

COMMUNIST REVIEW

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

No. 65.

JANUARY, 1947

Price 6d.

LIST OF CONTENTS

EDITORIAL	387
REPORTS TO THE C.C. MEETING	
E. Rowe	388
E. Thornton	388
ORIGIN AND CHARACTER OF THE SECOND WORLD WAR	A. Leontiev
THE W.A. LOCO DISPUTE	389
THE LABOR MOVEMENT IN SOUTH AUSTRALIA	395
DECLARATION OF THE C.P. OF JAPAN	L. Aarons
AMERICAN LABOR HISTORY AND THE THIRD PARTY	398
CONSCIOUSNESS AND DIALECTICAL MATERIALISM	403
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS	V. Bourke
BOOK REVIEW	404
CATS	409
	Prof. S. L. Rubinstein
	413
	L. H. Gould
	414
	Norman Freehill
	415
	Prof. J. B. S. Haldane, F.R.S.

ORGAN OF THEORY AND PRACTICE OF THE AUSTRALIAN
COMMUNIST PARTY

Editor L. L. Sharkey

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 wholesale 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.

EDITORIAL

THE struggle for world peace was advanced a further step by the proposals of Molotov to U.N.O. to reduce armaments and outlaw atomic weapons. This proposal met with all manner of specious opposing arguments from the British and American representatives. They declared that there were other weapons equally terrible in existence.

This attempt to obscure the issue is easily met by extending the ban to such weapons—germinal warfare—which is the aim of the Soviet Union and progressives the world over. The precedent for outlawing such weapons has already been established by the international prohibition placed on the use of poison gas in warfare. It is true that the Hitlerites decided not to use poison gas of fear that their opponents possessed the secret more potent poison gases.

It can be said with certainty that the various arguments used by Byrnes and Sir Hartley Shawcross were aimed at preserving the atomic bomb as an instrument of "Anglo-Saxon" diplomacy, of "atom bomb blackmail." However, they were forced in the end to agree to the general principle of disarmament and consideration of the proposal to prohibit atomic warfare. Disarmament of the type proposed by Molotov is a further safeguard to peace.

An armaments race imposes enormous burdens on the economy and finances of the powers mainly concerned in it. Expenditure on huge military installations constitutes a formidable barrier to improved standards of living in the capitalist countries. It would hamper the construction of Communist society in the Soviet Union and divert economic strength from the tasks of reconstruction of devastated areas and the implementing of the new, magnificent Five Year Plan.

Reduction of armaments is to an extent a guarantee that a new war is not immediately being prepared. Piling up armaments means that a time is reached where the strain reaches breaking point and an acute danger arises that the weapons will be used in a crazy effort to solve the problem by means of war.

Recently, Generalissimo Stalin indicated that war was not an immediate issue. That statement must be properly understood. It did not mean that the war danger has been removed forever. It does not mean that the labor movement must abate one iota of its struggle against war and warmongers of the Churchill type. On the contrary. If the warmongers are powerless to start war at the moment, nevertheless while capitalism is still strong the danger of war must ever remain with us.

War in our time is the outcome of monopoly capitalism, the striving of the monopolies to divide the world.

In the U.S.A. there exist today the biggest monopolies world capitalism has yet produced. The Morgan, Rockefeller, Du Pont and Mellon

monopoly groups control no less than 64 per cent of the wealth of the richest country in the world. Since the conclusion of the anti-fascist war in particular, American monopoly capitalism, through MacArthur's dictatorship, works in the direction of converting Japan into its satellite, in effect its colony. Through assistance to Chiang Kai Shek's reactionary dictatorship, thereby promoting civil war, Yankee monopoly-capital strives to convert China into its economic and financial dependency. In China and Japan American monopoly capital endeavours to bring more than 500,000,000 people under its economic and financial, and, consequently, political sway. American imperialism is invading the Middle East, the former preserve of British and French imperialism. It strives to put an end to the forward march of the peoples of Central and Eastern Europe. It wages a political and diplomatic offensive against the Soviet Union and the European democracies. It interferes, in one way or another, in the affairs of most capitalist countries. American imperialism, in a number of respects, has already reduced the British Empire to the position of "junior partner," a role which the ruling-class and its Bevins welcome just as Chamberlain once welcomed Hitler as an ally in the crusade against "Soviet influence." British imperialism, visibly weakening, struggles desperately to maintain its rule in Asia and the Middle East.

It is easy to understand, then, the menace that the Anglo-American monopoly-capitalists and their representatives, Churchill and the Tories and the Vandenberg Republicans, constitute to peace and freedom in the long run. Three Civil Wars of vital importance to the whole world are raging as a result of the material assistance and prompting of the reactionaries, on the part of the Anglo-American pretenders to world domination. These civil wars are being waged in China, Greece and Persia.

The Anglo-American imperialists are striving by all means in their power to promote similar civil wars in Poland and Roumania and wherever they can contact sufficiently powerful forces in the Balkans and elsewhere. Such is the policy of Anglo-American imperialism which clearly is a threat to the future peace of the world.

At least equally dangerous is the approach of a new economic crisis in the United States, which will profoundly affect capitalism the world over and more especially Britain and the Dominions. We understand only too well, as the result of two world wars and Lenin's genius, the connection between the general crisis, the cyclical crisis of capitalism and imperialist war.

The anti-war struggle must therefore be waged with greatest vigor. While disarmament and the outlawing of certain weapons cannot end the war-making proclivities of monopoly-capitalism in the period of general crisis, nevertheless, these and

similar measures can be regarded as the "partial demands" around which the masses can be rallied and organised and led along the path of struggle against war and against capitalism itself, in order to remove the basis of war.

It is time that many of our comrades realised the significance of the struggle for disarmament,

for the outlawing of the atomic bomb and imperialist intervention in China, Greece and Persia, instead of sinking to the level of "Mechanical Marxists" parroting phrases about the "inevitability" of war while capitalism lasts. They merely assist the warmongers by such passivity.

REPORTS TO THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE MEETING, NOVEMBER 1-3, 1946

E. ROWE

TWO dangers flow from the present situation: the one Comrade Wright emphasises that the reformists are already saying: you achieved what you set out to do, the Government has given the assurance of introducing the 40 hour week, there is going to be an increase in wages, and we can give them a breathing space in order for them to carry through the promises. We must impress upon the workers that eternal vigilance is the price of the 40 hour week and increase in wages. We must do everything in our power to see that there is no swindle.

I do not know what the general reaction to the 10/- week on the basic wage and 40 hour week is, but it is certainly no solution from a craft point of view. Most craft unions argue on what is to be the margin above the basic wage for the various crafts they represent and it seems to me it will be very easy, even after the 10/- increase in the basic wage and the 40 hour week comes in, to argue still that this solves nothing for the craft unions and big metal unions.

We have to aim not at a relaxation of the Wage Pegging Regulations in the developing period ahead, because one of the tentative proposals discussed with Chifley was that he should lift the wage ceiling percentage and if we accept that we face the danger of the Government saying "all right, we lift the wage ceiling say 5 or 10% and peg it again."

So we have to envisage this struggle against wage pegging as aimed at abolition.

E. THORNTON

WANT to refer to this big wage struggle that is taking place. We must see the remarkable transformation in many sections of the Australian working class, particularly in Victoria and especially in the railways industry. From reports we received we know that there is a completely new feeling among the workers in our industry in Melbourne since the foundry strike. Small foundries have joined the strike and the Union, without the Union making any approach to them.

There have been great gains and big blows have been struck against the structure of wage-pegging on which the Federal Government was sitting so tightly and it seems to me that an increase in the basic wage is certain. In discus-

On the question of price control: The whole of the reformist argument at the present time is, in addition to the desire to wait, being switched to the question that price control and a drop in prices would be as advantageous as an increase in wages. Most of the amendments that the Labor Council gang are putting forward, that they forward at the A.E.U. stop work meeting, have a clause around the question of a drop in prices and that this would be a solution to our question of wages.

I think we must not just meet that in a negative fashion, but we must bring out very clearly what we mean by price control and how the necessity for it goes sharply side by side with any increase in wages; and at the one time answer Chifley's arguments about inflation and of the other necessity that there should be a tightening up generally of the attitude towards price control and its application here in this country.

As Comrade Wright pointed out in the last issue of "Tribune," price control has been a much more potent weapon in their hands than have been the wage cutting proclivities of the Arbitration Court. It has been a real weapon whereby they have been able to lower very sharply the wages of the Australian working class and the average worker understands very clearly an argument of the comparison of nominal wages to their purchasing power, and we are able to demonstrate very clearly that there has been robbery.

sions with the A.C.T.U. executive it has become clear that the Federal and State Labor governments and people like Clarey and Stout now feel that, if there is going to be a 10/- increase in the basic wage, that will satisfy the workers for a time and there won't be any hurry about the 40 hour week. The declaration of Judge Drake-Brockman in approving the 40 hour week was mainly to delay getting it; we have information that the attitude of the Court will be that Australian industry in general cannot afford the 40 hour week and an increase in the basic wage. Secondly, they will leave this matter to be battled out with the individual unions.

There is one important question that I think we should all have clear in our minds: there has been no change whatsoever in wage pegging and any suggestion along these lines should be eliminated from our propaganda. The 40 hour week and an increase in the basic wage could have been granted under the old structure, and Chifley has not shifted one bit.

There is no likelihood that the Australian workers will be satisfied with a 10/- increase, or that plus a 40 hour week. Many of the workers involved in strike struggles for increased wages are already getting more than is offered by the basic wage increase. The 40 hour week, although it will be very acceptable to the workers, will not increase wages and that is the issue at the present time. They are not getting enough money and they will not be satisfied with the 10/- increase.

So a struggle still faces the workers in the very near future and there is no need to worry about whether there will be a long period of peace and the workers might be satisfied with the gains already achieved.

Alongside this great struggle for wage increases, for a decent standard of living for the Australian working class, is going on the biggest struggle that has taken place between us and the right wing for leadership of the Australian working class, and I think we must appreciate that a continuation of Labor Government and reformist officials consti-

tutes a very powerful force, and the reformists are at their old game. Reading the reports about the Victorian strike took me back to what the right wing there did from 1928-34, although the attempts they made to sell-out the struggle of the tramwaymen and railwaymen, weak and ineffective as they were, nevertheless indicated they were following the same line as was followed in the sell-out of the tramway men on previous occasions.

These people slander the workers, say the workers will not fight and when they do fight they say "wait for me, I'm not ready" and that is the whole attitude of the right wing and indicates their philosophy.

But there are big differences between the activities of the right wing today and 1928-34. In those days we had to fight them generally from outside the trade unions; today we hold positions in most important unions — yesterday we were inexperienced, today we are more skilful than the right wing — and finally we have educated the working class in the unions we lead so they are people who are able to discern treachery more rapidly than they could a few years ago.

We need more initiative, more vigor in this struggle; we need to be more ruthless than we have been up to the present time; we want to get rid of liberalism.

The fight is very hectic; it is going to be still more hectic, but there is no doubt that we are going to win.

THE ORIGIN AND CHARACTER OF THE SECOND WORLD WAR

A. LEONTIEV, Moscow.

THE second World War, only recently ended, left deep traces in the life of all nations involved in it. The war brought about radical changes in the international situation. It is therefore clear that questions concerning the causes and nature of this war assume for us a very real importance. In fact, these questions are in every way very closely connected with any attempt to evaluate the most burning problems of today's reality.

On February 9 of this year, Comrade Stalin, reporting on the activities of the Party for a recent period, turned the bright spotlight of Marxist-Leninist science upon the questions concerning the origin and character of the Second World War. Comrade Stalin's speech is a most valuable contribution to the treasury of Marxist-Leninist theory. The speech sums up the experience of the historic developments of recent times, a period overflowing with events of great significance. Comrade Stalin's speech not only arms the Soviet people with full knowledge and understanding of the sum total of recent experiences, and the perspectives and tasks connected with socialist construction in the U.S.S.R., but it also furnishes the key to a correct

understanding of international relations in the recent past, as well as the tendencies of the post-war period.

Can the Second World War be looked upon as an accident, something that happened independent of the laws of development of contemporary capitalism? To consider that an event of such gigantic significance could have been brought about by accidental causes would be to deny any scientific explanation of social life.

The advent of the Second World War cannot be considered accidental. It arose, as Comrade Stalin demonstrated, as the inevitable result of the development of world-wide economic and political forces on the basis of contemporary monopoly capitalism. Marxists have repeatedly pointed out, as Comrade Stalin said, that the capitalist system of world economy is characterised by crises and military catastrophes.

It is explained by the fact that, during the contemporary epoch of monopolistic capitalism, individual bourgeois countries develop unevenly and by leaps. Because of this situation, the correlation of economic, political and military forces

between the individual states is constantly and inevitably changing. Some states may spurt forward, outstripping their opponents, while others may lag and gradually remain behind.

At the present time, under present-day conditions the complete territorial division of the world has already been accomplished. There are no free, unowned territories. Meanwhile, the highly developed capitalist countries, in which the system of monopoly capitalist rules, need raw materials, fully secured foreign markets, and profitable spheres of capital investments. Therefore, every major capitalist power constantly strives to extend its sphere of influence. But under existing conditions, with the whole world already divided, with all colonial, semi-colonial and dependent countries already ruled by one capitalist power or another, any extension of a sphere of influence is possible in only one way — by capturing someone else's possessions. Thus, the completion of the division of the world merely serves to pose the question of the re-division of the world.

Those two conditions—(1) the uneven development of individual capitalist countries and (2) the completed territorial division of the world—bring about the inevitability of clashes and conflicts between groups of capitalist powers. Because of the unevenness of development, the existing division of spheres of influence from time to time inevitably enters into contradiction, into a conflict, with the correlation of the economic, political and military forces of individual countries. The equilibrium within the world capitalist system is thrown off balance. The given group of capitalist countries which considers itself less secured with sources of raw material and foreign markets undertakes an attempt to change the situation in its favor and bring about a corresponding re-division of spheres of influence.

In the abstract, it is possible to conceive of avoiding wars, granted there existed a possibility of peaceful, periodic re-division of spheres of influence by agreement, a re-division based upon the changing correlation of forces between individual countries. But as long as capitalism continues to exist, such means are impossible.

Even during the First World War, Lenin underscored the fact that under capitalism there is no way to re-establish the often upset equilibrium except by crises in economy, or by wars in politics.

The following is a brief, factual record of the changes in the political map of the world, caused by the uneven development of capitalist countries during the epoch of imperialism. In 1860 England held first place in the world's industrial production. This oldest of all capitalist countries held an undisputed monopoly in the world's industrial production. It used to produce more textiles, steel, cast iron, and coal than France, the U.S.A., Germany, Italy, Russia, and Japan combined. England was the world's industrial workshop. It ruled the seas and the world's markets. It was the world's great-

est colonial power. France held second place. The U.S.A. and Germany were making only the first serious steps in the sphere of industrial development.

