

COMMUNIST REVIEW

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

No. 66.

FEBRUARY, 1947.

Price 6d.

LIST OF CONTENTS

STRIKES AND LABOR'S ECONOMIC POLICY	R. Dixon	419
ERRORS OF SOVIET LITERARY JOURNALS	A. A. Zhdanov	421
CRISIS IN THE METAL INDUSTRY	E. J. Rowe	423
POLITICAL RESOLUTION	C.P.G.B.	433
CHINA'S CIVIL WAR	Rupert Lockwood	438
THE SHAPE OF WORLD POLITICS	Eugene Varga	441
BOOK REVIEW	W. A. Wood, M.A.	445
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS	L. H. Gould	446
EVOLUTION	Prof. J. B. S. Haldane, F.R.S.	447

ORGAN OF THEORY AND PRACTICE OF THE AUSTRALIAN
COMMUNIST PARTY

Editor L. L. Sharkey.

STRIKES AND LABOR'S ECONOMIC POLICY

R. DIXON

THE strike wave, which reached such heights in 1946, shows no signs of abating. Everyone, from the Prime Minister, Arbitration Court judges and employers down to the worker in the factory, knows and admits that the cause of the struggles is low wages and long hours, although there are still those who maliciously blame the Communists.

The Communist Party has always insisted that what is needed to meet the discontent is improved wages, shorter hours and reduced taxes, combined with effective price control and measures to deal with black marketeers that will put an end to the racket of rising prices.

When the war ended Labor Party supporters looked to the Labor Governments to achieve these things, but they are precisely the things the Labor Governments have not done and have no intention of doing.

The year 1946 has been very instructive to Labor supporters. More and more they have come to question the Federal Government's economic policy and where it is getting the working class. The Chifley Government has opposed all proposals for nationalisation of banks, mines or industries, it disposed of Government war factories to private capitalists, attacked the Trade Unions for striking and raising demands for improvement in wages and shorter hours, and combined these anti-working class acts with a wage-pegging and price-fixing policy that has resulted in lower living standards for the working class.

Ever since the Labor Party was founded in 1891, one of its chief aims was the raising of living standards, not by revolutionary struggle or strike action, but by a gradual process of reforms. The Chifley Government has reversed this policy. On the one hand, it pegged wages and resisted the efforts of the unions to raise wages. On the other hand, it firmly controlled the prices of goods included in the basic wage regimen, any upward movement of which would have resulted in an increase in the basic wage, but permitted the prices of all other goods, many of which are essential to the workers' existence, to fluctuate considerably. As a result the purchasing power of wages declined and living standards were lowered. Thus another major aim of the Australian Labor Party, the raising of living standards, has been sacrificed by Labor's leaders in the interests of capital.

It was inevitable that the workers would revolt against Chifley's economic policy and so, following Labor's victory at the Federal Elections, a new series of strikes broke out which culminated in the big struggles in the metal industry and the all-important Victorian Transport Strike.

These struggles achieved important gains. Mr. Chifley saw the economic house of cards he was tediously building up about to collapse. Reluctantly he was forced to intervene and make concessions in the hope of allaying the discontent. The Arbitration Court, which had wasted months on the 40-hour week case and planned to delay any decision until the end of 1947, acted with truly amazing speed for that institution and within a matter of days declared "in principle" for the 40 hours and granted the 7/- interim increase in the basic wage, and the Federal Government "amended" the wage-pegging regulations.

Thus, the first major breach in the reactionary economic policy of the Federal Government, which was reducing living standards, was made. But the Government's action, which was a sop intended to allay the industrial strife, misfired. It was another case of too little, too late. The 7/- wage increase, so belatedly granted, was received contemptuously by the Trade Union Movement, which was already resolved on the need for a £1.0.0 rise in the basic wage, and instead of dampening the strike ardour of the workers, if anything, helped to inflame it.

It was not only the smallness of the wage rise and its belatedness which stirred the workers. There was also the announcement of the Government that, instead of firmly controlling prices to enable the workers to get the full benefit from the wage increase, the capitalists were to be permitted to pass the higher wages on in the form of increased prices. Finally, when the amended wage-pegging regulations were examined, they were found to be nothing but a swindle. They did not meet the demands of the unions, and their application to some sections of the workers would result in wage reductions while for some other sections the best the workers could expect would be a few shillings increase in marginal rates.

The Government therefore has by no means abandoned its anti-labor economic policy and the workers must face up to the fact that the only way in which they can achieve their demands is by job action. There is no other way and even right-wing T.U. leaders (e.g., Tramways Union N.S.W.) are forced to admit this.

Having made the meagre concession on wages, the next step of the Government was to set in motion moves for an Industrial Peace Conference.

In his Christmas message, Mr. Chifley, after declaring that strikes produce inflation and weaken the economic position of the country, an argument which is both piffling and anti-working class, went on to praise arbitration and the virtues of industrial peace. Mr. Cleary, who, more than any other

ALL CONTRIBUTIONS SHOULD BE SENT
TO THE EDITOR,
COMMUNIST REVIEW,
695 GEORGE STREET, SYDNEY,
AND SHOULD BE IN BY THE FIRST
OF THE MONTH.

C.T.U. leader, is the voice of the Government, called for an Industrial Peace Conference representative of the inner circle of the A.C.T.U. leadership, the Government, and employers' organisations. How such a Conference could produce industrial peace only Mr. Clegg knows and he was not disposed to say.

Meanwhile the employers were busy. Mr. Oberg, President of the Australian Council of the Employers' Federation, forwarded a statement to the Prime Minister setting out the employers' plan for peace industry. And what a plan!

The way to Industrial Peace, according to the employers, is to enforce the law against the unions striking against Arbitration Court awards, to make compulsory ballots before strikes, to introduce more work and other speed-up methods on a more developed and intense scale, and to enforce labor discipline and the rights of the boss in industry.

Full responsibility for the present state of affairs in Australia is unloaded onto the unions by the employers, who condemn higher wages on the grounds that they will force prices up. But who is it that is forcing prices up whether wages rise or fall? Who is behind the black market racket but the Australian capitalist, on whose behalf Mr. Oberg attacks the Trade Unions and demands more production and industrial peace?

In the long statement Mr. Oberg submitted to the Prime Minister on Peace in Industry, nothing is said on the mundane subject of profits. There is not a word to suggest that the employers, in the interests of industrial peace, are prepared to disgorge some of the immense profits resulting from exorbitant prices they are charging and their earnings from the black market, in order to improve standards of their workers. They demand peace industry and more production because that means more profit.

It is no accident that, almost simultaneously, the Government, employers and reformist Trade Union officials have started the agitation for industrial peace. The economic policy of the Government and the treachery practised by reformist officials during strikes shows how closely they are linked to the employers.

What the working class must face is the fact that behind all this talk of Industrial Peace plans are being worked out to attack and shackle the Trade Unions. It is no use believing that the Federal Government will not stoop to such things. The

attitude of Labor leaders is well demonstrated by legislation the Queensland Labor Government has just passed amending the Arbitration Act, providing for secret ballots before strikes and penalties that have their equal only in the Union-smashing legislation of the Bruce-Page Government in the 1920's.

The capitalist class are demanding draconian measures against the unions not only here in Australia but in other countries as well. In the U.S.A. the Republican Party and many Democrats are insisting on legislation to outlaw strikes and break the power of organized labor. The economic and organisational gains of the working class during the war years must be swept away, the worker must become a submissive wage slave. The employers regard the "banishing of unemployment" as a "dubious blessing" (S.M.H., 6/1/47) because the workers are more independent and the Unions have greater bargaining power than in the years of depression. Hence their demand for the shackling of the Unions.

These are the issues the Trade Unions are now confronted with. The Government intends to push on with an economic policy that has already cut deeply into the living standards of the workers. The meagre increase in the basic wage, and the Industrial Peace discussions that are now proceeding, constitute an all-out effort to stifle the struggles of the working class which are forcing the Government and the employers to concede wage increases and other improvements.

To meet this challenge the labor movement must fight for a fundamentally new approach to the economic problems of Australia on the part of the Labor Party. The big issues of production and industrial discontent can only be successfully met and solved by raising living standards and shortening the hours of work, measures that must be undertaken at the expense of the capitalist class, which can well afford it. This much is certain, these problems will never be solved at the expense of the working class and every effort the Government and employers make in this direction will only result in greater conflict and more unstable economic conditions.

Higher wages, tax cuts, shorter hours and effective price control — these are fundamental if standards of living are to be raised and the fight for them, which is progressive and necessary, is at the same time a fight to end the reactionary economic policy being pursued by the Chifley Government.

ON THE ERRORS OF SOVIET LITERARY JOURNALS

A. A. ZHDANOV, Moscow

FROM the ruling of the Central Committee it is clear that the grossest error of the journal *Zvezda* is the opening of its pages to the literary "creations" of Zoshchenko and Akhmatova. I think there is no need for me to cite here the "work" of Zoshchenko, "Adventures of a Monkey." Evidently you have all read it and know it better than I. The meaning of this "work" by Zoshchenko consists in this, that he depicts Soviet people as idlers and monsters, as silly and primitive people. Zoshchenko takes absolutely no interest in the labor of the Soviet people, their exertions and heroism, their high social and moral qualities. With him this theme is always absent. Zoshchenko, like the philistine and vulgarian that he is, chose as his permanent theme digging in the basest and pettiest sides of life. This digging in the trivialities of life is not accidental. It is characteristic of all vulgar philistine writers, and hence of Zoshchenko. Gorky said a lot about this in his time. You remember how at the congress of Soviet writers in 1934 Gorky branded—excuse my saying so—"men of letters" who see nothing beyond the soot in the kitchen and bathhouse.

