the writer qua artist, writing a novel, is performing two very different acts. Second, Engels understood that a writer may be confused or even stupid or reactionary in his thinking—and yet it is possible for him to do good, even great work as an artist—work that serves even ends he despises. . . . This point is critical for the understanding of art and artists!"

8. "Writers must be judged by their work, and not by the committees they join."

9. "The political convictions of a writer or his lack of political convictions may have something to do with his growth or creative decline. Writing is a complex process . . . There are many, many reasons why writers grow and sometimes regress."

10. "The great humanistic tradition of culture has always been on the side of progress. The writer who works within this tradition—is writing a political work in the broadest meaning of the term."

Such is Maltz' main thesis. In the same issue Isidore Schneider, *New Masses* Literary Editor, takes no exception to any of the above statements, but does stress the positive achievement of left criticism in establishing the analysis of the social relationships of a work of art as a standard critical procedure, against the bitter opposition of the American ruling class.

In reply to Maltz, novelist Howard Fast names Maltz as "The formal apostle of literary liquidation, not only of Marxist, but of all creative writing." He expresses no objection to Maltz' points 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6. "Of course," he writes, "we are not free from critical mistakes, vulgarity, incompetence; this

we know and the reasons for the situation are manifold. Some of these critical failings we have corrected; others we will correct. And if Maltz had merely intended to add his voice to the many that are already raised against our critical failings no one could have had any real difference with him."

Further, Fast agrees that "an artist can be great without being an integrated or logical or progressive thinker on all matters." But when Maltz names this point as "critical for an understanding of art and artists," Fast replies, "If it is critical . . . then we are at least led towards presuming that confusion, stupidity, and a reactionary position are all qualities of art, and conversely clarity and understanding are detrimental to art."

From there he analyses Maltz' reactions to Steinbeck, Farrell, Koestler and others, and leads his argument to the point where he attacks Maltz' statement that "writers must be judged by their work, and not by the committees they join." From this he sums up Maltz' position as follows:—

"Art and politics don't mix. Therefore salvation—and of course achievement for the artist—lie only in separation from the Communist movement, the most highly political of all movements today." He sums up saying "underlying all Maltz' arguments is a rejection of the whole progressive movement of America, yet Maltz' own books are a direct refutation of the theory he now propounds."

*New Masses* Editor Joseph North comes to similar conclusions to Fast. "In his avowed intention to broaden that concept (i.e., 'art is a weapon') Maltz would abandon the weapon altogether." He attacks Maltz for his "mechanical division of politics and art," and points out that Maltz himself, writing of poet Ezra Pound, stated, "When a poet becomes the enemy of Man . . . betrays his heritage and talents to fascist thieves . . . then what is he? He is unspeakable—he is carrion."

North then says, "I do not ignore the real weaknesses of the literary left. But I do not think we are today making the blunders Maltz speaks of. He fails . . . to credit the left with its achievements, its present attitudes . . . no one has told him how much 'class struggle' he should put in, nor told him he must have a 'conversion ending'—nor have Marxist critics in recent times raised any such issues . . . the Left does not now—nor does it intend to 'narrow' any writer's work . . . basically such errors flow from an insufficient mastery of Marxism."

"Yes," writes North, "we of the literary left fully agree with Lenin when he says, 'There can be no doubt that literature is the last thing to lend itself to mechanical equalisation, to levelling, to domination of the majority over the minority. There can be no doubt that in this field it is absolutely necessary—that the widest latitude be assured personal initiative and individual inclinations, to thought and imagination, to form and content. All this is beyond dispute, but all this proves only that the literary aspect of the work of a proletarian party cannot be identified in a stereotyped manner with the other aspects of its work.'"

Finally North stresses "the need for the mastery by all left writers of the Marxist science without which there will be further confusion and halting advance, if not retreat."

Contributing Editor, Alvah Bessie, novelist and veteran of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade, agrees with Fast and North in so far as they scarcely attack Maltz' first six points, although he contends that Maltz is flogging a dying horse. ". . . The approach he castigates was never erected into a principle,"

Bessie then claims that Maltz' division of the writer into artist and citizen is product of a bourgeois concept which regards artists as sacred idiots who should be protected from popular anger even when they are fascist traitors such as Pound, whom Maltz had condemned.

Now here Bessie comes to a point which neither Maltz, Fast, North, himself, or any other of the contributors have attempted to solve.

Referring to Engels' attitude to Balzac, Bessie states that the latter was a monarchist-aristocrat at a time when the rising French bourgeoisie was the progressive class. That made him reactionary for his time, declares Bessie, but the fact that his work castigates his own beloved aristocracy more bitterly than the bourgeoisie makes him progressive for Engels and us. He then asks if Maltz can cite a monarchist or fascist writer of today who can be progressive in the sense that Balzac was progressive, i.e., in spite of his political philosophy. He indicates an answer to his own question by stating that there is a correlation between the quality of a writer's work and his grasp of human history and Marxism, which is merely repeating Maltz' ninth point as above.