Within a mere decade, the rapidly growing land of young capitalism, the U.S.A., outstripped France and changed positions with her. But England still held first place. Within another decade, in the 80's of the past century, the U.S. surpassed England and firmly took up first place in the world's industrial production. At the same time, Germany outstripped France and took up third position, following the U.S. and England. Within the first decade of the 20th century, Germany managed to crowd England out, and took up the second position, behind the U.S. Then Germany became second in the world's industrial production, and first in Europe.

German imperialism was late in its arrival upon the arena of colonial politics. The best tidbits had already been captured by the powers. German imperialism, brought up in the historic traditions of Prussian robber-militarism, from the very beginning conducted an extremely aggressive policy. Its aim, as expressed by Von Buelow, one of the chancellors of Germany, was to capture for itself "a place under the sun." For this purpose Germany established a tremendous war machine, ready for aggressive actions. Kaiser-Germany feverishly built a navy capable of disputing England's sea supremacy.

In summing up the historical experiences of this, Comrade Stalin pointed out that the First World War resulted from the first crisis of the capitalist system of world economy, and that the Second World War was caused by a second, similar crisis.

It is clear that we are not at the moment talking about the economic crises of "overproduction" which periodically shake the capitalist world, even though it is certain that the First World War broke out in a situation when the economic crisis was ripening, while the Second World War developed in the conditions of the economic crisis which began in a number of countries in 1936-38. Neither are we speaking about the general crisis of capitalism, representing the whole historic epoch, even though the two world wars reflecting this general crisis of capitalism undoubtedly contributed to the further deepening of the crisis. We are speaking of very concrete crises, representing the forced explosion of contradictions accumulated in the process of development of the world-wide economic and political forces of present-day capitalism. In the existing conditions of contemporary capitalism, each of these two wars was the only way of solving the ripened contradictions and re-establishing the upset equilibrium within the world system of capitalism.

The First World War was an imperialist war on the part of both coalitions participating in it. It was produced by a basic antagonism between Germany on one side and England on the other. The contradictions between the other participants in the

war, particularly between Germany and Czarist Russia, were of a secondary character.

Under capitalist conditions, an economic crisis temporarily re-establishes the equilibrium between the advanced industrial productive capacities, and the limited markets. Similarly, the First World War re-established the equilibrium between the correlation of economic, political and military forces on one side, and the division of spheres of influence between the capitalist countries on the other. This equilibrium was re-established through the defeat of the Germany of the Kaiser, which thus temporarily deprived Germany of its fighting strength.

However, it is commonly known that German imperialism, though defeated in the First World War, was not completely vanquished. On the contrary, the new international situation enabled the German capitalist robber-state to get on its feet again within a short time, and even to grow new tasks. It is characteristic that even the least attentive observers noticed and understood very soon that in this situation lurked the most serious menace for England first of all.

After Hitler's advent to power, it became perfectly evident that Germany was preparing for a new war. The new war became inevitable.

We must, however, bear in mind the fact that, ever since wars have existed, their true causes are always found deeply hidden within the complex labyrinth of social and political relations, as well as in the ideological concepts of the given epoch. During the First World War, Lenin repeatedly stressed the fact that the origin of the war was wrapped up in secrecy, and that it was essential to teach the masses to understand and analyse this mystery.

This principle is applicable, not only to contemporary, but also to more remote epochs. Even in remote epochs there existed a clear contrast between the real nature of wars, and the ideological guise in which wars were presented to the active participants and to the peoples of the times.

Thus, the Second World War, as well as the first, was not an accidental event. It would be entirely superficial to assume that it came about merely as a result of the errors of any given statesman of the bourgeois countries. Is it possible then to conclude that these errors have had no significance, and therefore may be discarded from historic considerations? Not at all! The short-sighted, greedy, narrow-minded policy of the reactionaries, ruling during the period between the two wars, especially in England, as well as in other bourgeois-democratic countries, to a very great extent eased the Hitler murderers' task of realising their conspiracy against the freedom and the very life of other nations. These errors secured for the German and Japanese imperialists the most favorable conditions for unleashing the Second World War, significantly sharpened its danger to the peace-loving nations, extended the length of the war, and increas-

ed the number of its victims and the volume of devastation.

This chain of fatal errors began with the Versailles peace treaty, when the political leaders of the victorious countries, blinded by their enmity against the new world born in Russia, left the economic and political base of German imperialism intact. These tenuous errors led to Locarno, the Four-Power pact, the sadly remembered farce of "non-intervention" during the Italo-German fascist intervention in Spain, and the disgraceful Munich agreement between Chamberlain, Daladier, and Hitler.

At the root of the policy of encouraging the German aggressor in Europe, as well as the Japanese aggressor in the Far East, there lay the short-sighted calculation that it would be possible to direct the aggression against the Soviet Union. The further development of events showed Chamberlain, Daladier, and their followers in the camp of international reaction, that nobody had as yet invented such guns, tanks, and airplanes that would work only in an eastern direction and that could not be turned westward as well. Thus, the people of Western and Eastern Europe had to pay very dearly for the errors of the reactionary rulers of the bourgeois-democratic countries. Nor is there anything surprising in the fact that these people want no repetition of past errors.

But if Marxists assume that wars are the inevitable result of the development of contemporary monopoly capitalism, can it be concluded therefrom that it is hopeless and unnecessary to fight for the longest period of peace, to fight for the security of peace-loving nations? Any such conclusion would be tantamount to posing the question upside down.

It is well known that opponents of Marxism, unable to produce any essential arguments, prefer to caricature Marxist theory. We can think back to the Russian Narodniks, who, toward the end of the past century, seriously asserted that, from the point of view of the Marxist concept of the inevitability of the capitalist development of Russia, it was not that the advanced people had to do was to all that the advanced people had to do was to help open more saloons in the villages, and thereby help to speed up the inevitable historic development. We can also recollect another, a different type of sophistry, often advanced as an argument against the materialist conception of history. These people said that, if the social revolution is inevitable, why fight for it? Do the astronomers who assert the inevitability of an eclipse of the moon, establish a political party to organize this eclipse?

Following the authors of such and similar sophisms, a certain sector of the foreign press is at present likewise trying to distort the essence of the Marxist concept of the causes of wars. They make broad use of somewhat hazy, but sufficiently biased, arguments purporting to show that in the Soviet Union there exists a certain amount of pessimism concerning the possibility of a stable peace.

insofar as they (the Soviet Union) assume the inevitability of wars under the existing capitalist system.

Hence, with a great deal of hypocritically assumed regret, they come to the conclusion that the Soviet Union is not inclined to participate in the common fight for a stable peace, insofar as it considers the task hopeless. Of course, all such assumptions are unparadigmatic distortions of the true meaning of the Marxist-Leninist concepts dealing with the causes of wars, or else they are nothing but clumsy attempts to transfer the burden of guilt to someone else's shoulders.

Certainly no one would think of accusing a doctor or a lawyer who has discovered the origin of a disease or a crime, of producing diseases or crimes through these very activities. But it is just as senseless to accuse Marxist science of discovering the actual contradictions of the capitalist system, and then charge this science with the responsibility for the existence of these contradictions. Of course, the groups which are interested, not in the exposure of the contradictions of contemporary capitalism, but rather in concealing them, prefer to deny the inevitable character of wars. Thus, reactionary fomenters of a new war maintain that in all history there has not been a war which could have been more easily prevented than the recently ended Second World War. In fact, they assert that this war could have been prevented without the firing of a single shot, and that Germany could today still be a mighty, prosperous, and respected power. Unfortunately, however, nobody as yet has stated by just what magic means they could have resolved the contradictions between the altered Anglo-German correlation of forces and the division of spheres of influence of these powers. We do know that there are people who counted on German imperialism satisfying its appetites in the East at the expense of the Soviet Union. However, the years of pre-war experience, as well as the war itself, have amply demonstrated the absurdity and unreality of any such expectations.

When Marxist-Leninist science exposes the deepest roots of wars, it not only does not necessarily follow that nations must cease to fight for the longest and most stable possible peace. On the contrary, exposure of the true causes of wars among the broad masses with a true knowledge of the laws of social development; it enables the people to get rid of illusions which help only those who seek to provoke a new war, who seek to dull the vigilance of the fighters for a stable peace. It exposes the proponents of an ostrich-like policy, who prefer to hide their heads in the sand rather than face any danger. It shows to the common people of all countries, vitally interested in the longest and most stabilised period of peace, the true sources of the menace of a new war, the true sources of renewed attempts upon the security, life, and liberty of the people. Is it not clear that all this mobilises all of the sincere friends of the peaceful existence

of nations, mobilises them for active struggle for a just and stable peace? And least accidental of all is the fact that the Soviet Union, which builds its policy on a scientific foundation, upon knowledge of the laws of social development, always has been and continues to be a true guardian of peace between the nations, a consistent fighter against all attempts to instigate wars, wherever they come from.

Even if the roots of the origin of the Second World War are to be found within the correlations of present-day monopoly capitalism, just as with the First World War, it still does not mean that the Second World War was merely a copy of the first in its character. On the contrary, as Comrade Stalin showed in his February speech, the character of the Second World War differed materially from that of the first.

The First World War, as we know, was an imperialist war on the part of both sides. The Second World War was primarily a predatory, robber, murderous undertaking on the part of Germany, Japan, Italy, and their satellites. At the same time, it was a just, liberation war on the part of those countries which fought against the fascist aggressors.

An indifferent, nihilistic attitude towards the question of the character of wars is alien to Marxism. Our great teachers always emphasised the thought that it is necessary to differentiate between two types of wars. There are just, liberating wars, whose purpose is either to repel the invading enemy, or to liberate a nation from foreign enslavement. There are also unjust wars of acquisition, whose purpose is to grab foreign lands, to enslave other nations. Lenin showed that even during the imperialist war of 1914-18 the struggle of small countries like Serbia against foreign invaders was a struggle for liberation, even though this fact could in no way affect the character of the war as a whole. It should be noted that a very reverse situation existed in the Second World War, when even the fact of the presence of imperialistic elements within the camp of the anti-Hitler coalition could not change the just, liberation character of this war against fascist aggressors.

Communists hold sacred the traditions of wars of liberation, such as Russia's patriotic war against the Napoleonic invasion, the Soviet people's patriotic war against foreign intervention during the first years of Soviet power, the war of the North American States for independence, the war of the Slavonic peoples against German and Turkish enslavement, the war of the French Jacobins against the Austro-Prussian coalition, etc. Hence, it was not an accident that the Communist Party became the organiser and inspirer of all-national resistance against the German-fascist invaders, not only in the Soviet Union, but also in all European countries and in the colonies, where Communists were in the front ranks of the difficult underground and partisan war against the fascist oppressors.

The character of the Second World War was determined by the entire direction of the fascist aggressors' internal and foreign policy, the continu-

ation of which resulted in the war. The fascists strangled all progressive elements within their own countries, destroyed the remnants of bourgeois-democratic liberties, established the rule of unheeded tyranny, violence and murder, and then began the war in order to gain mastery of the world and spread their rule of terror and medievalism all over the world.

Under these conditions, the fight of the freedom-loving nations against the fascist aggressors became a fight for liberty and independence, for the very existence of nations.

From the very beginning, the Second World War assumed the character of an anti-fascist, liberation war. As Comrade Stalin emphasised in his February speech, this anti-fascist, liberation character of the Second World War became even stronger after the Soviet Union joined in the war against the axis powers.

Even at the very beginning of the Soviet-German war, in his radio broadcast of July 3, 1941, Comrade Stalin pointed out that it was not an ordinary war. He pointed out that it was not merely a battle between two armies, but a war of the whole Soviet people against the German-fascist invaders.

If the First World War in Europe in its very progress and outcome decided the question of the fate of the colonies and the distribution of foreign spheres of influence, the Second World War was to decide the fate, the very existence, of the European nations themselves. The question at issue was whether these nations would be able to preserve their national freedom and state independence, or be transformed into slaves of the ill-fated German "Master race."

Fascism was the product of the most aggressive, man-hating, cannibalistic forces of international reaction of our epoch. Fascism personified extreme reaction, whose roots were deeply imbedded in the contemporary system of monopoly capitalism. It became a deadly menace to human civilisation, to the very existence of human society. Hence, all progressive and democratic forces united in the fight against the fascist invaders.

Even during the First World War, Lenin wrote in exposing people who denied the significance of the contemporary struggle for the democratic rights of the broad masses:

Capitalism generally, and especially imperialism, transforms democracy into a mere illusion. At the same time, capitalism is forced to introduce democratic tendencies among the masses, is forced to establish democratic institutions. It thereby sharpens the antagonism between imperialism, negating democracy, and the masses who are striving for democracy.

The Second World War demonstrated with unparalleled force this antagonism between imperialism, negating democracy, and the masses striving for democracy. The Soviet Union's decisive participation in the fight of the anti-fascist coalition against

the armed forces of the Hitlerite bloc gave an especially sharp expression to this antagonism.

For this reason, as Comrade Stalin noted, the Second World War could not be of short duration, of the blitzkrieg type, because it was a war in which nations fought for their very existence. With truly remarkable blindness, the Hitlerite leaders worked out the plans of their infamous blitzkrieg without realising that they were building on sand, for even the temporary victories of the blitzkrieg did not bring Germany's victory any nearer, but only delayed the moment of her inevitable defeat. Furthermore, the Second World War could not end in a draw, or a stalemate, even though there were many who would have been in favor of such an outcome, many not only in the camp of the Hitlerite murderers, but even among the reactionary groups in other countries. This war could not end in any form of a compromise, a cession of any territory, or any other kind of peace, under which both warring sides could survive. This war could end only in the destruction of one side or the other, and as we know, it did end in the destruction of the fascist aggressors.

So much for the question of the character of the Second World War.

But not all by far did or do recognise the anti-fascist character of this war. If the broad masses of the democratic countries did consider this liberation war as the vital task of the fight against the fascist aggressors, this cannot be said about the influential reactionary circles in England, the U.S. and other countries. It would be utterly ridiculous to imagine reactionary Republican and Democratic senators, opponents of Roosevelt and his policy in the U.S., or the seasoned Munichites in the ranks of the Conservative Party in England, as men inspired by anti-fascist ideas. On the contrary, before the war these reactionaries did not spare any effort in praising the Hitler and Mussolini regimes. They looked upon fascism as a reliable "barrier against Bolshevism." Of course, "Bolshevism" for them included any progressive movement, any tendency of the broad masses toward the realisation of their vital rights, any attempt of the enslaved peoples of the colonial world to escape from the foreign yoke. When Hitler attacked the Soviet Union, these people openly expressed their hope that Germany and Russia would bleed each other to death, and thereby would eliminate any obstacle to the establishment of Anglo-American domination the world over. With this purpose in view, they used their influence to create the maximum of delay in England's and America's participation in the war, and especially in the opening of the Second Front in Europe.