For Zoshchenko "Adventures of a Monkey" is not something that goes beyond the framework of his usual writings. This "work" has come into the focus of criticism only as the clearest reflection of the whole negative tendency that exists in the "creative genius" of Zoshchenko. It is known that since the time of his return to Leningrad from evacuation Zoshchenko has written several things characterised by the fact that he is incapable of finding in the life of the Soviet people one positive phenomenon, one positive type. As in the "Adventures of a Monkey," Zoshchenko is accustomed to mock at Soviet life, Soviet ways, Soviet people, covering this mockery with a mask of vacuous diversion and pointless humor.

If you read attentively and think over the story "Adventures of a Monkey" you will see that Zoshchenko casts the monkey in the role of supreme judge of our social customs and forces one to read something on the order of a moral lesson to the Soviet people. The monkey is presented as some sort of rational element, whose job is to evaluate the behaviour of the people. Zoshchenko needed to give a deliberately deformed, caricatured and vulgar picture of the life of the Soviet people in order to insert in the mouth of the monkey the nasty, poisonous, anti-Soviet maxim to the effect that it is better to live in the zoo than at liberty, and that it is easier to breathe in a cage than among the Soviet people.

Is it possible to reach a lower stage of moral and political decline, and how can the people of Leningrad tolerate on the pages of their journals such filth and indecency?

If "works" of this sort are presented to Soviet readers by the journal *Zvezda*, how weak must be the vigilance of those citizens of Leningrad in the leadership of *Zvezda* for it to have been possible to place in this journal works that are poisoned with the venom of zoological hostility to the Soviet order. Only the dregs of literature could produce such "works" and only blind and apolitical people could give them entry.

They say that Zoshchenko's story went the rounds of the Leningrad platforms. How greatly must the leadership of ideological work in Leningrad have weakened for such things to have taken place!

Zoshchenko, with his loathesome moral, succeeded in penetrating to the pages of a big Leningrad journal, and in settling himself there with all the conveniences. And the journal *Zvezda* is an organ whose duty it is to educate our youth. But how can a journal reckon with this task, which gives shelter to such a vulgarian and anti-Soviet writer as Zoshchenko? Can it be that Zoshchenko's physiognomy is unknown to the editorial board of *Zvezda*!

Yet, quite recently, in the beginning of 1944, Zoshchenko's tale, "Before Sunrise," written at the height of the liberation war of the Soviet people against the German invaders, was subjected to sharp criticism in the journal *Bolshevik*. In this tale Zoshchenko turned his vulgar and mean little soul inside out, doing so with delight, with relish, with the desire to show everyone: look, see what a hooligan I am.

It would be hard to find in our literature anything more repulsive than the "moral" preached by Zoshchenko in "Before Sunrise," which depicts people and himself as vile, lewd beasts without shame or conscience. And this moral he presented to Soviet readers in that period when our people were pouring out their blood in a war of unexampled difficulty, when the life of the Soviet state hung by a hair, when the Soviet people endured countless sacrifices in the name of victory over the Germans. But Zoshchenko, having dug himself in in Alma-Ata, deep in the rear, did nothing at this time to help the Soviet people in its struggle with the German invaders. With complete justice Zoshchenko was publicly spanked in the *Bolshevik* as a libeller and vulgarian alien to Soviet literature. He spat on public opinion then, and here, before two years have passed, before the ink with which the *Bolshevik* review was written has dried, the same Zoshchenko

makes his triumphal entry into Leningrad and begins strolling freely in the pages of Leningrad journals. Not only Zvezda, but the journal Leningrad also prints him eagerly. They eagerly and readily present him with theatrical auditoriums. More than that, they give him the opportunity to occupy a leading position in the Leningrad division of the Writers' Union and play an active role in the literary affairs of Leningrad. On what basis do you allow Zoshchenko to stroll in the gardens and parks of Leningrad? Why have the party activists of Leningrad, its writers' organisation permitted these shameful things?

The thoroughly rotten and corrupt socio-political and literary physiognomy of Zoshchenko was not formed in the most recent period. His contemporary "works" are by no means an accident. They are only the continuation of that whole literary "heritage" of Zoshchenko which takes its start in the 1920's.

Who was Zoshchenko in the past? He was one of the organisers of the literary group of the so-called "Serapion brothers." What was the socio-political physiognomy of Zoshchenko in the period of organising the "Serapion brothers"? Permit me to turn to the journal Literaturnye zapiski, No. 3 for 1922, in which the founders of this group set forth their credo. Among other revelations, Zoshchenko has his "articles of faith" there also in a piece called "About Myself and About Something Else." Feeling no constraint before anyone or anything Zoshchenko strips publicly and quite frankly expresses his political, literary "views." Listen to what he said there:

In general it is very troublesome to be a writer. Let us say, that ideology . . . Nowadays a writer is required to have an ideology . . . such a nuisance, really, to me . . .

What sort of an "exact ideology" can I have, you will say. If not one party attracts me as a whole, you From the point of view of party people, I am an unprincipled man. All right. I myself shall speak for myself; I am not a Communist, nor an SR, not a monarchist, but simply a Russian and furthermore a politically immoral one . . .

I give you my honest word . . . I don't know this day, well here, let's say, Guechikov . . . what party is Guechikov in? The devil knows what party he is in. I know, he's not a Bolshevik, but whether he is an SR or a Cadet — I don't know and I don't want to know. Etc., etc.

What will you say, comrades, of such an "ideology"? Twenty-five years have passed since Zoshchenko published this "confession" of his. Has he changed since then? Not noticeably. During two and a half decades not only has he not learned anything and not only has he not changed in any way, but, on the contrary, with cynical frankness he continues to remain a preacher of ideological emptiness and vulgarity. This means that now, as then, he is alien, and hostile to Soviet literature. If, with all this, Zoshchenko has become practically the coryphaeus of literature in Leningrad, if he is

exalted in the Leningrad Parnassus, then one can hardly be amazed at the degree of unprincipledness, looseness, slackness and unscrupulousness achieved by the people who pave the way for Zoshchenko and sing eulogies to him.

Permit me to bring in another illustration of the physiognomy of the so-called "Serapion brothers." In the same Literaturnye zapiski, No. 3 for 1922, another Serapionist, Lev Lunts, also tries to provide an ideological grounding for that tendency, harmful and alien to Soviet literature, which the "Serapion brothers' group represented. Lunts writes:

We have gathered in days of revolutionary, in days of powerful political tension. "He who is not with us is against us" — we are told from right and left — whom are you with, Serapion brothers — with the Communists or against the Communists, for the revolution or against the revolution?

Whom are we with, Serapion brothers? We are with the hermit Serapion. Too long and painfully has public opinion ruled Russian literature. . . . We do not want utilitarianism. We do not write for propaganda. Art is real, like life itself, and like life itself, it is without purpose and without meaning, it exists because it cannot not exist.

Such is the role which the "Serapion brothers" delegate to art, taking from it its ideological content, its social significance, proclaiming the ideological emptiness of art, art for art's sake, art without purpose and without meaning. This is indeed the preachment of rotten apoliticism, philistinism and vulgarity.

What conclusion follows from this? If Zoshchenko does not like Soviet ways, what is your bidding: that one adept himself to Zoshchenko? It is not up to us to reconstruct our tastes. It is not up to us to reconstruct our way of life and our social order for Zoshchenko. Let him reform. But he does not want to reform — let him get out of Soviet literature. In Soviet literature there is no place for rotten, empty, unideological and vulgar works.

This then was the point of departure of the Central Committee in adopting its decision on the journals Zvezda and Leningrad.

I pass on to the question of the literary "creative genius" of Anna Akhmatova. Recently her works have been appearing in Leningrad journals along the lines of "extended reproduction." This is just as surprising and unnatural as if someone were now to start republishing Merezhkovsky, Viacheslav Hippius, Mikhail Kuzmin, Andrei Belyi, Zinaida Seferis, Fedor Sologub, Zinovieva Annibal, and so forth, i.e., all those who have always been counted to our advanced public opinion and literature to be representatives of reactionary obscurantism and renegecy in politics and art.

Gorky in his time said that the decade 1907-1917 deserved to be called the most disgraceful and most untalented decade in the history of the Russian intelligentsia, when after the 1905 revolution a considerable part of the intelligentsia turned away from the revolution, slid into a swamp of reactionary mysticism and pornography, proclaimed ideological

emptiness as their banner, covering up their renegecy with the "beautiful" phrase: "And I burned everything to which I bowed, and bowed to what I burned." This was the decade in which there appeared such renegecy works as *The Pale Horse* of Ropshin, the works of Vinichenko and other deserters from the camp of revolution to the camp of reaction, who hastened to uncrown those high ideals for which the best, the advanced, part of Russian society was fighting. These swam into view the symbolists, imagists, decadents of all hues, who repudiated the people, proclaimed the thesis "art for art's sake," preached ideological emptiness in literature, covered their ideological and moral corruption by chasing after beautiful form without content. All of them were united by animal fear of the approaching proletarian revolution. Suffice it to recall that one of the biggest "ideologists" of these reactionary literary currents was Merezhkovsky, who called the approaching proletarian revolution the "approaching lout" and greeted the October Revolution with zoological malice.