Finally, Bessie states that "if we accept Maltz' contention that all we need ask of writers is that they work 'deeply, truly, honestly recreating a sector of human experience' within 'the great humanistic tradition of culture,' then surely the need for a Communist Party as far as writers are concerned ceases to exist—it would only cramp their style."

Writes Bessie, "We need writers who will joyfully impose upon themselves the discipline of un-

derstanding and acting upon working-class theory. They are the writers who will possess the potentialities of creating a truly free literature."

Correspondence following in the wake of the controversy supports largely the Fast-North-Bessie criticism. Typical statements are:—

"I don't believe for one moment that Maltz shows dangerous trends."

"Writers like Albert Maltz vainly dream of escaping the hard necessities of a worker's life, because they hunger for a solution that will neither hurt the class whose struggles they want to abandon, nor benefit the enemy they despise—because they look on the Party as an alien thing—as still another force pulling on their unhappy souls—because they want to close their eyes and forget . . ."

"Let us show him how and why, not with rancor but with love as Lenin showed Gorky, Maltz, like Fast, is among the best we have."

One writer compares T. S. Eliot with Balzac—both royalists in politics, both brilliant illuminators of the "wastelands" of the ruling classes of their times. On the other hand, Mike Hecht writes: "The honest writer today cannot faithfully present even a slice of reality unless he has affiliated himself with the working class and its struggles for emancipation."

In all, it is apparent that while Maltz has to answer for obviously liquidationist statements, the editors of *New Masses* have themselves to answer for throwing so little light on the meaning of the dictum "art is a weapon"—at which point, theoretically at least, Maltz' deviation commences—and for failing to answer the question "can an artist be reactionary in his political philosophy yet great in his art?" They have almost completely confined themselves to a critique of Maltz' points 8 and 10.

In justice to *New Masses*, however, let us admit that there are many in the working-class movement of this country who have no clear views on the points on which Maltz, North, Fast, Bessie and Lenin himself appear to find common agreement.

That in itself is sufficient cause why the Maltz controversy is of value to us.

## Questions & Answers

conducted by  
L. H. GOULD

"Would you please comment on the statement in the 'New Times' editorial of March 1 which deals with the character of the Second World War 'from the very outset?'—N. Mc.

The relevant paragraph reads:—  
"Stalin's speech presented a profound analysis of the causes and nature of the Second World War, in the light of progressive social science.

The war arose as the inevitable result of the development of world economic and political forces in the conditions of present-day monopolist capitalism. Owing to the predatory nature of fascism, the Second World War against the Axis Powers, from the very outset, assumed the character of an anti-fascist war of liberation, which became more marked with the Soviet



Union's entry into the war against the fascist countries.

What you really want to ask is whether our Party was correct in branding the war between September, 1939, and the entry of the Soviet Union into the war as an imperialist war.

Yes, we were quite correct, and if the editorial suggested otherwise it would be wrong. But neither the editorial, nor of course Stalin's speech, presents the least argument that we took an incorrect stand. Stalin's speech (election meeting, February 9, 1946) includes the following words which should settle the issue once and for all. He said: "The situation in our country in this respect (industrial development—L.H.G.) was so much better before the Second World War, in 1940, than it was before the First World War, in 1913." Note the phrasing. This means that the Second World War, with its essential anti-fascist character, emerged finally and on a world scale only in 1941, when the Soviet Union (and later America) entered the war.

But does this mean that there was no anti-fascist military struggle prior to that year? Of course there was! Spain was such. And we may use the Spanish war to uncover the confusion and the perturbations of some people who lack "progressive social science," in other words, a correct method of historical study.

The Marxist method of historical materialism teaches that there are no "pure" events or processes in social evolution. The emergence of a new class, the advent of a political crisis, or the actual revolutionary seizure of state power, never occurs in an absolutely "pure" form. Every process exhibits first, its own essential quality or character, but then associated with it are always certain exceptional features, admixtures and fortuitous occurrences. The 1917 Revolution, for example, made an extraordinarily clean sweep of the past; it was the most decisive, the most fundamental of all revolutions. But here, too, certain "admixtures" remained for some time, e.g. the survival of capitalist elements. As a matter of fact, the 1917 Revolution contained, in addition to the essential social transformation, features of a national liberation movement; for it is most likely that, but for the new Soviet power, old Russia would have been dismembered by the imperialists and converted into a series of colonial dependencies.

The Spanish war was truly anti-fascist. But it was also a war for national independence; a Republican triumph would have marked the completion of the long-deferred bourgeois democratic revolution; the war was also one of the first stages of the second imperialist world war. And the student will discover other ingredients.