But even some of the other politicians, who considered it advisable to separate themselves from such an openly pro-fascist position, maintained even in the midst of the war that this war was not even in the slightest, ideological, i.e., anti-fascist. English conservatives looked upon fascism with more than a little favor, but even they could not continue with these views when they became convinced that the fascist

aggressors threatened the very existence of England and its empire. This point of view reflected the concept of those ruling groups of England who would not have found any reason for war if Hitler had only confined himself to grabbing such territories which would not directly menace the vital interests of the British Empire.

Representatives of this point of view ignored, or more correctly, attempted to hide from their people the indisputable fact that fascism is not merely an "ideology," but that fascism represents, first of all, a definite physical force, inseparable from war, from aggression, and that, because of this, fascism becomes a deadly menace, not only to the countries where it is in power but also to the security of all nations, to the cause of world peace. Reactionaries in Anglo-Saxon countries have maintained that there could supposedly exist a non-aggressive, peaceable, and absolutely respectable fascism. And these very circles, even today, continue, with a zeal worthy of a better cause, to defend the bloody, fascist hangman Franco.

It is interesting to note that only recently, on March 9, the reactionary newspaper, the *New York World Telegram*, carried an article by Randolph Churchill, son of Great Britain's ex-premier, in which it was specifically stated that the past war was not against fascism as such, but merely a war against some aggressors who intended to conquer Europe.

But whether these particular groups in England and certain other countries did or did not want it, the war, in reality, did assume the character of an anti-fascist war. The freedom-loving nations conducted it as a war against fascism, against the most monstrous product of international reaction, and this war ended with the defeat of the major bases of world fascism and world aggression.

As a result of the war, serious changes took place in the correlation between the forces of democracy and reaction in the international arena.

The anti-fascist coalition won the war. The world press again and again poses the question now as to whether this coalition will also be able to win the peace. They usually refer to the experience of history. They cite historic examples to show that as a rule, after victory over the common enemy, coalitions usually fall apart.

We must, however, take into consideration the fact that the anti-Hitler coalition has a number of peculiarities, which make it slightly different from other coalitions. These peculiarities proceed from the just, liberation character of the Second World War. The process of the anti-fascist war not only united the governments of a number of countries, but led the broad masses to feel the necessity of marching shoulder to shoulder to fight against fascist aggression, mankind's enemy. As a result of this, millions of people in all countries, who lived through the deprivations of war and brought their sacrifices to its altar, are now ready to defend peace with

as much resolution as they demonstrated yesterday in the fight against the common enemy.

Even during the war, the leaders of the allied powers made repeated individual and collective statements to the effect that their aim was not only victory over the common enemy, but also the establishment of such a world order as would effectively prevent the danger of a new aggression on the part of enemy countries and secure for the world prolonged peace and safety.

But it is one thing to announce principles, and quite another thing to bring them into life, not only according to the letter, but also according to the spirit of adopted resolutions. The period since the end of the Second World War has shown that these principles and resolutions from time to time become subject to serious tests and trials. Without dwelling on details, but considering events from the standpoint of their basic significance, we may come to the following conclusion.

In approaching any solution of international questions, two different tendencies are becoming more and more clear. Representatives of one tendency are trying to arrange things so as to have some powers set the tone, while others would have to submit to decisions forced upon them. These are the new pretenders to world rule. The war against the fascist aggressors was not yet over, when the reactionary American press already began to proclaim loudly and often that America must dominate in all international affairs and in all corners of the globe, that America has been called upon to establish her "ideological hegemony" and her "moral leadership" all over the world. In order to leave no doubt about the real basis for this "moral" and "ideological" leadership, all these declarations are supported by quite plain hints at the destructive force of the atom bomb.

The English imperialist circles, evidently realising that they can no longer hope for their own rule of the world, are for this reason ready to satisfy themselves, as shown by Churchill's Fulton speech, with the role of a junior partner in the Anglo-American firm set up to dominate the whole world.

But the idea of domination by the "Anglo-Saxon" race, as promoted by English and American reactionaries, does not seem to suit the other peoples of the world, who constitute the world's majority, in comparison with whom the English-speaking people become merely an insignificant minority.

But along with this distinctly imperialistic tendency in contemporary world politics, there also exists another, a democratic tendency, based upon recognising the necessity of co-operation among all peace-loving nations, great and small, in the interests of peace, security, and social progress. This tendency is clear to the Soviet people, because during the pre-war years the Soviet Union proved to be a resolute fighter for peace among the nations. During the war, the Soviet Union played a decisive role in the defeat of the major bases of world fascism and world aggression. Since the war, the

Soviet Union has been conducting a constant struggle for establishing international relations on a basis of democracy and for the solution of international questions through international co-operation.

As a result of the war, the Soviet Union's international prestige rose enormously. The Soviet Union puts the whole weight of its authority on the side of favoring stable peace and security among nations, in favor of consistent application of democratic principles in the relations between countries, great and small. The Soviet Union looks upon the United Nations as an organization of great importance, judging it as a serious instrument for the preservation of peace and international security. This is shown in a number of Comrade Stalin's statements made during the war and after it was over. In reply to questions by a correspondent of the Associated Press, Comrade Stalin pointed out that the strength of this international organization lies in the idea that it is based upon the principle of the equality of states, and not on the principle of the domination of some states over others, and that if it will be able to preserve this principle of equality in the future it will undoubtedly play a great and positive role in the maintenance of general peace and security.

Sane, thinking people have always understood that at the basis of successful activity of the U.N. lies the preservation of unity among the leading powers of the anti-Hitler coalition, these powers being the initiators of the U.N., who are responsible for the work of this organization. It is also well known that this principle of the unanimity of the great powers, as an essential condition for the existence of the U.N., has been fixed in this organization's charter. Naturally, in connection with a number of questions, there may arise differences of opin-

ion, disagreements and contradictions among the great powers, in which case, of course, the task is to overcome these difficulties, and find common solutions of international affairs. In order to achieve this, it is, of course, necessary to counteract any propagandists of new wars, who often abuse freedom of speech in acting against the interests of peace; it is necessary to expose their plots and repel them. It is also clear that a "war of nerves" directed against the Soviet Union never brought any laurels to its initiators. The nerves of defenders of just tasks are much too strong.

Notwithstanding the ceaseless anti-Soviet campaigns of lies and slander which the many-voiced foreign reactionary press is developing, and which at times reaches the stage of hysteria and insanity; notwithstanding every possible attempt to distort the true meaning of Soviet foreign policy, the Soviet Union attracts the sympathy of millions of common people who are everywhere guarding the peace.

The Soviet Union stands high above the world, as the most important and resolute defender of the peaceful co-existence of peoples. It was the Soviet Union which played a decisive role in the victory over the common enemy. Now, too, the Soviet Union has no more important task than that of confirming and strengthening this victory. Following the defeat of its enemies, the Soviet Union began the task of peaceful construction, the renewal of the great task of building communism in our country, a task temporarily interrupted by the fascist invasion. The Soviet Union now stands as a mighty obstacle against instigators of a new war. The just task of maintaining the freedom of nations and peace among the nations is firmly and consistently defended by the Soviet Union under the brilliant leadership of the great Stalin.

THE W.A. LOCO DISPUTE

THE Locomotive Engine Drivers, Firemen and Cleaners' Union of Western Australia after a 16 days' strike, won their fight against the W.A. Labor Government for withdrawal of the Garratt engines.

Terms of settlement announced on Friday, November 22, were:—

Immediate resumption of work.
Reinstatement of suspended members without punishment or loss.

The Government to support an application for re-registration of the union.

Commissioner of Railways not to oppose an application by the union for annulment of all current legal proceedings against the union and its members.

No Garratt engines to be returned to service until fitted with certain safety devices and approved by the board of five (to be appointed) consisting of two representatives of the union, two

technical men and a non-technical independent chairman.

Highlights of the struggle were:—

(a) Role of the Labor Government.
The Labor Government after delaying tactics since 1945, after breaking promises, denounced the strike and strikers; supported the Court in its attacks and threats; tried to influence the rest of the workers against the strikers; used its control of the A.L.P. machine and of the A.L.P. Disputes Committee to attack the Loco Union and its officials; rallied the right wingers in the unions in opposition to the Locomen; gave the lead to the attacks and abuse by the reactionary politicians, employers and press. While negotiations were proceeding, railway employees received notices of suspension, indicating that the Government had had no intention of allowing a settlement.

(b) Exposed the right wing of the Labor Movement.

Right wing unionists rushed to justify the Labor Government despite the fact that the Loco Union is itself considered an "A.L.P." union. At a stage when they thought the Loco men were losing, weaker elements among the union leaders went over to, or came out openly in support of, the right wing.

(c) Exposure of the anti-working class role of the State Arbitration Court.

The President of the State Arbitration Court proved himself a worthy successor to Judge O'Mara. Lessons of the struggle were:—

Willingness of the workers to struggle. Government and Court threats, right wing sabotage and treachery — these failed to intimidate the workers. Their fighting spirit increased as the struggle progressed. When it was realised that the Government had moved from merely defending the Garratt engines, to attacking Trade Union democracy the whole political level of the struggle was raised.

Gains are made by the working class through struggle—not through Labor Governments or Arbitration Courts.

Progressive leadership of the Trade Unions is essential if struggles in favorable economic conditions are to be broadened; are to be moved on to an offensive basis. With conditions so obviously favorable (Victorian victory; labor shortage; general prosperity; members in fighting mood) the struggle should have been broadened to include improved conditions and increased wages.

Protracted negotiations and long conferences — normal employing class technique — reacted against the workers.

Necessity of planning before a strike. The Union's lack of clear-cut policy regarding the Government's emergency measures caused confusion among the workers.

Necessity of drawing rank and file members into activity — leaflet distribution — addressing union meetings — organising relief — in order to maintain interest and enthusiasm.

Necessity of amendments to the State Arbitration Act, including removal of the President.

Establishment of a Trades and Labor Council and closer Federal Union relationship.

The Union struck as from midnight on Wednesday, November 6. The issues were: Withdrawal of the Garratt engines; reinstatement, without loss of pay, of the six men suspended for carrying out union instructions and refusing to work Garratt engines as from midnight, Sunday, November 3.

These are the developments which led to the strike. In 1943, the W.A. State Labor Government purchased 25 Australian Standard Garratt engines from the Commonwealth Government. The Garratt engine is viewed far more favorably by Labor Governments than by engine-drivers who have to run them.

In Queensland a dispute centred around the Garratt engines, just as in W.A., and the workers were successful, the engines being withdrawn.

In a very short time after being put on the track in W.A., the Garratt engines revealed deficiencies which engine-drivers held made their working unsafe and uneconomical.

The W.A. Government has sidetracked the union since 1945. In that year the withdrawal of the Garratts on safety grounds was demanded. This demand was withdrawn after the Government agreed that Garratts should not be used for passenger service, the speed limit be reduced to 25 miles per hour, and a Royal Commission investigate the engine. The Royal Commissioner found that the engines were unsafe, listed about 50 measures of modifications necessary to make the engines serviceable and safe — and then recommended that the Garratts be used!

The Government agreed that modifications be carried out. It did not honor this agreement. Consequently the Union issued its second ultimatum to ban Garratts as from a date in October last. This was withdrawn after a special conference convened by the Arbitration Court.

Finally, on October 31, the General Committee and the Triennial Conference of the Union decided that, unless the Garratts were immediately withdrawn, members would be instructed not to work Garratts as from midnight, November 3.

On October 30, Premier Wise and Railways Minister Marshall conferred with Dunphy, President of the Arbitration Court. Dunphy convened a compulsory conference and read a long typewritten statement. Events indicated that the judgment reflected the attitude of the Premier and the Railways Minister. This judgment ranks with the most vicious anti-working class judgments ever issued by an Arbitration Court. Dunphy advised all engine-drivers not to obey the union's instructions; that union funds were liable to penalty; that the union was liable to deregistration; that members were liable, individually, to prosecution. It was clear that W.A. was to be no exception to the general pattern of methods used by Courts and employers in other States.

The effect of the judgment was the reverse of that which the Government and the Court expected. It immediately lifted the level of the struggle and completely consolidated the union leadership. Where earlier there had been a division of opinion, now was unanimity.

The reformist A.L.P. domination of the Trade Unions and the fact that the Loco Union leadership viewed the struggle from the narrow craft instead of the working class angle, made the organization of the struggle, particularly in its early stages, difficult.

As no strike would take place until Wednesday, November 6, and then only if the Government suspended drivers, the immediate needs were pledges of support from other workers and pressure on the Government to concede the Union's claims. There was ample discontent had the unions wanted to broaden the struggle. The discontent of the W.A.

Government railway workers is much wider than the question of the Garratt engine. The administration is so bad that unrest is rife from workshops to traffic workers. Further, the Victorian Transport workers' victory had supplied the best of reasons why the W.A. unions should take the offensive. Certainly this victory encouraged the rank and file. However, attempts to broaden the struggle did not succeed.

A big factor in the Government's determination to fight was fear of the development of the struggle for better wages and conditions. In this, the W.A. Labor Government lined up with the employers just as Labor in the other States and in the Commonwealth had done. Also, as in other States, the Labor Government received the endorsement of anti-working class forces. The W.A. Government clung to its Ministers and agents to side-track demands, and weaken the militant unions.

In Western Australia this plot to smash militant unions was actually planned in detail some time ago. Of this there is evidence. Until the dispute on the Garratt question the Court's consistent attacks on the unions had not met with any strong opposition. Thus it was understandable that the Government, the A.L.P. right wingers, and the Court itself, felt confident of handling the Loco men.

The Government refused to withdraw the engines. The union members refused to work them. On Monday, the Department suspended six men. The fight was on. Meantime the rank and file of the unions, incensed at the Court's tactics, encouraged by the success of the militant Victorian unionists and led by the progressives amongst them, moved into action. Resolutions began to come in from job meetings. The Tramways Union executive pledged full support, introduced the question of hours and wages and a clean-up of the administration.

The A.L.P. Disputes Committee had been brought into the picture by the Railways Officers' Association (membership 1141) and the Railway Employees' Association (membership 4489). Both are dominated by the Right Wing, but there are good progressive elements in the Railway Employees. The Loco Union, remembering past experiences, had decided not to put the matter entirely in the Disputes Committee's hands.