Anna Akhmatova is one of the representatives of this ideologically reactionary literary swamp. She belongs to the so-called literary group of acemists which in its time emerged from the ranks of the symbolists and is one of the standard bearers of empty, ideologically aristocratic-salon poetry, absolutely alien to Soviet literature. The acemists represented the extreme individualist tendency in art. They preached the theory of "art for art's sake," "beauty for beauty's sake," they did not want to know anything about the people, its needs and interests, about social life.

In its social sources this was a nobility-bourgeois current in literature at that period when the days of the aristocracy and the bourgeoisie were numbered and when poets and ideologists of the ruling classes were striving to seek shelter from a hostile reality in heights beyond the clouds and mists of religious mysticism, in wretched personal experiences and digging in their own petty little souls. The acemists, like the symbolists, decadents and other representatives of decaying nobility-bourgeois ideology, were preachers of decadence, pessimism and belief in another world.

The subject matter of Akhmatova is individualistic throughout. The range of her poetry borders on squalor — the poetry of a frenzied lady, dreaming between the boudoir and the chapel. Basic with her are amorous-erotic motifs, intertwined with motifs of sorrow, yearning, death, mysticism, a sense of doom. The feeling of being doomed — an understandable feeling for the social consciousness of a dying group; gloomy tones of death-bed hopelessness, mystical experiences coupled with eroticism — such is the spiritual world of Akhmatova, a splinter from the world of the old nobility culture, the "good old times of Catherine," that has passed into eternity, never to return. Not exactly a nun, not exactly a harlot, but rather nun and harlot, with whom harlotry is mixed with prayer.

But I swear to you by the garden of angels
By the miraculous (kon I swear
And by the smoke of our flaming nights
(Akhmatova, "Anno Domini")

Such is Akhmatova with her little, narrow personal life, her insignificant experiences and religious-mystical eroticism.

Akhmatova's poetry is altogether remote from the people. This is the poetry of the ten thousand, strong upper crust of old nobility Russia, the doomed for whom by this time nothing remains, except to sigh over "the good old days." Landlord country seats of the days of Catherine, with avenues of aged lime trees, with fountains, statues and stone arches, hot houses, love bowers and shabby coats of arms on the gates. Nobility Petersburg; Isarskoe Selo; the railway station in Pavlovsk and other relics of nobility culture. All this has vanished into the past, never to return! For the splinters of this remote culture, alien to the people, preserved by some miracle to our times, there is now nothing left to do but to shut themselves in and live by phantasies. "All is despoiled, betrayed, sold out" — thus writes Akhmatova.

Concerning the socio-political and literary ideals of the acemists one of the eminent representatives of this group, Osip Mandelstam, wrote, not long before the revolution:

Their love for the organism and organisation the acemists share with the physiologically brilliant middle ages . . . The middle ages, determining, in its own way the specific worth of a man, felt and recognised him for everything, quite independently of his merits . . . Yes, Europe has gone through a labyrinth of open-work delicate culture, when being in the abstract, unadorned personal existence was valued as a feat. Hence the aristocratic intimacy that links all people and is so alien to the spirit of "equality and brotherhood" of the great revolution. . . . The Middle Ages is dear to us because it possessed in the highest degree the sense of border and partition. . . . The noble mixture of rationality and mysticism, and the sensation of the world as a live equilibrium, relates us to this epoch and prompts us to draw strength from works that arose on the romance soil of about the year 1200.

In these utterances of Mandelstam are unfolded the hopes and ideals of the acemists. "Back to the middle ages" — such is the social ideal of this aristocratic-salon group. Back to the monkey is the antiphonal cry of Zoshchenko. Needless to say, the acemists and the "Serapion brothers" derive their genealogy from common ancestors. For both acemists and "Serapion brothers" the common progenitor was Hoffman, one of the founders of aristocratic-salon decadence and mysticism.

Why was it suddenly necessary to popularise the poetry of Akhmatova? What relation has she to us, the Soviet people? Why must one offer a literary rostrum to all these decadent and profoundly alien literary tendencies?

From the history of Russian literature we know that more than once or twice have reactionary literary currents, including both symbolists and acemists, tried to declare campaigns against the great revolutionary democratic traditions of Russian litera-

ture, against its advanced representatives; have tried to deprive literature of its high ideological and social significance, to lower it to the swamp of ideological emptiness and vulgarity. All these "fashionable" currents vanished into Lethe and were thrown into the past together with the classes whose ideology they reflected. All these symbolists, acmeists, "yellow shirts," "jacks of diamonds," "nothingists" — what remains of them in our native Russian, Soviet literature? Exactly nothing, although their campaigns against the great representatives of Russian revolutionary-democratic literature — Belinsky, Dobrolubov, Chernyshevsky, Herzen, Saltykov-Shchedrin — were planned with great uproar and pretentiousness and their collapse was equally spectacular.

The acmeists proposed: "To introduce no corrections in existence and undertake no criticism of it." Why were they against introducing any corrections whatever in existence? Because they liked the old nobility, bourgeois existence, whereas the revolutionary people were getting ready to disturb this existence of theirs. In October, 1917, both the ruling classes and their ideologists and songsters were shaken out into the trash pit of history.

And suddenly in the twenty-ninth year of the socialist revolution there reappear on the scene some museum rarities from the world of shadows who begin to teach our youth how one must live. Before Akhmatova the gates of a Leningrad journal are opened wide and she is freely provided with the opportunity to poison the consciousness of the youth with the baneful spirit of her poetry.

In one of the issues of the journal *Leningrad* there was published something in the order of a resume of works written by Akhmatova in the period from 1909 to 1944. There, along with the other rubbish, is one poem written in evacuation during the Great Patriotic War. In this poem she writes about her loneliness, which she was obliged to share with a black cat. The black cat looks at her, like the eye of the century. The theme is not new. Akhmatova was writing about the black cat even in 1909. Moods of loneliness and futility, alien to Soviet literature, link together the whole historical path of Akhmatova's "creative genius."

What has this poetry in common with the interests of our people and State? Exactly nothing. Akhmatova's creative genius is a matter of the distant past; it is alien to modern Soviet actuality and our literature is not tolerated in the pages of our journals. Our literature is not a private enterprise calculated to please the varied tastes of a literary market. We are not at all obliged to provide space in our literature for tastes and tempers which have nothing in common with the ethics and qualities of Soviet people. What in the nature of instruction can Akhmatova's works give to our youth? Nothing, besides harm. These works can only sow despondency, low spirits, pessimism, the inclination to turn

away from the burning questions of social life and activity for the narrow little world of personal experiences. How is it possible to turn over to her the upbringing of our youth? And yet Akhmatova has been published with great readiness, now in Zvezda, now in Leningrad, has even been put in separate collections. This is a crude political error.

In view of all this, it is no accident that in Leningrad journals there have begun to appear the works of other writers who have started to slide down to the position of ideological emptiness and decadence. I have in view such works as those of Sadofev and Komissarova. In some of their poems Sadofev and Komissarova have begun to sing in harmony with Akhmatova, have begun to cultivate the moods of despondency, yearning and loneliness so beloved of Akhmatova's spirit.

And what would have happened if we had brought up our youth in the spirit of despondency and unbelief in our cause? In that case we would not have been victorious in the Great Patriotic War. Precisely for this reason the Soviet state and our Party with the aid of Soviet literature have brought up our youth in the spirit of cheerfulness, of confidence in its own powers, and precisely for this reason we overcame the greatest difficulties in the building of socialism and achieved victory over the Germans and Japanese.

What follows from all this? From this it follows that the journal *Zvezda*, having inserted in its pages, along with fine, sanguine works with ideological content, works that are ideologically empty, vulgar, reactionary, became a journal without direction, became a journal that helped enemies to corrupt our youth. But our journals have always drawn their strength from their sanguine, revolutionary direction, not from eclecticism, not from ideological emptiness and apoliticism. The propaganda of Zvezda. More than that, it has been ascertained that Zoshchenko acquired such power in the Leningrad writers' organisation that he even yelled at write up critics in one of the periodicals. He became something on the order of a literary dictator. He was surrounded by a group of worshippers building his glory.

The question arises, on what basis? Why did you permit this unnatural and reactionary business?

It is not accidental that in the literary journals of Leningrad one began to be infatuated with the base contemporary bourgeois literature of the West. Some of our writers began to look upon themselves as teachers, but as pupils of bourgeois-philistine and worshipfulness before philistine foreign literature. It is such obsequiousness becoming to us, Soviet patriots, to us, who have built the Soviet social order, which is a hundred times higher and better than

any bourgeois social order? Does it become our advanced Soviet literature, the most revolutionary literature in the world, to bow low before the narrow philistine-bourgeois literature of the West?