Further, and with direct bearing on the subject under discussion, we should note Lenin's forecast after 1917 that the next period in history would be marked by tremendous upheavals, by struggle for national liberation, imperialist wars, civil wars, colonial revolts, etc., all following and interweaving

with one another. Communists must be able to recognise the essential (as distinct from what is subordinate, incidental, etc.) in the complex of historical development, and to know in what direction nations and classes are moving.

The character of the war between September, 1939, and June, 1941, can be understood therefore only by examining the entire historical setting.

Two main trends in international politics battled for supremacy in the decade, and more, before Chamberlain's declaration of war. One was the efforts of the imperialists to destroy the Labor democratic and Socialist movements all over the world—an aim which they pursued unremittingly even in the midst of their own inter-imperialist quarrels and the actual military struggles between the imperialist "haves" and "have-nots" for a new redivision of the world. The History of the C.P.S.U. states: "All these facts show that a second imperialist war has actually begun. It began stealthily, without any declaration of war. . . . It was the work of three aggressor States, the fascist ruling circles of Germany, Italy and Japan, that began the war in various parts of the world."

The invasion of Manchuria in 1931, Japan's first move to subjugate China, signalled the commencement of the Second World War. After Manchuria came Abyssinia, Spain, Austria, etc. Munich was both an epitome of the years of appeasement of fascism and the open encouragement of fascist aggression, and a warning that no matter what happened the tories would always, by whatever means at their disposal, pursue a pro-fascist policy. They would be pro-fascist while the Axis remained in existence; they would be pro-fascist even when circumstances, which they couldn't control, compelled them to wage an objectively progressive war against the Axis; they would be pro-fascist following the defeat of the Axis.

The second tendency was evidenced, first and foremost, by the triumphant establishment of Socialism and the emergence of the Soviet Union as the world's bastion of peace and democracy; then, the United Front and People's Front movements, the anti-fascist and national liberationist struggles in Spain, China, etc., and in the widespread conscious desire among the people of the world for the creation of a fighting united peace front between the peace-loving Soviet Union and the capitalist-democratic states which, for whatever reason, favored the preservation of peace.

The second trend proved the stronger, and its consummation was the United Nations and the armed alliance which destroyed the military power of the fascist Axis. And this is true even though it came to pass only in the face of prodigious opposition, of delays, sabotage, plots and treasons.

What N. Mc. and others fail to understand is that the very success of the anti-fascist war demanded consistent struggle against each and every one of these plots and treasons.

Indeed, N. Mc. and the others argue, in effect, that what the Chamberlain-Churchill reactionaries said and did in the period under review should be regarded as "anti-fascist" in every instance because this was the period of the developing world-wide struggle against fascism! But if Churchill, for example, landed British troops in Greece in 1944 to crush the Greek democratic forces—was that "anti-fascist"? Did it expedite victory for world democracy over the Axis? Churchill deliberately delayed the Second Front, thereby endangering the whole Allied cause. Are we wrong in denouncing that two-year delay as imperialist provocation which directly aided the enemy? In short, they fail to distinguish between what is essential and what is exceptional and, as in these instances, contrary.

And so to the set question. Was the war, that "phony" war, begun by Chamberlain's declaration on September 3, 1939, and which continued up to the Soviet entry, was it "anti-fascist" or imperialist? Were Chamberlain's ceaseless attempts to "switch the war" directed towards defeating fascism or defeating the Labor-democratic forces? Was his arming of Mannerheim, in the midst of the "phony" war, intended to win the war for democracy? The answer is clear. In denouncing the war at that period as imperialist, the Communists took the only

real step towards defeating the pro-Fascist and outright treasonable policy of Britain's Tory class. It was a struggle between patriotism and treason, and in line with the general historic development, the traitor class was defeated.

It was precisely to strengthen the anti-fascist struggle that we opposed the imperialist war. Our course was dictated by every consideration of honor, patriotism and by the practical needs of the movement to defeat the fascists and their allies within the government circles in the western countries.

This was the general theoretical line adopted by the Communists, and history—including the history of the past few months—has brought its full vindication.

There remains only the need to explain our tactics. In brief, we strove to replace the pro-fascist regimes in Britain, France and Australia with governments responsive to the democratic desires of the people, governments that would wage, if necessary, and in alliance with the Soviet Union, a real, not a make-believe, war against Hitler and his partners and satellites.

[References: Short History of the C.P.S.U., Chap. 12; Dimitrov's "War and the Working Class;" Stalin's election speech indicated above.]

## FREEZING AND THAWING

Prof. J. B. S. HALDANE, F.R.S.

DURING the last month freezing and thawing have become matters of immediate interest to all of us. They are examples of the abrupt changes of quality which are fairly common in physics.