Events quickly justified the decision. The Disputes Committee convened a special meeting of Trade Union representatives (about 200) to hear members of the Cabinet. At the outset, H. Graham, M.L.A. (Chairman, Disputes Committee) stated that there would be no comment, no questions, no discussion on the Ministers' reports. The delegates' reaction to this impudent dictation may be imagined. Support for the Government lessened still further when a Loco man attempted to reply to a particularly abusive speech by Panton, Minister for Works, and was told to sit down. The Loco men walked out in a body in protest.

The meeting demanded that the Disputes Committee hear the Loco men. This was done. After the Loco men put their case, support for them increased considerably. The Government was forced to put forward terms of settlement. The Loco men discussed these terms, but negotiations broke down after hours of discussion.

It was here that the Loco men made a serious tactical blunder. They continued discussion with the Government long after the time set for the commencement of the strike. In doing this they lost time and a valuable ally in the Tramways. The Executive of the Tramways Union had decided to call a stop-work meeting the next morning if the Loco men went on strike. When, there was no news of settlement or strike at 12.40 a.m. the idea of a stop-work was abandoned.

Late on Wednesday afternoon (during the period of the negotiations) Railway employees received notices of suspension, and, early on Thursday morning, the Tramways got theirs.

The Government's plan now became clear. Refusal to deal with the Locomen's grievances. Judgment by the Arbitration Court. Futile negotiations to goad the union to the only alternative — strike. The right wing to weaken, confuse and betray the struggle. Then the Government, aided by the Court, to smash the strike and weaken the union and thereby deter any later and broader move for better wages and conditions.

Employers' Federation, Government officials and individual employers joined in action against the strikers. Electric power was cut off at 6 a.m. The Railway Commissioner said no more trucks could be supplied, and Collie coal-owners obliged by immediately closing down the mines. The press did its usual vicious, anti-working class work.

Some weaker elements succumbed to the barrage. The W.A.A.S.R.E. executive passed a motion deprecating the action of the Loco men. It was promptly rejected by five branches, to be increased later to a majority.

Leaders of the Road Transport Union stood with the A.L.P. Disputes Committee. Without consulting their members the Clerks' Union Executive (two dissenting) condemned the Loco men.

The mass meeting of the Tramwaymen on Friday reflected the confusion. Representatives from the Loco men were well received. A motion was passed condemning H. Graham, Chairman of the Disputes Committee. And then a motion was moved to hear a representative of the Disputes Committee! In a seconding this, Chamberlain, Secretary of the Tramways Union, who had been in hospital and had risen from his sick bed to "do his bit" for the Government, spoke for one and a quarter hours!

Payne, President and Acting Secretary, opposed the motion and it was lost.

Chamberlain immediately launched into an attack on the Loco men, urged loyalty to the Government, etc., then read out a long resolution. By this time the men were thoroughly confused; im-

patient to get away. They had been meeting since 10.45 without a break until 4 p.m. One member opposed the motion. Payne rose to speak. It was the signal for deliberate and sustained uproar led by a clique of disruptors. So well was it organised that Payne couldn't get a hearing. The motion was carried and the meeting closed.

The Executive resigned in a body as a protest. They later got a vote of confidence, 260 to 10. Meantime the Loco men's solidarity grew.

The next move against the strikers was deregistration of the union, and fining of the union and of individual officials.

The obvious counter to the anti-working class attitude of the Government and Court and the threats and oppression was more and more mass pressure. The Loco men decided to issue leaflets and to organise public meetings.

Action was necessary to expose the right wing leadership of the W.A.A.S.R.E. and the Tramways. The result in the case of the W.A.A.S.R.E. has been mentioned. Midland District A.L.P. Council, by 20 votes to one, supported the Loco men. At the Metro Council meeting on Tuesday, November 12, the majority support, although side-tracked, obviously was for the Loco men. And the Council unanimously passed a resolution for a clean up of Railway administration!

Mass pressure was having effect. As the dispute developed additional unions declared support.

RECENT DEVELOPMENTS IN THE LABOR MOVEMENT IN SOUTH AUSTRALIA

L. AARONS.

THE development of the class struggle in Australia over recent months is having great effect on the labor movement in South Australia. The factors making for the development of great offensive struggles for wages and hours are present in marked degree in S.A., and the Victorian transport workers' victory has given great impetus to a movement which was already developing.

The labor movement in South Australia is rapidly coming of age. The heritage of a backward past, due to industrial weakness and the predominantly agrarian nature of the State, still influences the labor movement. Evidences of immaturity still remain, but rapid industrialisation is rapidly changing the labor movement; the working class today is an industrial—and a mainly heavy industrial—working class. Till quite recently, this was an agrarian State. What industry there was consisted of small industry, with but few exceptions.

What a change has taken place! Even before the war forced industrial development, big changes were taking place. Under a deliberate policy of L.C.L. Governments, industries were encouraged to the State. This policy was based upon special

Collie miners and the Lumpers were solid. After conferring with the Loco men the miners rejected a proposal by the Government that they haul sufficient coal for emergency measures to be transported by truck.

Public meetings called on the Mayors of Fremantle, Perth and Midland to get the Government to accept the union's terms. Attempts were made also to get the Mayors to convene public meetings to set up broad committees to organise relief for distressed women and children. This form of relief organisation is the only one open, as it is illegal in W.A. to organise relief for strikers.

The union was de-registered on November 18 and the Court convicted the union and 22 of its members of having instigated a strike.

Earlier Dunphy warned that any suggestion of linking up with other unions in the dispute "amounted to a conspiracy under the criminal code" and a penalty . . . of three years with hard labor.

On the 21st the Court announced the fines: Union £100; 22 members, each £10. The Court continued its threatening role, pointing out that an order could be obtained against every striker, the penalty being £100.

However, the Government had made its final gesture on behalf of the employers and bondholders and against the working class. The following day the settlement was announced.

circumstances—available raw materials (e.g., iron ore of great purity and concentration), low wage levels and deliberate L.C.L. policy of giving attractive concessions. Best example of the latter is the complete monopoly of the Iron Knob-Whyalla area given to B.H.P., giving this most powerful Australian monopoly a virtual Steel Empire in this area.

Some figures will give an illustration of the radical change that has taken place in S.A.

INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT IN S.A.			
No. of factories.	No. of workers.	Value of fact. land, Bldgs. Plant & Mech. million.	Value of output. million.
1924-5	1731	57714	£22.24
1941-2	2107	65352	£26.89

These figures do not show the full picture of the growth of the working class since transport workers, watersiders etc. have also increased in numbers, due to the increasing demands of industry.

S.A. industrial development is not only a normal increase, the rate of industrialisation is ahead of national industrial growth. Here are comparisons between national and S.A. industrial development.

Factory Employment	Value of factory and, Bldgs. plant & machinery		Fact. workers per 10,000 of population	
	1924-5	1941-2	1924-5	1941-2
1924-5	100	100	715	802
1941-2	143	173	1919	1322

As was to be expected, industry developing at this period is big industry, monopolist in trend. This is shown in the figures:

SOUTH AUSTRALIA.				
No. factories.	Factories employing 100 workers.		Factories employing over 100 workers.	
	1928-9	1941-2	1928-9	1941-2
1928-9	1892	22,483	41	25,073
1941-2	2088	32,394	84	49,917

Comparison with Australian trends are as follows:—

FACTORIES EMPLOYING OVER 100 WORKERS.			
Percentage of Factories.		Percentage of total factory workers employed.	
1928-9	1941-2	1928-9	1941-2
2.3	3.8	49.1	52
2.1	4.7	45.7	54.3

Although these figures are only to 1941-2, later war years intensified the trend, while big industrial developments have taken place since the war ended.

In the circumstances of the early growth of the labor movement, it is not surprising to find considerable weaknesses in the movement. Reformism and class-collaboration are still strong; there are some amazing illustrations of careerism and bureaucracy (e.g. Union "secretaries" who "run" three unions). At the same time, S.A. is a State in which anarcho-syndicalist and socialist sectarian theory and practice penetrated deeply, remained relatively strong for longer than elsewhere and still have a minor influence. This bears out Lenin's statement "the error of anarchism is often a kind of punishment for the opportunist sins of the labor movement." It is no accident that the I.W.W. influence was strong among the most industrialised workers in the circumstances of a most strongly marked reformist and class-collaborationist labor movement.

Whilst recognising the errors of the I.W.W., we must still pay due credit to the struggles of the workers influenced and sometimes led by the I.W.W. The Watersiders of Port Adelaide waged fierce battles against the capitalist class and its State in 1919 and 1928; it was in the industrialised Port area that the O.B.U. move was strongest, and it was from the Port that a strong contingent of unemployed marched in their demand for beef on the dole ration, only to be attacked by the police "defending" the "Labor" Government from the people whom they were starving.

In spite of a deep-seated reformism, the labor movement here has produced few strong right-wing leaders. Lack of maturity is evidenced in the right wing. In part, this is due to the general hangover from a recent past of weakness; in part to past weakness of the Communist Party. The aggressive gangsterism of the right wingers on Sydney and Melbourne Labor Councils and the

A.W.U. bureaucracy in Queensland is missing; but the same forces are there, eager to show the same "strength" in defence of capitalism when our Party more strongly threatens the capitalist class and therefore the bourgeois influences in the labor movement. This trend has already commenced.

Recent developments in the labor movement show the growing militancy of the workers and their determination to struggle.

Three months ago, 1200 workers at Richards' Industries won a dispute over speed-up methods. Railwaymen recently developed a really amazing display of strength, in which, for the first time, a solid united front of A.R.U. and A.F.U.L.E. was achieved and maintained. A 24-hour stoppage was followed by a ban on overtime which threw railway services into chaos. The ban was applied and maintained under difficult conditions, men finishing work and remaining in the country, away from their homes for days. It has since been removed and the men's case taken to Court, not due to lack of militancy but more due to lack of a farseeing leadership. The railway dispute is still in progress. Failure to win concessions—and quickly—will result in a new outbreak of the struggle, at a higher level. Already a mass meeting has decided to call a further mass meeting "to consider the Court's decision on their claims."

Trammen are consumed with grievances; only right wing leadership has so far succeeded in keeping them back from action.

The foundry workers' struggle has been a highlight of the whole movement for wage increases. Under Communist leadership, the struggle has been carefully planned, has brought a high level of militancy under planned guidance, with a concentration upon break through by selecting weak links in the employers' front. Employers have now locked out all foundry workers, and indications are that they will find it difficult indeed to get workers back without a general wage increase. The foundry workers' struggle is the centre of the wages struggle in S.A. at the moment.

The Amalgamated Engineers have now imposed an overtime ban, although a mass meeting would not agree to a follow-up stopwork meeting before Xmas, leaving it till January if claims are not satisfied. The engineers are a strong reserve for the foundry workers.

The right wing union officials, led by Thompson and Trevorror (E.T.U.), are doing their best to sabotage the struggle. After forcing the foundries dispute into the hands of the Disputes Committee, against the wishes of the two unions, Thompson and his supporters now refuse to accept the Disputes Committee decision to ban overtime, to support the foundry workers, and are organising to upset the decision.

The Ironworkers and A.E.U. still intend to carry out their overtime ban, while the foundry workers are solid in determination to hold out until victory is won. After the employers' lockout, the

general demand has been raised for the £1 increase and for improved amenities, which are even more primitive in S.A. foundries than in other States.

In spite of a vicious attempt by the Chamber of Manufacturers to prevent employment of new workers for "the next month," most of the foundry workers have found jobs at higher pay and under better conditions.

The Waterside Workers are also participating in the strike wave, protecting working conditions. Victory after victory has been won by the wharves in struggle for better conditions.

Groups as widely removed as the gantry-workers (who unload all coal for Adelaide) and the mental hospital workers, who are combined in one union (with many other categories), the A.G.W.A., are in a fighting mood. The mental hospital employees have just won big gains in a short, sharp struggle.

Building workers have recently gained big increases and are determined to wage struggles for new improvements. Fibro-plasterers are waging an "efficiency campaign" which has resulted in a lock-out by employers. The past struggles of the building workers for shorter hours makes it probable that building workers will take the lead in transforming Drake-Brockman's "acceptance in principle" of the 40-hour week into practice.

The widespread unrest has spread to clerical and professional workers.

Labor shortage is having a big effect. Turnover of labor is tremendous, particularly in big industrial establishments, such as General Motors' Holdens and Richards' Industries. Men at these two huge motor body-building plants are coming and going in droves, some even failing to pick up two or three days' pay due to them.

Under these circumstances, the employers are doing their utmost to halt the movement, to hold it back, force claims into Arbitration Court channels and stave off the movement for as long as possible.

Immediately, they are trying to call a halt by illegally locking out the foundry workers and plasterers and at the same time asking for and obtaining the help of the Courts. They are trying to stop labor turnover by refusing to take on men who tell the boss what "he can do with his job"—and there is reason to believe this is a deliberate and organised policy.

They are waging a propaganda campaign for "more production," "efficiency" and "harder work," stressing the dangers of inflation, etc., along the well-known lines of international capitalism. They are also commencing a campaign for "immigration" as the only solution to the labor shortage in S.A. — meaning a return to the "more men than jobs" conditions so favourable to them.

Under these circumstances, employers are obtaining invaluable support from the right wing in the labor movement.

In the labor movement in S.A., we have a position slightly different from the other States. It is true that the extreme right wing finds its main strength in the smaller unions, but three of the largest unions in the State provide a mass basis for them.

The A.S.E. is one; S.A. is the only State in which this union is stronger than the A.E.U. The A.S.E. leadership here is probably more class-collaborationist than any other. Reason for its growth, apart from certain A.E.U. weaknesses, is the conclusion of special agreements with employers under which they receive the employers' support for their union in return for concessions to employers, which means agreements favourable to the latter. Agreements include the provision of secret ballots before strikes (Pope's, Finsbury), bonus systems (Vactic), etc.

As part of the A.S.E.'s drive for membership, they are waging a body-snatching campaign against the Ironworkers. In this, of course, they have the support of the employers.

In return, Thompson and Co. have attempted to discredit the Ironworkers and their leadership. In one such attempt, they made charges against C. J. McCaffrey, which recoiled on their heads. Thompson, in debate on the T. & L.C., admitted that Pope, leading metal trade employer, preferred dealing with the A.S.E. instead of the Ironworkers. He said this was because the A.S.E. was "honourable" in their dealings with employers!

Thompson is the leading retailer of employers' arguments inside the union movement. In private, it is alleged, he has said that "there is only a certain pool of goods produced and we cannot take more out until more is produced."

Whether this is true or not, he has made more than enough public utterances to show his beliefs. Just two examples: the A.S.E. Executive has dissociated itself from the A.E.U. overtime ban. Thompson appealed to his members not to be "stampeded" into action for the £1 increase and 40-hour week. When the A.E.U. imposed the overtime ban, Thompson was invited down to one factory by the boss "to explain A.S.E. policy" — i.e., why we shouldn't fight for the £1. (And the boss would vote of thanks to him!)