A big shortcoming in the work of our writers is also withdrawal from contemporary Soviet themes, a one-sided infatuation with historical themes, on the one hand, and, on the other, an attempt to occupy oneself with vacuous subjects of a purely diverting nature. Some writers, in justification of their neglect of great contemporary Soviet themes, say that the time has come when one must give the people empty, diverting literature, when one cannot pay heed to the ideological content of works. This is a profoundly untrue notion of our people, their demands and interests. Our people are waiting for Soviet writers to comprehend and generalise the tremendous experience gained by the people in the Great Patriotic War, for them to portray and generalise the heroism with which the people are now working on the restoration of the national economy of the country after the expulsion of the enemy.

A few words on the journal *Leningrad*. Here, Zoshchenko's position is even more "stable" than in *Zvezda*, as is also Akhmatova's position. Zoshchenko and Akhmatova have become an active literary force in both journals. Thus the journal *Leningrad* is responsible for opening its pages to such vulgarisms as Zoshchenko and such salon poetesses as Akhmatova.

But the journal *Leningrad* has made further errors.

Take, for example, the parody on Evgeni Onegin, written by one Khazin. This thing is called "The Return of Onegin." They say that it was frequently performed on the boards of the Leningrad platform. It is incomprehensible why the people of Leningrad allowed their city to be demeaned from the public rostrum, as was done by Khazin. For the sense of this whole so-called literary "parody" does not consist in empty grimaces in connection with the adventures of Onegin on his appearance in contemporary Leningrad. The sense of the lampoon composed by Khazin is that it tries to compare our modern Leningrad with the Petersburg of the Pushkin epoch and prove that our age is worse than the age of Onegin. Glance at even a few lines of this "parody." Everything in our modern Leningrad displeases the author. He snorts with malice and slander against the Soviet people, against Leningrad. How different the age of Onegin — a golden age, in the opinion of Khazin. But now — housing control, ration cards, permits appear on the scene. Girls, those unearthly ethereal creatures, in whom Onegin delighted before, have now become traffic regulators, repair Leningrad's houses, etc. Permit me to quote only one passage from this "parody":

Now in the tram sits our Evgeni
The gentle, O the poor dear man!
Such forms of rapid locomotion
His unlightened age knew not.
Some fate looked out for our Evgeni,
His foot alone was somewhat tra-pi-ed.
And then just once a belly poke
Delivered with the words: "You fool!"
He, mindful of the ancient custom,
Thought by a duel to end the feud.
He felt his pocket . . . But a thief
His gloves some time before had pilfered.
And so for lack of such as these
Onegin had to hold his peace.

There you see what Leningrad used to be and what it has now become: nasty, uncultured, crude, and what an unsightly appearance it presents to poor dear Onegin. This is how Leningrad and the people of Leningrad are presented by the vulgarian Khazin. There was a wrong, vicious, rotten idea in this slanderous parody!

How is it possible that the editorial board of *Leningrad* should overlook this malicious slander against Leningrad and its excellent people? How is it possible to let Khazin into the pages of Leningrad journals?

Take another work — a parody on a parody of Nekrasov, put together in such a fashion as to constitute a direct insult to the memory of a great poet and public figure, such as Nekrasov was, an insult over which any enlightened person should feel indignant. Yet the editorial board of *Leningrad* readily gave room to this dirty concoction in its pages.

What else do we find in the journal *Leningrad*? A foreign anecdote, flat and vulgar, taken, evidently, from old hackneyed anecdote collections of the end of the last century. Can it be that the journal *Leningrad* has nothing to fill up its pages with? Can it be that there is nothing to write about in the journal *Leningrad*? Take even a theme like the restoration of Leningrad. In the city magnificent work is going on, the city is healing the wounds inflicted by the blockade, the people of Leningrad are full of the enthusiasm and pathos of post-war restoration. Has anything been written about this in the journal *Leningrad*? Will the people of Leningrad wait indefinitely for their laborious feats to find reflection in the journal's pages?

Take another theme, the Soviet woman. Surely one cannot cultivate among Soviet men and women readers the shameful views inherent in Akhmatova on the role and vocation of woman without giving a really truthful general notion of the modern Soviet woman, of the Leningrad girl, of the woman heroine, particularly of those who bore on their shoulders the enormous difficulties of the war years, and now labor self-sacrificingly on the solution of the hard tasks of restoring the economy.

As we have seen, the state of affairs in the Leningrad section of the Writers' Union is such that at the present time there are plainly not enough good works for two literary-artistic journals. That

is why the Central Committee of the Party decided to close the journal *Leningrad*, so as to concentrate all the best literary forces in the journal *Zvezda*. This of course does not mean that under appropriate conditions Leningrad will not have a second or even a third journal. The question is decided by the quantity of good works of high quality. If a sufficient quantity of them appears and there is no room for them in one journal, it will be possible to create a second and a third journal — only let the production of our Leningrad writers be good in respect to ideology and artistry.

Such are the crude errors and shortcomings that have been uncovered and recorded in the ruling of the Central Committee of the Communist Party relative to the work of the journals *Zvezda* and *Leningrad*.

What is the root of these errors and shortcomings?

The root of these errors and shortcomings lies in the fact that the editors of the journals named, who play an active role in our Soviet literature and also are leaders of our ideological front in Leningrad, have forgotten some fundamental postulates of Leninism on Literature. Many writers, including those who work in the capacity of responsible editors or occupy important posts in the Writers' Union, think that politics is the business of the government and the Central Committee. As for writers, it is not their business to occupy themselves with politics. A person wrote well, artistically, beautifully — give the work a start, regardless of the fact that it has rotten passages that disorient our youth and poison it. We demand that our comrades, both those who give leadership in the literary field and those who write, be guided by that without which the Soviet order cannot live, i.e., by politics, so that our youth may be brought up not in a devil-may-care, unideological spirit, but in a vigorous and revolutionary spirit.

It is known that Leninism embodies in itself all the best traditions of the Russian revolutionary democrats of the 19th century and that our Soviet culture arose, developed and reached its flowering on the basis of the critically reworked cultural heritage from the past. In the sphere of literature our Party, through the words of Lenin and Stalin, has more than once recognised the enormous significance of the great Russian revolutionary-democratic writers and critics — Belinsky, Chernyshevsky, Dobroliubov, Plekhanov, Beginning with Belinsky, none of the best representatives of the revolutionary-democratic Russian intelligentsia recognised so-called "pure art," "art for art's sake," but were the spokesmen for the people; of its high ideological content and social significance. Art cannot be separated from the people's fate. Remember Belinsky's famous "Letter to Gogol," in which the great critic, with all the passion that was inherent in him, lashed Gogol for his attempt to betray the cause of the people and go

over to the side of the tsar. Lenin called this letter one of the best products of the uncensored press, which has preserved a tremendous literary significance even for the present time.

Remember the literary-publicist articles of Dobroliubov, in which the social significance of literature is demonstrated with such power. All our revolutionary-democratic publicists are saturated with mortal hatred of the tsarist order and permeated with a noble striving to fight for the basic interests of the people, for their enlightenment, for their culture, for their liberation from the bonds of the tsarist regime. A fighting art, conducting a struggle for the best ideals of the people — this was the conception of literature and art held by the great representatives of Russian literature. Chernyshevsky, who of all utopian socialists came closest to scientific socialism and from whose works, as Lenin pointed out, "there breathed the spirit of the class struggle," taught that the task of art is, besides perception of life, to teach people to evaluate correctly the various social phenomena. His closest friend and collaborator, Dobroliubov, pointed out that "it is not life that proceeds according to literary norms, but literature adapts itself to the trends of life," and energetically propounded the principles of realism and nationality in literature, considering that the foundation of art is actuality, that the latter is the source of creative genius and that art has an active role in social life, in forming social consciousness. According to Dobroliubov, literature must serve society, must give the people answers to the sharpest questions of contemporary life, must be abreast with the ideas of the epoch.

Marxist literary criticism, the continuator of the great traditions of Belinsky, Chernyshevsky, Dobroliubov, was always the champion of realistic, socially directed art. Plekhanov laid a lot of work to expose the idealistic, anti-scientific notion of literature and art and defend the positions of our great Russian revolutionary democrats, who taught that one should see in literature a powerful means of serving the people.

V. I. Lenin was the first to formulate with utmost precision the attitude of advanced social thought to literature and art. I remind you of Lenin's well-known article "Party Organisation and Party Literature," written at the end of 1905, in which he showed with characteristic force that literature cannot be non-partisan, that it must be an important component part of the general proletarian cause. In this article by Lenin are laid all the foundations on which the development of our Soviet literature is based. Lenin wrote:

Literature must become partisan. To counterbalance bourgeois mores, to counterbalance the bourgeoisie entrepreneurial, commercial press, to counterbalance gentlemen's anarchism, and the drive after gain—the socialist proletarian must put forward the principle of Party literature, develop this principle and bring it to life in the most complete and integral form possible.

What constitutes this principle of Party literature? Not only the fact that for the socialist proletariat the literary cause cannot be an instrument of gain to persons or groups, it cannot in general be an individual cause, independent of the proletarian cause as a whole (Down with non-partisan writers! Down with supposed men writers! The literary cause must become part of the general proletarian cause.)

And further on in the same article:

To live in society and be free of society is impossible. The freedom of the bourgeois writer, artist, actress is only a disguised (or hypocritically masked) dependence on the money-bag, on the bribe, on the salary.