There are gradual changes as well. As we cool down water from its boiling point, it becomes gradually denser till it reaches a maximum density at four degrees Centigrade. Then its volume increases by about one part in 7,600 until it reaches freezing point, but as it freezes it expands by nine per cent. When further cooled it contracts again, but never gets as dense as water.

The expansion due to freezing bursts our pipes, though we do not notice this until the ice melts again, and water leaks out. Water is unusual in this respect. Most substances contract when they freeze, but the way in which water molecules are packed in ice crystals is rather uneconomic of space.

Metallurgy would be a good deal easier if all metals behaved like water. But iron contracts considerably when it solidifies, so castings seldom quite fit their moulds exactly. On the other hand, if ice were denser than water, it would sink to the bottom of rivers, lakes, and seas on forming, and would not easily melt in spring. So the world would be a good deal colder.

Physicists find it hard to explain why most substances melt at a very exactly defined tempera-

ture, and do not behave like candle-grease, for example, which softens gradually. Melting is one example of a change from order to disorder. In an ice crystal each molecule has its place, in water it wanders about. Another similar change is demagnetisation by heat. Each iron atom acts as a little magnet, and if they are arranged in an orderly way a whole block acts as a magnet. But this type of order disappears on heating before the iron melts.

Physicists have given pretty complete theories of matter in the gaseous and crystalline states. That is to say, from a knowledge of the forces between atoms they can calculate fairly accurately how a gas or a crystal will behave. But they have not yet got a satisfactory theory of liquids. We know, as a matter of fact, how they do behave, and can make the necessary calculations about the flow of water, oil, or mercury, through the pipes, or the motion of a ship in water. But we cannot yet show why a particular liquid has just the properties that it has.

This is because a crystal is an almost perfectly orderly arrangement of atoms, and a gas an almost perfectly disorderly one, but a liquid is something in between. Similarly steel balls can be packed in an orderly way, or scattered at random, but when they are rolling over one another they are neither quite orderly nor quite disorderly.



Economic theory is in a similar position. The "classical" economic theory describes what would happen if thousands of producers competed with one another in a disorderly way, and thus determine the price of commodities. This theory was mined a century ago. One can also describe the economics of a socialist community, in which production is orderly, being controlled so as to give the maximum use value from the labour expended, instead of the maximum profit.

But our present economics are halfway between order and disorder. The State controls prices, and enforces the production of Utility goods. But the producing firms try to make as large profits as they can. And economic theorists are hard put to it to give a satisfactory account of such a system.

Chemical disorder favours the liquid state at the expense of the solid and gaseous states. Mixtures are on the whole harder to freeze or boil than pure substances, that is to say, they stay liquid over a greater range of temperature.

For example, the freezing point of water containing three per cent. of common salt is about  $1\frac{1}{2}$  degrees Centigrade below that of pure water, and the boiling point about half a degree higher. So if you throw salt on to snow which is just at freezing point it will melt it, and if you add salt to boiling water it will allow it to get hotter without boiling off, and thus cook potatoes more efficiently.

Another curious feature of the liquid state is that a liquid can be supercooled or superheated. One can sometimes cool down water several degrees below freezing point without its freezing. Such water may start freezing for no obvious reason. But it will certainly do so if the tiniest crystal of ice is dropped into it. The temperature at once rises to freezing point, as the formation of ice releases some energy.

Similarly, if water is boiled for a long time in a smooth vessel, so as to drive out all the air, and to

provide no point where steam bubbles form easily, it is often possible to heat it above boiling point. When it boils, there is something of an explosion. On the other hand, it is quite impossible to heat ice above its melting point, except under very high pressure.

A supercooled or superheated liquid is in what chemists call a metastable state, analogous to a revolutionary situation in politics. A small amount of ice will organise the supercooled water round it into crystals, just as a few discontented people to take definite action to end their wrongs.

A great many substances can exist either as solid, liquid, or vapour; as H<sub>2</sub>O can exist as ice, water, or steam. Some cannot, for various reasons. Solid carbon dioxide is quite well known as "dry ice." If you warm it, it goes off into gas without melting. It can exist as a liquid, but only under a pressure of five atmospheres or more. I am one of the very few people who have ever seen liquid carbon dioxide except through thick glass, as I happen to have opened cylinders of the liquid while working in air at a pressure of ten atmospheres, and seen it flow out.

Other substances, such as sugar, cannot be melted without changing their chemical composition. Others again explode before they melt.

On the whole, the harder a solid the higher its melting point, because the same forces which hold the atoms together against ordinary strains prevent them from moving off into a liquid. So melting points vary from about minus 272 degrees Centigrade for helium to three or four thousand degrees for carbon. Only in a few cases do the solid and liquid have different names, such as ice and water, fat and oil. But if we realise that all liquids will freeze, and most solids will melt, it helps us to think dialectically about Nature.

(World Copyright Reserved.)