When the Metal Trades Council was discussing the campaign for the economic demands, Thompson's line was: "I have been in touch with the employers and they assure me that, if any increase is given as a result of other unions' action, the A.S.E. members will get it. Besides, it costs money for stamps to send a demand to employers."

But the A.S.E. bureaucracy is not having things its own way. With their undemocratic rules, they have been able to maintain their position, but only rank and file. Crick, an organiser, elected by the a recent meeting of the members demanded his reinstatement — but the Executive has appealed to the Federal Council against this decision!

A mass meeting of A.S.E. men at the Tramway Workshops decided unanimously to support the A.E.U. men in their overtime ban and similar movements are expected in other metal shops.

Several hundred signatories to a petition by A.S.E. members urge their State Executive to take action to win the A.C.T.U. demands.

There is a somewhat similar position in the V.E.U. Lawn, the Secretary, has, up till now, succeeded in holding back the rank-and-file demand for action to win wage increases.

The A.W.U., under the leadership of Cameron, though not as completely in the hands of the right wing as in other States, is still a source of right wing strength. Cameron recently attacked the A.E.U. decision to ban overtime and has taken a prominent part in right wing plotting to divert and stifle the developing movement of struggle.

The Trades and Labor Council has proved a testing-ground for the rival conceptions of reformist class collaboration and militant struggle.

When the Ironworkers' and Moulders' struggle in the foundries was developing, the press carried hints of moves to discipline "certain unions" who were taking action "on their own." Such moves were in the wind, but were defeated on the T.L.C.; instead, a motion was carried (with only two dissentients speaking up) endorsing the actions of unions who had commenced the fight, and calling upon all unions to serve the £1 and 40 hours demands on all employers. Those who most loudly deplored the "lack of unity" were most conspicuous by their failure to do anything to maintain fighting unity in terms of this resolution.

After the Victorian transport victory, Tom Garland, Secretary of the T.L.C. and A.C.T.U. Executive member, gave the Council an excellent full report of the developments. Pointing out the promises made as a result of the transport strike, he urged action now to force the implementation of the promises, and, even more important, preparation for action to force the full demands of the union movement.

A proposal was made for an immediate and full ban on all overtime — working of the standard hours only.

The right wing appeared as "militant" — but demagogues, proposing a "general strike" — but in January "if demands are not met." They took additional safeguards — it would be a "recommendation" to the A.C.T.U. Executive to "recommend" such action to the Labor Councils. It is safe to say that if a miracle occurred and the A.C.T.U. and Labor Councils endorsed such a step, the movers would find "good" arguments against about this move. It is not worthwhile to say more about transparent fraud, except to quote a police delegate who, asked how the police could take part in a general strike, replied: "It's alright — we know these jokers don't mean it, but you fellows do mean the your overtime ban." A perfect commentary on the move—and explanation why some centre elements

voted for the move and ensured its adoption by a narrow margin.

Mover and seconder of the "general strike" resolution were Messrs. Lawn and Thompson, who pursue the policy of aiding Playford and the S.A. bourgeoisie in urging overseas capital to come to this State. A few months ago, these two "general strikers" urged capitalists to come to this State "because of the lower basic wage and the more stable labor position."

The right wing is still strong in the union movement, but their strength is waning. The militant mood of the workers, the resistance of employers, Court and Government to the legitimate demands of the workers and the struggles this will produce will further this development, exposing the right wing and building the left.

Many union officials and leading rank and files who are by no means Communists or even leftists are disgusted at the right wing policy and they will respond the more readily to the mass movement.

The position is, however, much different in the A.L.P. The recent Labor Party convention was a right wing victory, though a barren one. The Labor Party here has always been weak. The parliamentarians are far out of touch with the unions. At only one period have the industrial wing assumed leadership, when the Premiers' Planners were expelled from the Party. At this period, there were three parties — the Premiers' Planners, the Official Party and the Langites. Richards, Opposition Leader, and A. V. Thompson, new M.H.R. for Hindmarsh, are among many politicians still in Parliament who were expelled in 1931.

The fact that the L.C.L. is still in power in S.A. cannot alone be explained by gerrymandering of electorates, though this is a factor. More is it to be explained by A.L.P. weakness—especially weakness of the parliamentary party.

Right wing A.L.P. leaders often state that Playford has done a good job for the State; Richards himself said in Parliament recently: "This is one of the few times I do not see eye to eye with the Premier." For some reason, the A.L.P. politicians seem to think they will defeat Playford by time after time "accusing" him of — carrying out A.L.P. policy!

To maintain their position, right wing majorities are needed to stifle the mass movement, even the demands of genuine A.L.P. members for a fighting A.L.P. policy. This they had at the Convention. The A.L.P. membership is given by the Secretary as 49,000 — but of these, the vast majority are members of affiliated unions. There has been a falling off in Local Committee membership; yet at the Convention the Local Committees, etc., had more delegates than the Unions. The balance sheet shows that unions paid £2,312 in sustentation fees, Local Committees but £124. With hand-picked Local Committees, plus some right wing Union delegations, it was quite a safe Convention;

in fact, the most surprising feature was the strength displayed by the left wing.

There were several major features of the Convention, which illustrated the right wing domination and its policy trends, and the left wing strength.

First was the "Fighting" Policy for the State Elections. Not a mention of hours and wages — excuse by Richards on the 40 hours that we might have the 40-hour week by then and we must be prepared to advance the 36-hour demand! The whole fighting platform, while containing some good features, does no more than illustrate most effectively the bourgeois-liberal character of the A.L.P. In fact, it will probably not differ much from L.C.C. policy.

A passing reference was made to the most vital question of the day — a resolution was carried "supporting" the unions' demands for higher wages and shorter hours. This shows very clearly the difference between a reformist and a revolutionary party. The Communist Party has been giving leadership to the struggle, its leadership in the Victorian transport strike made the first big break through, will benefit all workers. The A.L.P. carries a vote of "support"!

Bardolph, Past President, did give lip-service to the workers' demands — but no plans for winning these demands were laid; in fact, the only real decisions made on industrial matters were those which will weaken the industrial movement if the right wing A.L.P. leadership has its way.

One was the decision on the bogus Chemical Workers. Declared bogus by unanimous vote of the T.L.C., this scab body was affiliated to the A.L.P. When the affiliation was made, the A.L.P. Executive was notified of the union movement's attitude. Strong moves were made at Convention to have the affiliation cancelled, with the support of almost all the union delegates. It was defeated by a small margin, Convention deciding to wait on the decision of the litigation in the Arbitration Court. In the meantime, the affiliation stands.

Another, and perhaps more far-reaching decision, was that to set up "A.L.P. Industrial Groups" on N.S.W. pattern. It is significant that J. J. Graves, M.L.C., was in Adelaide while he should have been at the Legislative Council to vote on the Coal Bill. These groups were formed, not to fight for the workers' demands, nor even to propagandise A.L.P. policy, but, it was freely stated, to "combat" the Communist Party. It is certain that the right wing will use these groups as in N.S.W., to attempt disruption and promote faction fighting in the union movement.

They were rebuffed in their efforts to gain union support for their "anti-Communist Manifesto" early this year, but vigilance will be needed to see that these plotters do not weaken the union movement when its strength is most needed.

Another move was the alteration of rules to prevent the continued affiliation of the Socialist

League. This was carried only by 102 votes to 97. It can scarcely be said that the Socialist League is a body with any mass influence, though it counts a number of sincere and honest people in its ranks. Two reasons influenced the decision — a precautionary move to make more difficult any possible future move for A.C.P. affiliation, and the well-known right wing and particularly C.A. hatred of the very term Socialism.

The ballots for Executive positions were interesting, though almost wholly right wing successes. F. J. Walsh, A.L.P. Federal President, was elected Junior Vice-President, but defeated as a Federal Conference delegate. This can be attributed to his close link with the union movement. Though by no means a left or militant, he has refused to be tied up with the extreme right wing.

The Executive, except for Walsh, is even more an extreme right wing body. One of the members is J. J. O'Grady, industrial officer of a big business concern — that very Vetric Co. mentioned earlier.

There is much disgust in the union movement and among progressive A.L.P. members at the convention and its results. One union delegate, an old militant, former A.W.U. organiser in that union's good period, said he had been to 19 Conventions, had seen all the struggles between the political and industrial wings, including the Premier's Plan split. But he was of the opinion that another, a bigger, split would develop soon as a result of the present miling clique's policy and its divergence from the union movement.

Undoubtedly, the struggle between right and left in the whole labor movement will grow sharper as the conflict between labor and capital sharpens and reaches new levels. For the struggle against the right wing is part of the struggle between labor and capital. Nowhere is this more clearly seen than in S.A. where the right wing is more open in its class collaboration than in most places, less skilled in its manoeuvring and demagoguery.

Great responsibility rests upon our Party. Already S.A. is the third most important heavy industrial State; the creation of new industry creates a dialectic and a qualitatively new working class. The turning — capitalist dreams of "lower incidence of strikes," etc., into a horrible capitalist nightmare of developing class struggle.

Our Party grows strong in struggle. We must speed this growth by special attention — indeed almost a new turn — to development of factory organisation, to strengthening militant forces in the trade union movement.

Linked with this is the development of the united front; the capacity to work with honest reformists, both officials and rank and file who abhor class collaboration; unity with the labor membership, and continued struggle against the theory of reformism, the "ideology of the bourgeoisie within the labor movement."

DECLARATION OF THE FIFTH CONGRESS OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF JAPAN

THE principal objective of the Communist Party of Japan is to accomplish the bourgeois-democratic revolution now in progress in a peaceful, democratic way. Therefore, our Party does not maintain that the capitalist structure as a whole should be abolished immediately in order to realise socialism. The following are the aims that we, the Japanese Communists, want to realise.

(1) Abolition of the Tenno system as a feudalistic-despotic-military-police political structure.

As for the Imperial family, the question of its continuance should be decided by referendum after the establishment of a Popular Republican Government. However, the war responsibility of the present emperor should be prosecuted. Furthermore, the Party asserts that the war criminals and those guilty of violation of human rights should be ousted from important posts they occupy in society in economic and political circles.

(2) Establishment of democratic institutions which should take the place of the Tenno system, based upon the sovereignty of the people, and establishment of a Popular Republican Government on the basis of the one-chamber system; ousting of reactionary officials from central as well as local administrative structures and the institution of a system in which all Diet members, Government representatives, and members of local committees who have the right to exercise power, should be elected by the people, while those elected should have the duty of reporting their actions to the voters, whereby the people are in a position to keep a strict watch over their exercise of power so that, should they neglect the duty of reporting or act dishonestly or wrongfully, they may be replaced by newly elected members.

(3) Reduction of land rents and the prohibition of the taking away of lands by landowners and establishment of the right of cultivation; and confiscation and distribution among peasants by a democratic government of the lands owned by the emperor, temples, shrines, peers and idle landowners; confiscation of the lands owned by huge landowners without compensation and compulsory purchase of the lands owned by small landowners. As for the question whether a landowner is a huge or a small one, a peasants committee will take the local situations and the character of the landowner into consideration, and the Popular Government will finally decide the matter.

We propose to confiscate idle fields and woods without compensation and to bring them under cultivation at State expense by the use of machinery and to increase arable lands through adjustment of arable lands and irrigation system, and through reclamation of marshes, and to start up

land and dry-land farming at State expense and thus distribute newly cleared lands to peasants and to increase their own lands. We also advocate the mechanisation of agriculture at State expense, establishment of state-operated model farms, and co-operative cultivation. We are opposed to overburdensome taxation imposed upon peasants. In this way, the livelihood of peasants will be stabilised as well as quickly improved.

(4) Nationalisation of the property of the war criminals and dissolution of finance capital. Intensification of control of big capital by the Popular Government, and management of industries through establishment of "managing councils" in which the workers participate. Unification of banking institutions and their management by the Popular Government. Liberation of medium and small industrialists from monopoly capital and bureaucratic interference, and guarantee of their freedom of enterprise. Utilisation of managing councils and improvement of their efficiency. Co-ordination of the whole production system and maintenance of balance in production. Prevention of panics in production through increased purchasing power and improved living conditions of the masses.

(5) Unification of banking institutions and their management by the Popular Republican Government, and freeing of funds of landowners and capitalists in order to prevent their wasteful expenditure and cornering of goods for dealing in black markets, thereby to eradicate the cause of inflation and stabilise the price system. Utilisation of state income derived from property and war profit taxation for the recovery of war-damaged industrial communications, social institutions and for the rebuilding of houses and for the relief of the unemployed, war-sufferers, demobilised servicemen, and repatriates. The present corrupt, bureaucratic government is not in a position to increase the ration of foodstuffs and daily necessities and to uncover concealed goods. Therefore, the people's councils based on the combinations of trade unions, peasants' unions, citizens' foodstuff control committees, must undertake the task of co-ordinating the rationing system. When this system has attained a nation-wide development and a democratic Popular Government has been established, then this government will further the development of people's councils and will absorb them into the administrative structures of the government.

(6) Institution of the minimum wage for the workers. The amount of the minimum wage must be enough for the stabilisation of the people's livelihood. Same wages for the same work. A seven-hour day (with the maximum of one hour overtime). Protection of working women and

minors. Institution of a complete factory law. Institution of social insurances, including unemployment and endowment insurance. Management of the rations of foodstuffs and daily necessities by the trade unions. Intensification of the system of managing councils. Establishment of the right of the worker by the Constitution and the Labor Law.

(7) Liberation of women from feudalistic subordination. Establishment of equal rights for men and women. Reformation of the neighbourhood association which imposes heavy burdens upon women. Institution of scholarship and opportunities for higher education for young men and boys. Democratic education for young men and abolition of feudalistic interference with them.

What we have in view after the accomplishment of a bourgeois democratic revolution, is to make the capitalist system develop into a higher social organisation, or into a Socialist structure in which there no longer exists the exploitation of man by man, in a peaceful, democratic way, with the approval and support of the majority of the people. We are convinced that this is the natural and necessary course of social development.

In realising this form of society, we, Japanese Communists, will neither use violence, nor adopt

dictatorship, but will make use of the peaceful way of education, and attain our objective by a democratic Popular Republican Government which is best fitted for the realities of our social development.

Our Party has never maintained the abolition of private property. The abolition of private property is impossible in any form of society. Since the end of primitive communism, private property has undergone changes varying in form and nature with the ages. Private property exists in a Socialist society in a form adapted for the society.