The Leninist point of departure is that our literature cannot be apolitical, cannot be "art for art's sake," but is called upon to fulfil an important vanguard role in social life. Hence the Leninist principle of partisanship in literature — a most important contribution of V. I. Lenin to the science of literature.

Consequently, the best tradition of Soviet literature is a continuation of the best traditions of Russian literature of the 19th century, the traditions created by our great revolutionary democrats — Belinsky, Dobroliubov, Chernyshevsky, Salykov-Shchedrin — carried further by Plekhanov and scientifically elaborated and grounded by Lenin and Stalin.

Nekrasov called his poetry "the muse of vengeance and sorrow." Chernyshevsky and Dobroliubov looked upon literature as a sacred service to the people. Under the tsarist regime the best representatives of the Russian democratic intelligentsia perished for these high and noble ideas, went into penal servitude and exile. How is it possible to forget these glorious traditions? How it is possible to neglect them, how possible to permit Akhmatovas and Zoshchenkos to propagate surreptitiously the reactionary slogan "art for art's sake," and taking cover behind a mask of ideological emptiness, to get in ideas that are alien to the Soviet people!

Leninism recognises that our literature has enormous significance for social transformation. If our Soviet literature were to permit a reduction of its enormous educational role — this would mean development backward, a return "to the stone age."

Comrade Stalin called our writers engineers of human souls. This definition has deep meaning. It speaks of the enormous responsibility of Soviet writers for the education of the people, for the education of the Soviet youth, for not tolerating wastage in literary work.

To some it seems strange that the Central Committee adopted such severe measures on a literary question. We are not used to this. They think that if wastage is permitted in production or if a production programme for articles of mass consumption or a wood storage plan is not fulfilled — then to pronounce a reprimand for this is a natural thing, but if wastage is permitted with respect to the education of human souls, if wastage is permitted in the business of educating the youth, here one must be tolerant. Whereas actually, is not this a more bitter fault than the non-fulfillment of a production

programme or the disruption of a production assignment? By its decision the Central Committee has in view the bringing of the ideological front into line with all the other sectors of our work.

In the recent period big breaches and shortcomings have been exposed on the ideological front. Suffice it to remind you of the backwardness of our film art, of the littering of our theatrical-dramatic repertoire with bad-quality productions, not to speak of what went on in the journals *Zvezda* and *Leningrad*. The Central Committee was obliged to interfere and introduce decisive corrections. It did not have the right to soften its blow against those who forget their obligations towards the people toward the education of the youth. If we want to turn the attention of our activists to questions of ideological work and introduce order here, give clear direction in the work, we should be sharp, as befits Soviet people, as befits Bolsheviks, in criticising errors and shortcomings in ideological work. Only then will we be able to correct matters.

Other writers reason thus: inasmuch as during the war the people were starving for literature, and few books were published, it follows that the reader will swallow any commodity, even with rot in it. But actually this is altogether not so, and we cannot tolerate any literature that unscrupulous writers, editors, publishers will palm off on us. The Soviet people expect from Soviet writers genuine ideological armament, spiritual nourishment that would aid in fulfilling the plans for the restoration and further development of our country's national economy. The Soviet people make high demands on writers, they want satisfaction of their ideological and cultural claims. The situation during the war made us unable to secure these burning needs. The people want to comprehend the events that have taken place. Their ideological and cultural level has grown higher. They are frequently dissatisfied with the quality of the products of literature and art that we put forth. Some workers in literature, workers on the ideological front, have not understood this and do not want to understand it.

The level of the demands and tastes of our people has risen very high, and he who does not want to rise, or is incapable of rising to this level, will remain behind. Literature is called upon not only to keep abreast of the demands of the people, but more than that — it has an obligation to develop the people's tastes, to raise higher their demands, to enrich them with new ideas, to carry the people forward. He who is incapable of marching in step with the people, of satisfying their growing demands, of keeping up with the tasks of development of Soviet culture, will inevitably be retired.

Ideological inadequacy among the leading workers of *Zvezda* and *Leningrad* leads to a second big error. This is that some of our leading workers have set up as a guide in their relations with writers not the interests of the political education of the Soviet people and the political direction of the

worshippers of bourgeois culture or the role of pupils? Certainly our literature, which reflects a social order higher than any bourgeois-democratic order, and a culture many times higher than bourgeois culture, has the right to teach others a new universal morality. Where do you find a people and a country like ours? Where do you find such magnificent qualities in people as our people displayed in the Great Patriotic War and as they display every day in their labors of transition to peacetime development and restoration of their economy and culture? Every day raises our people higher and higher. Today we are not what we were yesterday, and tomorrow we will not be what we are today. We are already not the same Russians we were before 1917, and our Russia is different, and our character. We have changed and grown together with the great transformations that have radically altered the face of our country.

To exhibit these new high qualities of the Soviet people, to exhibit our people not only as it is today, but also to give a glimpse of its tomorrow, to help illumine with a searchlight the road ahead — such is the task of every conscientious Soviet writer. The writer cannot jog along at the tail of events, he must march in the forward ranks of the people, pointing out, to them their path of development. Guided by the method of socialist realism, conscientiously and attentively studying our reality, striving to penetrate deeper into the essence of the processes of our development, the writer must educate the people and arm it ideologically. While selecting the best feelings and qualities of the Soviet man and revealing his tomorrow, we must at the same time show our people what they must not be, we must castigate the remnants of yesterday, remnants that hinder the Soviet people in their forward march. Soviet writers must help the people, the state, and the party to educate our youth to be cheerful and confident of their own strength, unafraid of any difficulties.

No matter how bourgeois politicians and writers strive to conceal from their own peoples the truth about the achievements of the Soviet order and Soviet culture, no matter how they try to erect an iron curtain, through which it would be impossible for the truth about the Soviet Union to penetrate abroad, no matter how they endeavor to belittle the actual growth and dimensions of Soviet culture — all these attempts are doomed to collapse. We know very well the power and advantage of our culture. Suffice it to recall the stunning successes of our cultural delegations abroad, our physical culture parade, etc. Is it for us to bow low before every foreignism or occupy a position of passive defence?

If the feudal social order and then the bourgeoisie in the period of their flowering could create an art and a literature that affirmed the establishment of the new order and hymned its flowering,

then we, who represent a new, socialist order, the embodiment of all that is best in the history of human civilisation and culture, are all the more in a position to create the most advanced literature in the world, which will leave far behind the best examples of the creative genius of former times.

Comrades, what does the Central Committee want and demand? The Central Committee of the Party wants to understand well that the time has come when it is necessary to raise our ideological work to a high level. The young Soviet generation is faced with the task of intensifying the power and might of the Socialist Soviet order, of fully utilising the motive forces of Soviet society for a new, unheard-of blossoming of our well-being and culture. For these great tasks the young generation must be educated to be steadfast, cheerful, unafraid of obstacles, ready to meet these obstacles and overcome them. Our people must be educated people of a high ideological level, with high cultural and moral demands and tastes. To this end our literature, our journals must not stand aside from the tasks of contemporary life, but must help the Party and the people educate the youth in the spirit of unreserved devotion to the Soviet social order, in the spirit of unreserved service to the interests of the people.

Soviet writers and all our ideological workers are today posted in the advanced line of fire, for in conditions of peaceful development there is no reduction, but on the contrary, there is an expansion of the tasks of the ideological front and principally of literature. The people, the state, the Party want, not the withdrawal of literature from contemporary life, but its active invasion into all aspects of Soviet existence. Bolsheviks value literature highly. They see clearly its great historical mission and role in the strengthening of the moral and political unity of the people, in the welding and education of the people. The Central Committee of the Party wants us to have an abundance of spiritual culture, for in this wealth of culture it sees one of the main tasks of socialism.

The Central Committee of the Party is confident that the Leningrad detachment of Soviet literature is morally and politically healthy and will speedily correct its errors and occupy its proper place in the ranks of Soviet literature.

The Central Committee is confident that the shortcomings in the work of the Leningrad writers will be overcome and that the ideological work of the Leningrad party organisation will, in the shortest period, be raised to the height that is required today in the interests of the Party, the people, the state.

CRISIS IN THE METAL INDUSTRY

E. J. ROWE

WHILE certain leaders of the A.C.T.U., reformist Union leaders in general, the Press, the employers, and Mr. Chifley are avidly, even if academically, discussing the prospects of peace in industry and increased production, workers in the metal industry are preparing action to cut sharply across the "front of words" that the employers and, one is forced to conclude, the Chifley Government also, are erecting to avoid any real approach to increased wages, shorter hours, and a generally higher standard of living for metal workers.

The demand for increased wages has been steadily growing since the end of the war and is based upon the powerful growth of the metal unions in this expanded metal industry, their increased fighting efficiency and the very important development of trade union unity and cohesion that the Metal Trades Federation is bringing about among Metal Unions. Indeed, the big steel strike in the closing period of 1945 was in fact an attempt by the employers to smash the growing strength of the Unions while they were still "off balance" in the early transitional period from war to peace.

The attack failed and until the middle of 1946 a species of guerrilla warfare was conducted, particularly by the Ironworkers' Union where the shortage of labor in the industry was used by the unions to shift members from factory to factory, thus forcing the employers to offer increased wages to retain their labor. The employers attempted retaliation by introducing a black list, but this reply was largely ineffective because of the competition engendered among them by the very shortage of labor upon which the union's tactics were based.