It was the scheme of the intriguing Tenno Government that spread an unwarranted rumour that the advocacy of the abolition of private property was in the supreme programme of our Party. This government also framed the Peace Preservation Law. We hope that the people will not be deceived by this scheme intended to separate them from our Party. Our ultimate aim is to abolish private ownership of lands and capital owned by idle landowners and capitalists and to do away with the exploitation system through their conversion into common ownership. We are also convinced that in this way alone the livelihood of the people will be stabilised, enriched, and constantly improved through increased means of production and abundant supply of goods for their consumption.

AMERICAN LABOR HISTORY AND THE CALL FOR A THIRD PARTY

V. BOURKE

THE furor created by Henry Wallace's speech to a C.I.O. meeting in U.S.A. has been followed by a strengthening of the demand for a "third Party" to challenge the power and policy of both the Republican and Democratic parties.

Why is it that no mass working-class party has yet appeared on the American scene? What are the prospects for such a break with political dependence of the working class on the big capitalists and their parties? The answers to these questions are found in this history of the American labor movement.

America struck out for nationhood with the War of Independence of 1776. This blow by the new American bourgeoisie against the imperial autocracy of Britain sounded the tocsin for the French bourgeoisie to smash feudalism in the great French Revolution of 1789.

The American bourgeois revolution did not lead to the appearance of a revolutionary working class movement as in England (the Levellers), and in France (Babeuf). But where there is a bourgeoisie there is an exploited proletariat, and working class organisation and struggle is inevitable. The first trade union, of Shoemakers, appeared in 1792. By 1827 organisation was strong enough in Philadelphia to stage a general strike for a ten hour day.

In 1829 a Working Men's Party was formed both in Philadelphia and New York.

Up to 1850 the working class was distinguished by great fluctuation, and did not have a constant composition due to the continuous renewal of the frontier, and the opening up of new lands. This meant a constant renewal of classes by successive sectional development which prevented the combination of the workers as a conscious and independent class. Workers in the older regions might begin to develop a class programme and ideology, but their development was retarded, distorted and upset by the emergence of workers in the newer regions influenced by and subservient to petty-bourgeois ideology.

The agrarian class was much larger and grew more rapidly than the working class, hence the latter was considerably influenced by petty-bourgeois agrarian movements—Agrarian Radicalism.

In this lies a feature of the development of the Labor Movement peculiar to America: explaining its failure to throw up a strong centralised trade union movement and an independent working-class party despite the rapid growth of capitalism.

Agrarian radicalism in America during the nineteenth century expressed itself in the philosophy of Thomas Jefferson—in Henry George's Single Tax

schemes—the Bryan "free coinage of silver plan" and the "Greenback Party," which later received sufficient support from workers for its financial reform programme to be renamed the "Greenback Labor Party."

In order that American capitalism could fully develop industry the bourgeoisie was forced to destroy the political power of the Southern landholding slaveowners. This completion of the tasks of the bourgeois revolution that commenced with the War of Independence was achieved in the American Civil War of 1861-65.

The Civil War was conducted under the leadership of the radical bourgeoisie under pressure from the working class and farmers. This historically progressive war, waged by the North under Lincoln, was supported by Marx and Engels, and the First International.

The workers played an important part in the war. Following the defeats of 1862 under General McClellan, the Northern armies were fleeing in disorder. Workers' and farmers' protest meetings throughout the North forced a change in the indecisive policy of Lincoln to waging of the war in a revolutionary manner. The workers forced a purge of counter-revolutionary elements and proceeded to organise Workers' Regiments (Printers—Building Workers, etc.) and immigrant regiments according to nationality.

The workers selected their own commanders among whom were a number of Socialists, e.g. Weidmeyer (a friend of Marx); Willich, a member of C.C. Communist League; and Seigal, a German Socialist. The workers' regiments under General Grant waged the decisive battles, and won major victories on all fronts.

The defeat of the South in the Civil War cleared the decks for industrial capitalism, strengthening it in relation to commercial and landed capital and the petty-bourgeoisie, and opening the way for the development of America as a powerful industrial power.

In this period the workers took advantage of the labor shortage to demand higher wage rates. In turn the higher cost of labor power stimulated mechanisation. The free lands making it possible for a worker to become a farmer facilitated the struggle for higher wages.

"In the peculiarity of the United States which consists in the presence of unoccupied free lands is explained the exceedingly broad and rapid development of capitalism in America." (Lenin.)

The stormy development of American capitalism was paralleled by a flourishing of the Labor movements and militant class struggle. In 1869 the Knights of Labor commenced as a secret society. The Knights of Labor admitted all workers, including Negroes, but declared for—"No conflict with legitimate enterprise, no antagonism to necessary capital." Its membership grew rapidly from 28,000 in 1880 to its peak of 703,000 in 1886, but its leadership failed the workers in the great struggles

for the eight hour day in that year, and within two years its membership fell to 260,000.

During this period strife and dissension among the reformist leaders of the Knights of Labor led to the emergence of the American Federation of Labor under the leadership of Samuel Gompers, who strongly influenced the American Trade Union movement, directing it along lines which rejected political independence for the working class, on the contrary practising class collaboration, winning concessions for the organised skilled workers at the expense of the mass of unskilled workers.

This period saw the formation of the Socialist Labor Party. Following the dissolution of the First International at Philadelphia in 1872, Socialist groups which split off from the American section of the International formed the Working Men's Party of the United States. In 1877 its second convention renamed it the Socialist Labor Party of America, and two years later, it claimed 10,000 members. Its leading figure was Daniel DeLeon, a Syndicalist who was opposed to the reformism of both the Knights of Labor, and American Federation of Labor. DeLeon advocated "dual-unionism." In 1895 the Socialist Labor Party established the Socialist Trades and Labor Alliance, consisting of a few left wing trade unions.

This theory of "dual-unionism," a belief that the old unions were static and unchangeable, and it was therefore necessary to establish new pure "socialist" unions, became a disease in the American Labor Movement, maintaining divisions and leaving the field to the reformists headed by Gompers, and isolating the revolutionaries from the mass of organised workers, shutting them off into sects. As Anthony Gimba says: "...loudly chanting their principles, diligently guarding their revolutionary innocence and integrity, but hopeless, helpless and without any influence on the masses."

Despite the political weaknesses of its leadership, this period saw the working class engaged in great mass movements and sharp class battles, the great strikes of 1877 assuming the character of a mass insurrection. 1886 witnessed great struggles for the eight hour day from which May 1st has ever since been celebrated as the international day of labor. The great Pullman railroad strike of 1894 became known as "Debs' Rebellion" after Eugene Debs, leader of the railroad brotherhoods.

These struggles demonstrated the violence and ruthlessness of so-called capitalist democracy in its suppression of the workers' movement. An example is that of the Chicago Anarchists who, unlike the European Anarchists, were not concerned with arming small groups and liquidating individuals, but advocated the necessity for the violent overthrow of capitalism by the working class as a whole. The Chicago Anarchists organised a mass movement leading 80,000 in a general strike on May 1st, 1886. Following this, at a peaceable demonstration in Haymarket Square, the police launched an attack on the workers in which a provocateur killed a

policeman. Ten Anarchists were charged with the murder and given a farcical trial. Seven of them were condemned to death, and one to fifteen years' imprisonment. Some of them begged a pardon, and their sentences were commuted, but Parsons, Spies, Fischer, and Engel refused to beg mercy and on November 11th, 1887, all four were hanged. These working class heroes defied capitalism to their last breath. From the scaffold Fischer declared: "This is the happiest moment of my life," while Spies said: "The time will come when our silence in the grave will be more eloquent than our speeches."

Debs' railroad strike was broken in battles with Federal troops. This struggle witnessed the use for the first time of the Sherman Anti-Trust Act of 1890, which "forbade combinations in restraint of trade," to legally hamstring and shackle the unions.

Despite the militancy and heroism of the workers in these great struggles, unionism was unequal to its tasks. It was isolated from the mass of unskilled and semi-skilled trades, which embraced large masses of immigrant workers of all nationalities, being limited almost wholly to sheltered trades and comprising mainly American-born workers. And there was no independent Working Class Party or ideas.

Frederick Engels had noted this weakness of the American Labor Movement and understood the reasons for it—the absence of any nationwide democratic tasks facing the proletariat as in Europe, the complete subjection of the proletariat to bourgeois politics and the sectarian isolation of the Socialists from the working class. In a letter to American Socialists in 1886 he wrote—"The first great step of importance for every country newly entering into the movement is always the organisation of the workers as an independent political party, no matter how, so long as it is a distinct workers' party." . . . "No matter in what form so long as it is their own movement in which they are driven further by their own mistakes and learn wisdom by hurting themselves" . . . "the great thing is to get the working class to move as a class" and ". . . in anything that might delay or prevent that national consolidation of the working men's party—no matter what platform—I should consider a great mistake." (Marx-Engels correspondence.)

But whereas the Australian working class made the break in 1895 and formed its "distinct workers' Party," the Labor Party, although on a bourgeois liberal platform, the American Labor Movement was not destined to be as fortunate, for it continued to be dominated by the rank opportunism of Gompers, which opposed the formation of a workers' Party, and the secretarism of the anarcho-syndicalists, DeLeon and Debs. The American workers failed to establish an independent working-class party, and continued to tail behind the two bourgeois parties—the Republicans and Democrats.

In 1898, following differences in the Socialist Labor Party over working in conservative trade unions, the majority broke away and in 1901 formed

the Socialist Party of the United States, Eugene Debs becoming its leader. Debs, whose leadership of the railroad unions had taught him the value of working in the established trade unions, differed with the sectarian "dual-union" policy of DeLeon, but he was a syndicalist and denied the need for a political party of the working class. By 1914 the Socialist Party had 118,000 members, but it was dominated by petty-bourgeois intellectuals who condemned it to a policy of sectarianism and opportunism.

By 1900 class relations in America had altered. There was no longer any frontier, with its renewal of classes and instability of class relations. America had entered the stage of monopoly-finance-capital. Agrarian radicalism was dead, and now the working class and capitalist class were face to face as antagonistic and hostile classes. The drive for monopoly super-profits led to intense exploitation, and the class battles, particularly during the 1914-18 war, but only a minority of the workers were organised, and there was no revolutionary party to lead their struggles.

Tired of the class collaboration policy of the Gompers A.F. of L. leadership, the militant trade union leaders convened a conference of unions in 1905 from which was formed the Industrial Workers of the World. Its leading figures were DeLeon, Debs, and Bill Haywood, the famous Miners' leader.

The I.W.W. was anarcho-syndicalist, i.e., it denied the necessity for a workers' State, and considered the trade unions would be the organs of administration under Socialism. In 1908 DeLeon led a faction split and there were two I.W.W.'s, the Detroit and Chicago. However, the I.W.W. played a militant role in organising the unskilled workers—it exposed the reformists and fought against the 1914-18 imperialist war. In 1917 its membership reached the peak of 130,000.

After the U.S.A. entered the war in 1917 the I.W.W. was savagely attacked. It was declared illegal and one hundred of its leaders gaoled. Its leader, Haywood, attending a conference of Red Unions in Moscow, was sentenced to twenty years in his absence. He was directed by the American workers to remain in the Soviet Union. This outstanding American working class leader died in 1928, and was buried alongside John Reed under the Kremlin wall. The I.W.W. was unable to withstand the attacks of the ruling class, its membership dwindled and following the war its leadership degenerated into a small anti-Soviet clique.

W. Z. Foster, who broke with Syndicalism, attributed its influence in America to three main reasons. First, the favourable economic conditions, free land, higher wages, the development of a large labor aristocracy and a corrupt trade union bureaucracy, the passage of many workers into the ranks of the petty-bourgeoisie and even the bourgeoisie in the period of industrial expansion. All these factors created strong petty-bourgeois illusions, blurred

class lines and stifled class struggle. Secondly, the democratic rights accorded by the bourgeois revolution no longer provided cause for acute political struggle, hence the working class did not see the necessity for political struggle or a mass political party. The principal demands of the working class were economic, hence the main struggles were economic, predisposing the working class to Syndicalism. Thirdly, the decentralisation of American Government (48 States) scattered the political effort of the working class, while the presence of masses of disfranchised immigrants, and the heterogeneous character of the working class (national, religious, tradition) made class solidarity difficult, and in addition the petty-bourgeois control and reformist policy of the Socialist Party drove militant workers to Syndicalism.

In 1918 saw the first successful attempt to organise the workers in the mass production industries. Under the leadership of William Z. Foster the meat packing workers were organised as a result of a strike for higher wages and shorter hours, but two years later the organisation was smashed by Gompers and the A.F. of L. leaders.

Foster next attempted to organise the steel industry. In 1919, 365,000 steel workers in ten States struck. Twenty-two workers were killed and thousands bashed and arrested by the Company thugs, and State Police. The strike ended the twelve hour day, but the attempt to unionise the industry failed. This would not be achieved until 1936 by the C.I.O.

The early twentieth century gave further examples of the brutality of American capitalism. In 1910 the MacNamara brothers were framed and charged with dynamiting a newspaper office during a strike. They languished in prison for over thirty years. In 1916 Tom Mooney and Billings were framed with a bomb outrage. Despite proof of the frame-up Mooney was only released in January 1929. This working-class hero died in 1942. In 1920 Sacco and Vanzetti were framed, and in 1927, when the Labor Movement was too weakened by opportunism to resist, they were burned to death in the electric chair despite protests from all over the world.

The stormy post-war years saw the birth of the Communist party, which marked an historic break with the isolation of the American labor movement from scientific socialist theory and practice. Internal struggles between left wing elements in the Socialist Party resulted in 1919 in two groups splitting off, and forming the Communist Party and the Communist Labor Party. These Communist groups were immediately attacked, and declared illegal by the Government, and hundreds were arrested. However, a legal form was maintained in the "Workers' Party."

The strong influence of Syndicalism was seen in the first Communist programme which, while declaring for parliamentary activity, also declared support for "dual-unionism."

Refusal of recognition by the Communist International resulted in the two Communist groups uniting in 1921, and forming the Communist Party of America. The programme of the united Party reflected the teachings of Lenin in *Left Wing Communism*, by declaring against "dual-unionism."

The Communist Party immediately launched a campaign to organise all workers into the trade unions, particularly in the mass production industries. It also called for the formation of a third Party—a workers' Labor Party.

In 1922 a Conference for Progressive Political Action was convened consisting of Rail and Clothing Unions, Socialist Party, Workers' Party (C.P.) and Farmer-Labor Party of Minnesota. The Conference declared for the establishment of a Labor Party, but the move was sabotaged by Gompers and collapsed.

The temporary stabilisation of capitalism with its post-war boom swept the American Labor Movement with illusions about capitalism. There were cries for "Union-Management Co-operation," Ford's "profit sharing" and "Labor banking" schemes. Abe Cahan repudiated Marx and all references to class struggle were struck out of the Socialist Party application forms.

The ballyhoo about "prosperity" and "class peace" covered vicious exploitation. From 1923 to 1929 industrial output increased 29% per worker, while profits rose 200% and 300%, but average real wages increased not more than 41%, and most wage increases only went to the skilled workers.

For the first time in a period of boom the trade unions failed to grow, they actually lost members. The A.F. of L. lost about one third of its members, and in 1927 there were only about three million workers organised of a total industrial labor force of 28 millions.

While the reformist union bureaucrats urged "class peace," the capitalists waged war on unionism by means of "welfare" clubs and company unionism. The hitherto relatively strong craft unions were further undermined by the rationalisation of industry, and technical developments abolishing the skilled trades. Meantime the left wing struggled to maintain militant unionism. In 1922, under the leadership of W. Z. Foster, the Trade Union Educational League was established, and became the American section of the Red International of Labor Unions. In 1929 the name was changed to Trade Union Unity League. The Trade Union Educational League conducted a vigorous drive to unionise the unskilled workers in the face of A.F. of L. opposition, which even used gunmen to attack and intimidate militant workers and leaders.

In 1928 a faction fight which existed in the Communist Party from its inception came to a head with the expulsion of the right wing leadership headed by Lovestons. The Lovestons were infected with the ideology of American "New Capitalism," and "eternal prosperity." They declared the 6th Communist International Congress resolution

Concretely, this divorce of consciousness from the life and activity of the individual has the following result: the consciousness of the individual excludes experience of whatever is of actual significance to him and can serve as a motive for his behaviour. The entire inner plane of man's life is reduced to an aggregate of "concepts" or "ideas," which deploy, in accordance with associative or some other such ties. All that is retained in psychology is the problem of the "mechanisms," supposed to be instrumental in effectuating the succession of "concepts" or "ideas" which takes place against this ideal background. The question of motives, of motivation forces, of men's real needs and interests, is dropped from psychology, as in the classical, intellectualistic psychology of the nineteenth century. Man's consciousness is reduced to an abstract contemplation indifferent to the vicissitudes of life, a mere hypostatized function of "pure" consciousness. As James pittoresquely describes it:

... the spiritual principle attenuates itself to a thoroughly ghostly condition, being only a name for the fact that the "content" of experience is known ... (and he continues): I believe that consciousness, when once it has evaporated to this estate of pure diaphaneity, is on the point of disappearing altogether. It is the name of nonentity, and has no right to a place among first principles. Those who still cling to it are clinging to a mere echo, the faint rumor left behind by the disappearing "soul" upon the air of philosophy ...

Thus the isolation of consciousness from the real life of the individual results in the liquidation of consciousness, clearing the way for the mechanism of the behaviourists, which negates consciousness altogether. The theoretical activity of the concrete subject elicited by human needs is transformed into an autonomous ideal agent (as we see in Hegel). On the other hand, as in the case of old and new variations of Platonism, the content of thought assumes the aspect of "ideal being," as opposed to subjective consciousness. As a result the objective content of knowledge loses its vitality and effectiveness, while the consciousness of the real, concrete individual becomes a purely subjective, immaterial experience.

Something similar occurs when the objective social content is detached from the motives of human behaviour. In idealist ethics — with especial clarity in Kantian ethics wherein that which should be is counterposed to what is, where duty is counterposed to impulse — the content of the socially important factor in the human will appears alienated from the concrete individual and becomes transformed into a transcendental subject or an ideal imperative which is counterposed to every real impulse of the individual. As a result, what remains within the sphere of concrete motivation is merely narrow personal elementary sensual impulses and organic needs. Paradoxical as it may seem at first glance, it must be admitted

nevertheless that the crudely naturalistic position of the psychological school, which in the beginning of the twentieth century set out to investigate the dynamic aspect of the psyche and the motives of behaviour, and reduced them to elementary sensual impulses and organic needs (Freud), was nothing but the reverse side of the Platonist or Kantian theory of the transcendental Ought.

This is why the imperative, the moral, the socially significant — which is counterposed extremely to the individual's consciousness — has dropped out from the sphere of psychology and psychological research. The alienation of the basic social content of human consciousness has produced the inevitable result that everything of living significance, and all the motives of behaviour and its dynamic tendencies, were submerged in the obscure depths of the instincts, the irrational, the subconscious (Bergson, Freud).

Thus the isolation of consciousness from the concrete activities of the individual resulted in the distortion of consciousness, in theoretical sterility representing a more or less indirect reflection of the actual sterility of life in a society based on private property and exploitation. The interests of the ruling classes of such a society foster and fortify the subjectivism and one-sidedness of the idealist conception whose gnosological roots were expounded by Lenin in his *Materialism and Empirio-criticism*.

The first task of present-day Soviet philosophy and psychology is to further the development of the new theory of consciousness on the basis of Lenin's theory of reflection. The development of this theory is in a considerable measure interwoven with investigations in the physiology of higher or nervous activity (in the tradition of Pavlov and Sechenov), and the Soviet theory of language, which sheds light on the forms of consciousness in the historical development of language.

"Consciousness," said Marx, "can never be anything but consciousness of being." It is not the perception of the objective world which returns independently of it; but when consciousness senses, conception, etc., and to these conceptions rivative. That is something secondary and de-

only in an indirect way, as a reflection, through manifests his relation to others and to himself. Our own experiences, no matter how direct their impact, become known in consciousness only indirectly, through their relation to the object. Thus the inner world, by an experience is not confined to related with the external, material world which is its basis and source. The material content of consciousness, contrary to Hegel, is never in reality eliminated from self-consciousness. This posture in Marx's early criticisms of the Hegelian concept and in the structure of Marxian dialectics and the

Marxian theory of cognition. It retains its force today, especially for psychological theory. As in the matter of investigating the psychology of others so in the case of self-consciousness, the immediate data are inseparable from the material content. Thus data furnished by introspection require interpretation; they may be checked and verified or may be discredited in the light of the objective conditions which gave rise to them.

Consciousness, in essence, is not the narrow personal possession of the individual, locked up within his own inner world; it is a social formation. It arises and develops on the basis of human activity within the sphere of social labor and is indissolubly bound up with the development of speech and language. Marx's formula concerning consciousness and language implies that the practical form of consciousness which is real for others and therefore real for myself, expresses not only the common origin of consciousness and language, but also their common structure. Man's consciousness is cloaked in words; it is conditioned by social relations and serves a cognitive purpose.

Man's concrete consciousness is not merely theoretical, but primarily practical, inextricably connected with the conscious practical activity by which man transforms the world. "Man's consciousness," says Lenin, "not only reflects the objective world, it also creates the objective world. As the reflection of being, consciousness also represents man's practical relation to being. Thus man's consciousness includes not only the knowledge, but also the experience, of the world as significant to him, as answering his needs and interests. This explains the dynamic tendencies and forces with the human psyche, the active function and selectivity which makes of consciousness not a mere passive reflection but an attitude, not merely a perception but an evaluation, an affirmation or negation, an impulse or rejection. Real consciousness has no resemblance to the empty abstraction of "pure" consciousness as conceived by the idealists, for it embraces the motives of man's practical and theoretical activity.

Within the consciousness of the individual the objective content of knowledge and social morality lives in all the fullness of the concrete individual life, inseparably bound up with real motives and impulses. Knowledge, the content of social consciousness, ceases to be detached and formal; the consciousness of the individual is no longer a purely subjective formation. The penetration of this objective content into individual consciousness does not subjectivise or "psychologize" it. There is consequently no justification for the false antithesis between psychology and anti-psychologism which corroded the idealist philosophical and psychological theories of the beginning of the twentieth century.

Stating that man's consciousness can be nothing but consciousness of being, Marx continues: "man's activity is the rich process of his life." Every experience, each phenomenon of

consciousness represents data of being, which are the object of consciousness, and bears testimony about the subject himself. Consciousness reflects the being of the object and expresses the life of the subject in his relation to the object. To be genuinely understood, the evidence of consciousness, the "immediate data" of experience, require the same sort of interpretation as the text of a speech. In order to understand a speech — not merely as a subject of grammatical exercise but as a factor of life in its essence — in order to understand the speaker, not merely the formal text of his speech, it is necessary to go beyond the text, it is necessary to decipher his "subtext" and to bring out not only what the individual formally said, but also what he wished and intended to say. In other words, it is necessary to bring to light the motive and purpose which underlie the speech's inner content. In the same way, we discover the meaning of man's experience, the phenomena of his consciousness.

This, incidentally, is the way a practical psychologist, like an actor or stage manager, would act in the performance of his professional duties. Taking as his basic material the part of an actor in which the hero expresses his thoughts and feelings, the stage manager makes him a "subtext," as Stanislavsky did. In the "subtext" the psychology of the dramatic character is revealed by the thoughts and feelings expressed by the character in relation to his concrete situation.

Present-day psycho-physiological research discovers a psychological content in every allegedly arbitrary movement of the individual. It shows how the sensory signals which are constantly moving from the periphery to the centre, indicating the position of the motor organ in relation to the aim of the given movement and correcting the motor impulses, regulate the motor process along its entire course. A movement as a whole represents a sensori-motor unity which, even in the simplest responses, cannot be divided into two separate parts, one an exclusively sensory process, and the other an exclusively motor process. Their dependence is reciprocal.

Psycho-physiological research shows that motor tasks, which differ in psychological content, involve actually different neurological motor mechanism as well. Thus the psychological and physiological data are included in a unified psycho-physical context. We thus eliminate the dualistic conceptions according to which those movements are purely physical, while the psychological factors are treated as external forces in relation to those movements. In reality, however, the sensory, psychic components become an integral part of the motor process and regulate its course from within in accordance with the objective external conditions.

Every human performance has psychological content. Every so-called arbitrary action of the individual proceeds from given impulses and is directed towards the accomplishment of a more or less completely and adequately conscious objective.

January, 1947

tive. Yet no matter how essential the objective, a conscious realisation of the purpose alone is not enough. To accomplish a given objective it is necessary to take into consideration the conditions under which the action is to take place. The interrelation of the objective and the conditions determines the problem which is to be solved through action. Man's conscious action represents a more or less conscious solution of a problem. But in order that an action be effected properly, he must also accept it. And for this purpose it is necessary that the problem should find a response and a source in the subject's experience, directly or indirectly, either through its results or through some phase of it.

The experience of something that is of importance to the individual becomes a stimulus for action, a motive. A motive includes the attitude of the individual to his problem—to the objective, and to the circumstances in which the problem presents itself, and the action is initiated. This attitude gives form to the psychological content of action. A human action is not merely an external fact which is to be correlated externally with the individual's experience and consciousness. In reality, every human action, every deed constitutes a unity of the external and the internal. Since every deed is an act of the subject, which expresses his attitude to reality, and is an instrument for dealing with reality, it already includes, as a component, a psychological content; a tension, an emotion, a cognitive element; it is an intuitively presented and palpably given psycho-physical unity.

For Soviet psychology, which eliminates the idealist isolation of consciousness, investigation of the psyche is a study of man's consciousness in action. Soviet psychology today carries on its investigations of psychic processes such as perception, memory, thinking, by investigating man's theoretical, his concrete activity both practical and motives and objectives underlying action; thus breaking with the treatment of traditional functional psychology.

The focal theory of personality has found itself in a blind alley and has become the most stagnant and reactionary part of traditional psychology because, in harmony with the philosophical postulates upon which this psychology is based, the concept of the individual has lost its relation to the individual's activity. Everything in the theory of aptitudes or of characterology, has come to a dead stop before the allegedly immutable biological and spiritual attributes (arising no one knows how) of the individual, on the one hand, and the external environment on the other.

All the endless and futile argumentation going on in present-day psychological literature (particularly in America) about the variability or constancy of abilities and whether they are deter-

mined by heredity or environment, is merely the outcome of the basically faulty philosophical positions in present day literature.

"Philosophers," remarked Hertzzen in his *Dilettantism in Science*, "have neglected positive activity." It is in this neglect of practical "positive activity" that Hertzzen found the principal defect of the philosophy of Hegel and of German idealism in general. In his *Theses on Feuerbach* Marx, too, pointed to the neglect of human practice, and of human material activity, as the chief shortcoming of all preceding materialist philosophy. And that included Feuerbach's own materialism, an essentially contemplative philosophy. Marx continues, "the materialist doctrine that men are products of circumstances and upbringing and that, therefore, changed men are products of other circumstances and changed upbringing, forgets that circumstances are changed precisely by men. The coincidence of the changing circumstances and of human activity can only be conceived, and rationally understood as revolutionising practice" (*Theses on Feuerbach*, iii).

Central to the theory of Soviet psychology with respect to the ways of development of the individual and the formation of his psychic attributes is the thesis of the interdependence between man's psychic attributes and his activity. In man's activity, in learning and in labor, his psychic traits—his faculties and traits of character—not only manifest themselves but also form themselves on the basis of hereditary traits which condition his development but do not predetermine it.

We constantly observe in life around us how human faculties are formed and cultivated every day, in work or study, on the job. This is attested to by the continuous rise of new talents in scientific and artistic creation from the midst of the working class, from among the broad masses, from the nationalities which had been oppressed in tsarist Russia. These talents were stultified and perished when they were not allowed to come out, they are developing rapidly.

As a result of special, planned research, Soviet psychology has been recently bringing out, Soviet obtained through observation and laboratory experimentation which prove the dependence of faculties upon activity. The thesis which has been formulated by Soviet psychologists concerning human faculties applies also to characterological attributes. Between characterological attributes and human behaviour there exists, not a mere one-sided dependence of behaviour upon character, but a mutual dependence produced by the two-character and motives. An act performed by a man is a concrete fact which reacts upon the man himself. As a result of a given act there may occur a change in the motivation which gave rise to the act; but the motive of behaviour constitutes a potential future trait of character, a trait in its

January, 1947

genesis as it were. An objectively brave deed by a timid man, performed in a given situation under the influence of a motive resulting from that situation, may change that man's attitude to danger and may even become the starting point in the formation of a brave character. To use the words of Aristotle in his *Nicomachean Ethics*: "We become just by doing just things, temperate by doing temperate acts, brave by doing brave acts . . . the virtues we acquire by first having actually practised them . . ."

Characterological traits manifest themselves in

man's actions and are formed in those actions. It is not an accident that in the Soviet Union the formation and transformation of man takes place in the course of socialist construction. Contrary to the Utopian socialists and to the idealist enlighteners, men do not have to fit themselves by special training to acquire special traits corresponding to the demands of a socialist society before they may begin to build socialism. It is only in the process of building socialist society, by including themselves in that process, that men form such traits.



Questions & Answers

conducted by
L.H. GOULD

"What is meant by basic criticism, by criticising the reformist ALP in a basic way? How would you apply basic criticism to the press reports of the 'Left vs. Right' struggles in the NSW Labor Council?"—A.T.