But while these tactics succeeded in winning increases for sections of the workers and were a big help in the struggle to remove the barrier of wage-pegging regulations, they were not, of course, the final solution to a substantial general wage increase. The employers, too, were now commencing to counter with the use of the lockout and so secure some unity in their own ranks.

The Communist Party and progressive unions had during this period also been campaigning for the implementing of our Party programs and that of the A.C.T.U. for a £1 per week increase in wages.

In Melbourne last May the Interstate Conference of the A.E.U. unanimously affirmed the demand for the relaxation of wage-pegging and after instructing its Commonwealth Council to make another attempt with the Government, declared that if this attempt failed the union "would have no other alternative but to use its organised strength to secure wage increases." The Negotiating Committee of the Metal Trades Federation took the matter up with Chifley in Canberra, but he refused to move.

Aggregate meetings of A.E.U. members were held in Sydney, Melbourne and Adelaide and by big majorities endorsed the demand for £1 per week increase. They instructed the District Committees in these centres to limit overtime to four hours per week pending the employers' reply. A small section of the employers agreed to pay the increase, but the majority, through the Metal Trades Employers' organisations, declared they were bound by the Wage-Pegging Regulations and that the wage demands were a matter for the Government and the Arbitration Court.

Further aggregate meetings, after considering these replies, placed a complete ban on overtime and decided upon stop work meetings in these States to decide further action.

The stop work meeting in Sydney in October was attended by 6300 members and rejected by a huge majority the right wing's attempt to lift the overtime ban and "place our trust in the Labor Council Disputes Committee, the Labor Government and the Arbitration Court." Instead, the meeting empowered the District Committee to continue the campaign and to call further stop work meetings of all or any section of the industry. It also instructed that the Metal Trades Federation be approached to enlist the support and co-operation of all Metal Unions.

Early in November the Federation considered this request and, after endorsing the campaign for the £1 increase, decided to organise combined meetings of Branch Executives and Shop Stewards of all metal unions in each metropolitan centre, plus Newcastle and Wollongong, with a view to similarly endorsing the campaign and organising common action.

These meetings have been held, were largely attended and after endorsing the demand for £1 increase, demanded a speedy decision on the 40-hour week case and instructed the Metal Trades Federation to meet early in January, 1947, to organise the common action envisaged by the meeting and resolutions.

Late in 1946 the Victorian transport strike took place, involving also quite a big section of metal workers. This strike, winning substantial concessions for transport workers, and considerably hastening the interim basic wage and shorter hours decision, also lifted to a much higher level the general struggle of the workers, including of course those in the metal industry.

In Victoria too, the Ironworkers and Moulders in the foundry section had been negotiating with the employers for higher wages and finally struck to secure these. The A.E.U. overtime ban was also beginning to prove effective and the employers, aming at a black Xmas, decided to lock the

members of these three unions out of the foundries and some sections of the engineering industry. Similar action was taken by employers on the Sydney waterfront and some 62 plants were closed down by the employers there. The Unions have replied to this by declaring that their members will not now return to these industries until their demands for wage increases have been met.

Discussions took place between a delegation from the A.C.T.U. Executive and the A.E.U. on the one hand, and a full meeting of the newly organised Federal Metal Trades Employers' Association and the Australian Metal Industries Association on the other, and the A.E.U. wage demands were put forward. Next day the employers replied urging the unions to go to the Arbitration Court. An aggregate meeting of A.E.U. members in Melbourne rejected this and, joined by the Ironworkers, demonstrated through the streets, ending up with a mass meeting in front of the Chamber of Manufacturers.

The employers then asked the A.C.T.U. Executive to accompany employers' representatives to wait upon the Prime Minister and try to secure a settlement of the dispute. The A.C.T.U. Executive refused, stating they rejected the employers' reply to the A.E.U. demands and would be prepared to negotiate only on terms satisfactory to the Union.

So 1947 opened with considerable sections of metal workers either locked out or on strike.

In Sydney and in Melbourne the attempts by the employers to end their own lockouts are being met by demands for wage increases before the unions will allow their members to return.

The farcical interim increase in the basic wage, the delay in the 40-hour case has had superimposed upon it the obvious swindle that Mr. Chifley has dignified by the name of "formula" under the amended wage-pegging regulations.

When one poses against the mass union demand for £1 per week increase the fact that the new "formula" will give a toolmaker an increase of 2/-, a tradesman 4/6, process worker 2/- and will lose a tradesman's assistant 9d per week, one can understand the scorn heaped upon the Government's "relaxation" by the unions and the increasing demand from them that now we must have no more such "tinkering" but instead the abolition of wage-pegging.

And it is becoming increasingly clear that bigger struggles, more pressure yet are necessary before the Government will step aside and allow the workers to enforce their just demands.

Both Sydney and Melbourne District Committees of the A.E.U. have carried unanimously resolutions demanding that the unions now take the offensive, and the Commonwealth Council has endorsed this demand and will ask the Metal Trades Federation for the practical support of the other unions comprising the Federation.

In view of this request, and the undoubted desire

of the 200,000 workers in the Federation for substantial wage increases, a review of the attitude of the Metal Unions is of some interest.

The campaign for the £1 increase has been endorsed fully and the demand served on the employers by the Ironworkers, Sheetmetal Workers and Blacksmiths' Unions. Other unions have in varying degrees endorsed it and taken action to organise support for it.

The most negative reaction has been that of the A.S.E., the Executive of which, despite the resentment of the members, has refused to support the A.E.U. ban on overtime and has in many cases allowed its members to do work declared black by the A.E.U. In some cases the employer has dismissed A.E.U. men and replaced them by A.S.E. members without protest from that Union.

There are, however, signs of some more positive approach, but it cannot be too strongly stressed that in the struggles we are now entering there is no place for such dangerous divisions. Rather does it call for the highest degree of unity and co-operation among metal unions.

The post-war period following the war of 1914-18 has some lessons for us today. The metal unions grew during that war too and made some gains in wages, but these were swept away by the offensive of the employers in 1922. For example: Engineers' wages were 120/- in 1920, dropped to 101/- in 1922. The Unions forced them back to 115/- by 1930, and then came an all-time low of 88/- in 1932. It was not until 1941—20 long years after—that they reached 120/- again and then were pegged fast in 1942 while prices rocketed. Surely at once a bitter commentary on reformist leadership and "Arbitration" strategy, and a solemn warning against any purely defensive strategy now.

The metal industry is the heart of any economy, either socialist or capitalist. The metal unions hold a key strategical position therefore. They have a shortage of labor in the industry, an expanding demand for its products, and the unions are more powerful, more united, and better equipped than at any period in their history.

That is why the employers, the Government and the enemies of the workers are "trading space for time," are attempting desperately to stem, to canalise the drive for increased wages.

The unions therefore must, as indeed the workers already have, reject any attempt to sidetrack the campaign and by their united strength ensure that the developing struggle in the metal industry not only ends successfully for the metal industry but that it is made a real step towards ensuring that this post-war period bears the imprint of a workers' victory offensive from which they can pass to ever greater victories.

This is a much more substantial perspective than the "golden age" of the reformist politicians here in our country.

POLITICAL RESOLUTION

(Proposed by the Executive Committee for the Nineteenth Congress, C.P.G.B.)

THE Nineteenth Congress of the Communist Party declares that the main objectives before the people of this country now are:—

- (1) To ensure peace and security and defeat all attempts which would rebuild fascism and reaction, disrupt the United Nations and lead to a new war.
- (2) To speed up reconstruction at home, breaking through the resistance of monopoly interests, so as to win improved standards for the people and prepare the way for the advance to Socialism.
- (3) By the united pressure of the Labor movement and the people to bring about such changes in the policy of the Labor Government as are necessary to fulfil these aims.

The period now facing us is marked by the increasing bankruptcy of capitalist society, the great advance of the working class and subject peoples, and the desperate struggles of monopoly capitalism to hold back that advance.

1. The Deepened Crisis of Capitalism.

The war—itsself the outcome of the general crisis of capitalism—has deepened that crisis.

Economic: The conflict between the growth of the productive forces and the existing capitalist relations of production has been enormously intensified. There is extreme unevenness of development and disproportion between war-ravaged Europe, suffering from under-production, famine-stricken Asia, and surplus-ridden United States already facing problems of overproduction.

United States monopoly-capitalism has enormously increased its predominance, and now controls three-fifths of the production output of the capitalist world. But with the closing of the war market, this enhanced productive power is faced with the limited absorption possibilities arising from its existing social relations in the United States and in an impoverished world. The reckless lifting of all controls has accelerated the development by which the feverish boom already begins to give place to the signs of approaching depression. The Republican victory in the American elections has further strengthened the domination of the most aggressive anti-working class sections of American capitalism.

British capitalism has been further weakened as a result of the war. Its hold on the Empire is shaken by the advancing struggle of the colonial peoples and the pressure of American penetration. The economic problems arising from the decline of capitalism are acute, and find expression in the deficit in the balance of payments, the dependence on the American loan, the chronic crisis of the basic industries and agriculture, and the relative obsolescence of plant and lower level of productive power in contrast with the United States.