THE yellow press reporting of Labor Council events provides a very useful object lesson in distinguishing the superficial from what is basic and real. What is the aim of the press barons? First, of course, to discredit the Communists and praise their right wing servitors; second, to discredit the Labor Movement as a whole by its pictures of endless brawls and incidents among the trade union delegates. It is quite true that a struggle is proceeding between the militants and reformists (the "Left" and "Right"); and without doubt the disgraceful behaviour of the right wing (such as "diluting a bogus 'union'") does injure the whole Labor Movement. But much more is involved than this.

The Labor Council events are, basically, an expression of the class struggle between the employers (here aided by the right wing) and the workers. The Labor Council represents one sector of the extended battlefield between exploiters and exploited.

By basic criticism, therefore, is meant the disclosure of the underlying reality, the ability to reveal the inner content, the essence, of the class struggle in its various stages, to analyse the main contradictions which divide capitalist society, and to understand the conflict between the old that is dying and the new that is emerging.

Only Marxist-Leninists are capable of basic criticism, because of their mastery of dialectics. In his foreword to *Capital*, Marx writes:

"In its rational form dialectic is a scandal and an abomination to the bourgeoisie and its doctrinaire spokesmen, because, while supply-

ing a positive understanding of the existing state of things, it at the same time furnishes an understanding of the negation of that state of things . . . because (dialectic) lets nothing overrule it, but is in its very nature critical and revolutionary."

To continue: Is the struggle on the NSW Labor Council (also of course on the Melbourne Trades Hall Council) a "quarrel" between the progressives and the right wing splitters? Superficially, yes. But the true significance is the fight between the working class for higher wages, etc., against the combination of employers and the right wing "lieutenants of capital in the army of Labor."

The capitalists and their scribes understand this just as well as we do, but naturally they will not, they dare not, admit the truth. Take the stamping out of the counter-revolutionary Trotskyites in Soviet Russia. The capitalists are fully aware of the fifth-column role of Trotskyism, but they still portray the arch-traitor Trotsky as one who was "persecuted" merely because of "some differences in interpretation of Marxist doctrine!"

Similarly with all the decisive questions — war and peace, economic crises, democratic liberty, culture, national freedom. Capitalists must conceal the truth; Communists examine every label, brush aside every mask.

During the Federal election, several Party members did not criticise, in a basic way, the reformist government and its failures. It was not sufficient to say that Chifley had failed to implement the 40-hour week. Our policy required an explanation for Chifley's shortcomings, namely, that his government is only a liberal capitalist government, one concerned with the defence of capitalist profit-making and not with weakening capitalism to benefit the workers. Further, in presenting our own programme little or nothing

was said by these Comrades about our Socialist objective. In short, they appeared only as "electioneers," but not as what they really are — revolutionary political leaders of the toiling masses.

Every issue requires a basic approach. Here are a few good examples, the first about Lenin during the imperialist World War:

1. Just before the October Revolution, a certain Alexinsky slandered Lenin, alleging that he was a German spy, a traitor to the Revolution, and so on. Lenin replied, first, by pointing to the record and policy of the Bolshevik Party, and his own personal record in the Russian and international Labor Movement. Then Lenin went on to examine Alexinsky's record and activity, his connections with the bourgeoisie, the press facilities so freely given him by the enemies of the people (just like the lengthy SMH columns at the disposal of the Ormondes, Langs, Kennys, Junors and Origlases!), the reasons for Alexinsky's "adoption" by the Russian capitalists, and so forth, thus proving to the Russian workers that slanders against him were intended, basically, to trap them into continued support for the imperialist slaughter!

2. The Fabians. In their recent Jubilee celebrations, these gentlemanly "Socialists" complimented themselves upon all sorts of things they claim to have done in the past 75 years. They did nothing, of course, except in the early years when, as Engels remarked, "they produced amid all sorts of rubbish some good propagandist writings as well." Engels said: "The Fabians are an ambitious group here in London who have understanding enough to realise the inevitability of the social revolution, but who could not possibly entrust this gigantic task to the rough proletariat alone, and are

therefore kind enough to set themselves at the head. Fear of the revolution is their fundamental principle. . . . Hence their fanatical hatred of Marx and all of us, because of the class struggle."

The answer to the Fabians and their childlike pretensions is that their charming, polished, so-very-educated and cultured "Socialism" was possible all these years only because of the wealth that flowed to the British bourgeoisie from their inhuman exploitation of countless millions of colonial slaves as well as from the overworked and undernourished toilers at home. The master class of Britain, which exercised its monopoly control in the world, could afford the luxury of Fabianism which no more threatened the system of exploitation than did the Salvation Army.

3. Basic criticism of atom bomb diplomacy discloses the danger in the scare publicity emitted, perhaps quite sincerely, by various nuclear physicists. The argument that defence against the bomb is "impossible" is extremely harmful in that the imperialists skillfully use the bogey thus created for their own ends.

Finally, basic criticism presupposes a certain effectiveness in its presentation, whether oral or written; for example, the opinions we express cannot always include basic analyses along with the appropriate references and quotations. Nor does basic criticism mean that the details, the secondary or incidental features of any issue are to be ignored. Far from it. Lenin said: "The aggregate of all the aspects of a phenomenon, their actuality and their mutual dependence — that is the source of truth."

(References: All Marxist-Leninist writings provide innumerable splendid examples. Foremost would be Marx, CAPITAL.)



BOOK REVIEW

THE STEEL STRIKE
NORMAN FREEHILL



THE story of the steel strike of 1945 is a story of courage and cowardice, of loyalty and treachery, of provocation and plotting.

Inspiring courage and solidarity of workers fighting a class fight — a fight against victimisation of a fellow worker and in protection of basic union principles.

Shameful cowardice of Labor politicians who give lip service to working class ideals in order to climb into power, and then refuse to face up to the employing class when the latter attack the workers.

Loyalty of union to union, loyalty of unionists to fellow unionists. Loyalty of miners, of seamen to the Ironworkers. Loyalty of all true unionists, of the useful people, of the masses to those who were bearing the brunt of the battle.

Treachery of Red-baiters and right wingers, back-stabbing their fellow-unionists, seizing eagerly the employers' propaganda and using it against the workers.

Provocation by the Courts, plotting by the B.H.P.

All these are contained in the story of Australia's greatest strike since 1917. "The Story Of The Steel Strike Of 1945" is given just that title in an 80-page illustrated booklet just issued by the Illawarra Trades and Labor Council and Newcastle Trades Hall Council. It gives the history of the fight from its beginning, exposing the anti-working class actions of the Courts, the servility of Labor Party heads to the B.H.P. It exposes the ruthlessness, the insolence, the arrogance of Australia's biggest

monopoly, a monopoly built up by gifts of millions of pounds from Federal and State Governments.

These were the beginnings: The A.W.U. (which possesses Australia's most reactionary union bureaucracy) applied for an award covering chemical workers at Newcastle whose pay and conditions the Ironworkers' Federation was seeking to improve. Judge de Baum, who was handling the matter, decided, against warnings, to visit two works, although the A.W.U. had no members engaged in production at either place. The workers stopped work in protest and a Full Bench on September 18 deregistered the Federated Ironworkers' Association.

Next step was the dismissal (September 22) by the B.H.P. of Don Parker, a shop delegate at Port Kembla. The B.H.P. ordered him on to coke ovens lids against union practice. It followed with a series of acts which it was obvious would extend to the future.

It put non-union labor on the ovens, the "black" coke to the blast-furnaces (other coke was available), refused to negotiate with the Illawarra Trades and Labor Council or with the Ironworkers' Union.

On October 15, 15,000 workers in B.H.P. Newcastle industries held a 24 hour stopwork meeting and recommended an extension of the dispute unless settled within 14 days. On October 18, the Port Kembla men asked the Metal Trades Federation to consider extending the dispute to the Newcastle works and offshoots.

Meantime the B.H.P. continued its provocative actions, and on November 3 steel production in N.S.W. had practically ceased.

The ironworkers were given the loyal support of other unions. On December 3, the miners and seamen approved a strike recommendation in support of the ironworkers. The Federal (not N.S.W.) A.R.U. Executive declared its full support, praising the courage and unity of the striking ironworkers, miners and seamen.

Against that picture of class loyalty was the evidence and the treachery of the right wing Laborites and the Red-baiting union leaders. Prime Minister Chifley refused throughout to intervene. McKell, on November 29 said "certain organised elements" were seeking to dictate to Governments. He didn't mean the B.H.P. A.L.P. Secretary Stewart declared that "present strikes were benefiting only the employers."

In general the right wing echoed the propaganda of the daily press.

The steelworkers won through struggle. The Arbitration Court merely put the seal on what they had won. They won because of unity within their ranks, because of the support of the miners and seamen and the solidarity of workers throughout the Commonwealth.

The ironworkers' strike was against victimisation; in protection of trade union principles. It was, to that extent, a defensive struggle. But the organisation of the strike may well be a blueprint for future struggles, for it contains invaluable lessons of organisation, of mass participation in the detail of the struggle, of planned effort to maintain the morale of the strikers and their families.

Within a short time of the dispute 21 Area Committees were set up in the N.S.W. South Coast towns. These Committees organised fishing, rabbiting and wood-collecting parties. Staple food-stuffs — potatoes, other vegetables, eggs, fruit — were collected or purchased as crops. Distribution was organised.

Morale was maintained by regular distribution of strike news, organisation of concerts, dances, toy-making (5,000 children received toys), and all manner of money-raising efforts. Actors' Equity gave great help. Individuals showed unexpected talent. The sick were cared for. A dentist, a hairdresser, an artist gave services.

Similar organisation was promptly set going when the B.H.P. carried the dispute to its Newcastle plant.

Speakers were sent over Australia. Soldiers sent money from the island outposts. In all £78,058 was paid out.

From every important angle the fight was a victory. Parker was reinstated. The unions went back united with bands playing, the B.H.P. plan to break the militant Ironworkers' Union having failed. And the workers learned in struggle lessons which will be invaluable in the critical times that lie ahead.

A booklet which every Party member, every unionist should study.

(Obtainable wholesale from Current Book Distributors. Retail from all Progressive bookshops and Party branches. Price 1/-.)

CATS

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

THE cats of any town are an extremely interesting sight to a geneticist, that is to say, a student of heredity, like myself.

They vary a good deal in color. So do the dogs. But the dogs mostly belong to some definite breed and their matings are arranged for them, as the Nazis would presumably have arranged those of human beings had they conquered the world.

Almost all cats choose their own mates, though we interbreed with them by castrating many males, and trying, usually in vain, to keep the females from mating when they want to.

The result has certainly not been a drab uniformity, which some people suggest will be the fate of humanity unless we prevent people of different races from intermarrying. But except for the length

of hair, and occasional taillessness and extra toes, almost all cats are fairly alike in structure. It would perhaps be possible to produce cats as different from the standard type as bulldogs and greyhounds are from the primitive type of dog, but it has never been done.

On the other hand, one can learn the laws of inheritance very simply from the colors of cats.

Let us begin with a simple case, the white cat. White cats are often born with a small patch of colored fur which they may lose, or keep through life. Their eyes are blue or yellow, and they are often deaf.

Whiteness is due to what is called a dominant gene. This means that on an average a white cat will hand on whiteness to about half its children.

Of course in a litter of four you may get four whites or four non-whites, and you are very likely to get three of one kind and one of the other. But if your white cat has a dozen litters you will get quite close to half and half. As it happens, my white cat has borne just two whites and two tabbies.

The only exception is when two whites mate. In this case each kitten has an even chance of getting whiteness from one or other parent, so only one in four will not be white, that is to say, on an average three kittens out of four will be white. And those whites which got a gene for whiteness from both parents will give nothing but whites with any mate. However, if you let your white cat choose her own mate, she is very unlikely to pick another white, so true-breeding whites are very rare except in pedigree animals.

There are two common types of tabby. The commonest of all is the blotched type but the striped kind with narrow bands of grey and black fur, as in wild cats, is not at all unusual.

The striped type is dominant. That is to say, a striped tabby will always have some striped kittens in the long run, but it is rather difficult to get striping to breed true. On the other hand, two blotched tabbies never have striped kittens.

Tabby is dominant over black. This means in practice that a tabby will always have some tabby kittens, if you breed from her long enough, though she may rarely produce a litter of four or five blacks. But two blacks will never give tabbies. However, if you let your black puss out, she may very well mate with a tabby, and give a whole litter of tabbies, or a mixture of tabbies and blacks.

When we come to yellow or 'ginger' cats, things are a little more complicated. Yellowness is a good deal commoner in males than females, and the sexes inherit it differently.

The key to the problem is the tortoiseshell cat. Tortoiseshell cats are almost always females. The

show type has patches of black and yellow fur, and is unmistakable. But the tabby tortoiseshell, with yellow patches on a tabby ground, is not so easy to pick out.

A yellow female cat, no matter to whom she is mated, has only yellow sons, whereas half the sons of a tortoiseshell are yellow. But a cat with no yellow in her fur can never have yellow sons or daughters, unless she is a white, with the yellow hidden by the dominant gene.

It is not so simple to produce yellow female cats. To make one you must get the yellow gene from both parents. The father must be yellow. The mother may be yellow or tortoiseshell. That is why yellow females are comparatively rare. If you want a yellow female kitten it is not enough to get a yellow or tortoiseshell mother. You must see also that she mates with a yellow male.

There are a number of rarer colors, such as blue and its yellow version cream, smoke, silver and Siamese. They are all recessive to the commoner colors. That is to say, they generally disappear on crossing with ordinary cats, but may occasionally turn up in the litters from two ordinary parents.

Of course there are plenty of unsolved problems in cat breeding. My wife is tackling one at the moment, and we have just made the first really yellow cats I have ever seen, that is to say, cats which are a uniform yellow all over, like lions, instead of with orange and yellow stripes like the ordinary ginger.

Some readers will object to my writing that we have made cats. I use the word deliberately. If I make a chair, I don't create it out of nothing. If I make a fire, I am merely setting certain chemical reactions at work after arranging the wood and coal. So with the yellow cats. We predicted that they would appear from certain matings, and so they did.

Science has now got to the stage when one can to some extent design an animal or plant beforehand, and make it to specification.

Naturally we don't yet know how to make a cat with wings or a horse with a single eye. It may be impossible to do so, as it is known to be impossible to make a transparent metal or an oil which will dissolve freely in water. But in two hundred years we ought either to have made such animals or found out why they cannot be made.

The trouble about cat breeding is that one can't rear all the kittens, and I dislike drowning them. So one object of this article is to find readers who will take unwanted kittens.

But the other is to get them to look at the cats which they meet every day, and which are just as scientifically interesting as stars or atoms.

(World Copyright Reserved.)