On the other hand, the Soviet Union, despite its heavy losses through the war, on the basis of its Socialist economy, is able to carry through a great plan of reconstruction and development which ensures rising standards for its people. In Eastern Europe the new people's democracies are developing their countries' resources on a secure economic basis that will not be at the mercy of capitalist crisis. In all countries the working people are pressing forward for the control of monopoly and planned measures to ensure a rising standard of living.

Political: Politically, the hold of imperialism in the world is weakened by the collapse of the Axis powers and the strengthening of the Soviet Union and the new democracies in Europe. The bourgeoisie in all European countries is weakened as a result of its connection with treacherous capitulation to Nazism, and the working-class parties have won government position in a number of countries.

The strength of socialism and the peoples has enormously grown. This strength is shown in:

- (i) The influence of the Soviet Union, now the second leading World Power alongside the United States, and rallying the world democratic and peace forces;
- (ii) The new democracies in Europe, comprising one hundred million people, who have ended the domination of feudalism and big capital, and advanced along the path of popular social and economic reconstruction;
- (iii) The electoral victory of the Labor movement in Britain, and the advancing militancy shown in the Trades Union Congress and in the working class generally; the electoral victories of the Communist Party in France and of the Communist and Socialist Parties in Italy; the trade union militancy and beginnings of a progressive movement in the United States;
- (iv) the advance of the colonial liberation movements, especially in India, South-East Asia and the Middle East;
- (v) the consolidation of the democratic forces in China, despite armed foreign intervention on the side of reaction;
- (vi) the increased strength of the working class movement, with the advance of Communist Parties to a leading position in the major European countries, extension of Socialist-Communist co-operation, and achievement of world trade union unity through the World Federation of Trade Unions, comprising 71 million members.

February, 1947

2. The New Reactionary Offensive.

In opposition to this advance of the popular movement, an intensified offensive of world reaction is taking place.

United States monopoly capitalism seeks to find scope for its vast accumulated capital and enhanced productive power by a policy of aggressive world expansion to conquer markets in all countries, break down all barriers of planned economy, and subject the world to its domination.

British policy today in general combines with American imperialism in a block in opposition to the Soviet Union, the new democracies in Europe and democratic advance over the world. British imperialism in many cases even takes the principal anti-democratic initiative, as over Greece, Spain, the Middle East, Indonesia, etc. The Anglo-American block reveals itself in practice in the diplomatic field, in all international conferences, with the ranging of a majority of satellite and client States against the Soviet Union and new democracies, and with the parallel dispatch of notes and protests to the new democratic States; and in the military field, with joint staff co-operation. The Anglo-American block seeks to build up the reactionary forces all over the world against popular advance. This offensive, fanned and stimulated by the most extreme anti-working class elements and war incendiaries in both countries, endangers peace and international co-operation.

At the same time, sharp divisions of interest of British and American imperialism are revealed, especially in the economic field, as in the proceedings of the International Trade Conference and the question of imperial preferences, and in special spheres of rival penetration, as in the Middle East.

3. The Fight for Peace and Democracy.

To defeat this new offensive and prevent the menace of a third world war will require the combined strength and activity of all the Socialist working class and progressive movements throughout the world.

The representatives of the Soviet Union and the new European Democracies are playing a foremost part in international conferences for the peace peoples against the war-mongers to rally the attempts to limit democracy and against all nations and impose Western monopoly-capitalist domination.

The World Federation of Trade Unions is similarly rallying the world working class for the aims and backers of fascist revival.

Within Britain and the United States there is growing opposition of progressive opinion against the aims of the Anglo-American block. This has found expression in the United States in the campaign led by Wallace and by the progressive labor movement represented by the CIO; in Britain within the ranks of the Parliamentary Labor Party and in the Trades Union Congress.

4. The Situation in Britain.

The changed situation of Britain in the world after the war makes imperative far-reaching economic and political changes. The old basis of British capitalism and imperialism is bankrupt. The only solution for the problems before the British people today lies along the path of the advance to Socialism.

The basic choice opens out more and more clearly before the British people:—

Either to go forward along the path of radical social and economic reorganisation, breaking the power of monopoly and building up planned economy, and establishing close co-operation internationally with the Socialist Soviet Union, the planned economies of the new democracies in Europe and the advancing colonial peoples.

Or to sink to dependence on American monopolist reaction, surrender to the monopolies at home, succumb to economic crisis and depression spreading from America, and be engulfed in war as the outpost and vulnerable advance base of American reaction against European democracy.

Britain holds a pivotal position in the present world situation, and the action of the British people can play a decisive part for the future of humanity.

Economic: Economically, Britain is faced with acute problems. The old parasitic imperialist basis, by which tribute flowed to Britain in the shape of vast imports, only half of which were paid for by exports of goods, can no longer be maintained. To meet the deficit requires both an increase of exports and an increase of home production to meet home needs. This is of exceptional importance in agriculture, which is capable of great development. But the drive to increase exports is faced with the intensified American exports drive and the greater competitive power of American industry in many fields.

This situation, no less than the need to raise social standards at home, requires a radical reorganisation of industry, agriculture and the whole field of economy to increase production and lower production costs. But such reorganisation comes up against the heavy obstacles of monopoly, the obsolescence of existing plant and the heavy capital costs of new equipment. The base industries, coal, iron and steel, textiles, and also agriculture, all reveal critical problems.

There is an overall shortage of manpower, but it is felt with special force in the basic industries, as a result of generations of technical backwardness and low wages. The shortage is intensified by the withdrawal of over a million women from industry, and the rejection of a policy of equal pay to encourage the participation of women in industry.

The economic outlook for Britain is closely linked with the policy carried out in foreign and colonial affairs. The manpower shortage is in-

February, 1947

tenified so long as great military forces are maintained abroad to protect the interests of British imperialism in exploiting other peoples, and to prevent the growth of democracy.

Social: War conditions, with full employment and higher family earnings, coupled with rationing and price controls, and the stronger position of the trade unions, brought about a certain improvement in conditions for the working class. Since the war ended, however, these conditions have deteriorated, and the limitation of many needs, accepted as inevitable during the war, is becoming more oppressive for working people.

In fulfilment of Labor's programme, measures have been carried out which have brought social gains for the people through the raising of Old Age Pensions, the provision of Family Allowances, and extended Education and Health Services. The maintenance of rationing and price controls for necessities has protected the people from economic anarchy such as has developed in the United States.

However, there is a substantial fall in average family earnings; large-scale unemployment has reappeared in the distressed areas; many workers, especially women, are compelled to take jobs at reduced rates; prices and fares are rising, and the continued short supply of necessities is forcing workers to buy substitutes at high prices. As yet, there is no extension of education or of health services, although the need is greater than ever as a result of the war. The housing shortage is growing more acute in spite of the use of camps, requisitioned houses and the small number of new houses completed. The working class is conscious of the extent of licenses issued and Black Market building and repairs for the rich, while most Local Authorities do little to improve the state of existing working-class houses, and are even raising rents. In industry, with few exceptions, hours, wages and working conditions show no improvement; there are growing signs of a tendency on the part of the employers to attack privileges gained in the war years, to threaten workshop organisation and to victimise active shop stewards.

This general deterioration in conditions for working people is in striking contrast with the rising profits and luxurious living of the rich, whose influence and money enable them to evade controls, cut right across the housing programme by the selfish use of labor and material, and inflate prices and profits by monopoly and speculation.

Political: The electoral programme on which Labor was returned raised the immediate issues of democratic reforms in the economic and social field, the fight for which can further strengthen working class political consciousness and influence against monopoly and vested interests.

In its operation of this programme, however, the Labor Government, representing the outlook of Social Democracy, is not taking those decisive

measures which rouse the enthusiasm of the working class, and strengthen its fight against monopoly, but is seeking to apply its programme without inroads into capitalism and by agreement with vested interests, thus transforming it into a programme to reorganise capitalism at the cost of the working class. Its foreign policy is a continuation of Tory imperialism, and seeks to maintain imperialist interests, even where the strength of Liberation movements forces political concessions to the colonial peoples.

While these tendencies have aroused the concern of active sections of the labor movement, the response has been shown in increased militancy and not in surrender to moods of passive disillusionment or reaction. All attempts of Toryism to take advantage of current difficulties in order to stage a come-back have so far been unsuccessful, although note needs to be taken of the attempts of Mosley fascism to take advantage of the free play allowed it by the Government in order to regather its forces for a future offensive.

5. The Policy of the Communist Party.

In the present critical situation in Britain the Communist Party fights to promote all measures which will safeguard peace, win the rapid improvement of working and living conditions by the controlled use of Britain's resources, and strengthen the working class for the advance to Socialism.

The Communist Party supports the Labor Government against Toryism and the monopolists for the fulfillment of Labor's electoral programme. It opposes all policies which endanger peace, surrender to the monopolists and worsen the social and living conditions of the people.

The Communist Party fights for basic changes in the present policy of the Labor Government which are necessary to ensure the fulfillment of these aims.

Reconstruction: Only a resolute programme of overall economic planning, overriding the resistance of monopolist interests, can ensure the rapid improvement of the standards of the people and defeat the menace of a new economic crisis.

The Communist Party places in the forefront the need for the most rapid all-round increase of production. This will require strengthened Government action in close co-operation with the Trade Unions and the Co-operative Movement along the following lines:—

Drafting and publication of a production plan covering the most urgent needs and ensuring full use and expansion of industry in the Development Areas.

Government control of prices and supplies, and bulk purchases to safeguard production of priorities.

Immediate nationalisation of steel, railways and privately owned transport services, electricity and gas; compensation to be scaled down for big owners and paid in terminable annuities.

February, 1947

Physical and financial control of investment, to ensure its direction into useful channels.

The energetic development of all forms of agriculture, cutting through the rings controlling supplies and marketing, and ensuring full use of the country's land.

Planned control of exports and imports so as to ensure priority of essential imports for the people before luxury imports and develop trading relations, especially with those countries which are building planned economies.

Improved Living and Working Conditions: In order to win a rapid improvement in working and living conditions for the people, it is necessary to press forward on the following main issues:—

Higher wages in all sections of industry and trade, equal pay for women, the establishment of a £4/10/- minimum wage, and participation of all workers in the proceeds of greater productivity.

The 40 hours five-day week, with shorter hours for special sections of industry and for young workers. Minimum two weeks' paid holiday, in addition to paid Bank Holidays.

One hundred per cent. Trade Unionism, the strengthening of workshop organisations, defence of established workers' participation privileges. Effective trade union participation at all levels in the running of nationalised industries and in the operation of all Government plans and controls; workers' participation in solving production difficulties and in improving working conditions and the technique and methods of production.

Introduction, without delay, of the full benefits under the Government's social measures; speeding-up of educational advance.

Abolition of income tax on incomes under £250 a year, and raising of allowances on lower incomes.

No higher prices, fares or rents; imprisonment for speculators and black market operators.

Housing: Speed up the housing programme under a separate Ministry for Housing; stop licenses for luxury building and repairs; improve conditions for building workers, and draw them into the drive for houses; concentrate labor and materials on housing and repairs for working people; cut housing costs by nationalisation of the land and effective Government control of the building materials industry.

Foreign Policy: To defeat the aggressive imperialist plans and to bring Britain into association with democratic and progressive peoples throughout the world, the Communist Party sets out the following immediate aims:—

- (1) To re-establish effective co-operation of the three leading Powers — Britain, the Soviet Union and the United States —

and to build up international co-operation through the United Nations under the leadership of the three principal Powers.

- (2) To ensure that Britain supports all progressive policies in UNO and other international organisations, defending Socialist and democratic countries against interference by British and United States imperialism.
- (3) To end British subservience to United States imperialism and support for reaction in Europe, and to establish friendly political and economic relations with the Socialist Soviet Union and all countries whose Governments are seeking to develop their resources on a planned and stable basis.
- (4) To carry through the denazification of Germany, the break-up of the estates and trusts in the western zone, and establish a unified political and economic Germany based on democracy and peaceful progress.
- (5) To end British military, financial and political support of reaction in Greece.
- (6) To end British diplomatic and trade relations with Franco-Spain, and to give British support for U.N.O. action to end the Franco regime and establish a representative democratic Government in Spain.
- (7) To end British imperialist policy in India and all colonial and mandated territories, and enable the peoples of these countries to establish democratic governments and develop their countries for their own benefit.
- (8) The application of this policy also requires the immediate demobilisation of our present excessive armed forces; far-reaching democratic reforms as the basis for compulsory military service; and changes in the Foreign Office and Embassies, and the use of people with a consistent democratic outlook as Britain's representatives abroad.

6. Social Democracy and Communism.

The Labor Government attempts to justify its policy as a "Social-democratic middle way" between capitalism and Communism. To make this argument more convincing, it sets up a bogey of Communism as dictatorial, undemocratic and violent, and presents Social Democracy as the democratic and peaceful way of achieving Socialism.

Under cover of similar arguments, Social Democracy has never hesitated to support the use of violence against the militant sections of the working class or peoples struggling for their freedom, while it has condemned the forcible suppression by the peoples of the big landowners and capitalists who stand in the way of freedom.

February, 1947

Nowhere has the path of Social Democracy led to the achievement of Socialism. Its record in Europe has shown that, in country after country, it has led to the strengthening of capitalism and prepared the way for fascism.

In fact, there is no "middle way" to Socialism. There is only the way of struggle against the exploiting classes. That struggle is at all times democratic, embodying the will of the great majority of the people for a new order of society, for Socialism. Whether at any stage it is "peaceful" or "violent" depends not on the desires of the working class or its political parties, but on the resistance of the exploiting classes to the democratic will of the people.

The question at issue for the working class is not a "middle way." It is a Socialist way, as against a capitalist way. That is why the search for the "middle way" leads the Labor Government inevitably into surrender to capitalist interests and hostility to the democratic advance of the people.

This is shown in its foreign and colonial policy by its defence of British imperialist interests; its subservience to American imperialism, its support of reaction in Greece and Spain; its use of Indian troops in Indonesia and Iraq while proclaiming India's freedom; its maintenance of huge armed forces in the Far and Middle East; its settled hostility to the countries where the people, rejecting the "middle way" conception of Social Democracy, have won their freedom by the Socialist way, under the leadership of the Communist Party or the united Socialist and Communist Parties.

The "middle way" surrender to capitalist interests shows itself also in the Labor Government's home policy. Nationalisation is carried through slowly, by agreement with the capitalists and with excessive compensation which leaves the parasitic burden on the working class unchanged; the "best capitalist brains" are put in control of the nationalised industries. Instead of being tackled as an urgent military operation, housing is retarded by fear of interference with profit-making interests at every stage. Prices and profits are allowed to rise; while the workers are discouraged from fighting for wage increases and shorter hours.

Against this alleged "middle way" policy, which leads only back to the path of capitalism, the Communist Party, together with the best sections of the labor movement, is fighting for a Socialist policy; a rejection of British imperialist interests; withdrawal of troops and rapid demobilisation; friendship with the Socialist Soviet Union and the new democracies in Europe; freedom and help for the colonial peoples. At home, nationalisation on terms that reduce, and within a short term end, the parasitic burden on the people, and administration of the nationalised industries by Socialists. A planned programme that sets production the task of improving conditions for the people, and overrides the monopoly interests; higher wages, shorter hours and reduced prices.

These are the real issues of today for Britain's advance along the path to Socialism, as against the "middle way" that never leads out of the jungle of capitalism.

It is the special task of Marxism, of Communism, to bring clearness of understanding as to the class issues involved; to bring into the fight for a Socialist policy all supporters of democracy, progress and peace; and to strengthen working-class confidence in its ability to solve present problems in the Socialist way, and harness the gigantic new production forces released by modern science for the limitless advance of humanity.

7. How to Carry Forward the Fight.

The working class and progressive sections of the people have become increasingly aware, in the 18 months of the Labor Government, that the situation in Britain and of Britain in the world is not what they hoped and voted for in the General Elections. The struggles against rent increases, the squatters' movement, the fight for Trade Union organisation, the strikes for higher wages and against victimisation, show a growing understanding of the need for action to defend and improve working and living conditions. The votes cast at the Brighton Trades Union Congress for progressive policies also show growing appreciation of the class issues at home and abroad. At the same time, Trade Union and co-operative organisations continue to grow stronger.

The mood of the workers is increasingly militant; dissatisfaction with the reactionary trends in the Labor Government's policy, and with its failure to break through the vested interests that are holding up improvements in the lives of the working people, is overcoming passivity and becoming an active force.

The problem at present is how to develop this active force in the working class and strengthen its influence in order to bring about sharp changes in the Government's policy and direct it towards radical, social and economic reorganisation at home and alliance with the progressive peoples abroad. It is this decisive policy of carrying forward the fight against monopoly and its imperialist policies that alone guarantees the consolidation of victories won, and lays the basis for further advance towards Socialism. The alternative is surrender to monopoly and the "continuity" of Tory-imperialist policy, losing the working-class initiative and seeing the advance to Socialism overwhelmed by economic crisis and a new war.

There is increased political awareness within the Labor movement, and a growth of influence and activity by the progressive sections of the labor organisations. The task of Communist political leadership is to help this rising working-class militancy and political consciousness to develop and strengthen its influence in the labor movement.

February, 1947

This requires increasing vigilance and initiative of the Communist Party and quick reaction to events, so that in the industries and localities the correct issues are raised at the right moment and help given to the mass movement on those issues. This fight must be conducted on every issue of concern to the working class, whether local, home or foreign, economic or social or political, in response to events.

The Party must overcome tendencies to concentrate on limited issues, or to fail to give adequate response to issues that develop. For the development of such movements, which draw in all sections of the labor movement, steady and widespread propaganda is essential, explaining the issues in factory, street and working class organizations, exposing lies and distortions and showing how the workers' aims can be achieved. Party pamphlets and periodicals and the *Daily Worker* are invaluable for this purpose. The effective development of our propaganda requires the political education of our members on a greater scale than ever.

CHINA'S CIVIL WAR

RUPERT LOCKWOOD

"If you keep your men and lose some land, you can get the land back again. But if you keep the land and lose your men, you will lose both land and men."

Thus the famous Chinese Communist strategist, General Liu Po-cheng, explained the strategy of the Liberation troops now defeating the Chinese people's independence and social gains against Chiang Kai-shek's American-backed onslaughts. It's the kind of strategy that has driven Chiang Kai-shek to darker treachery and fear and America's General George Marshall to fury and frustration.

Knowing the future is theirs, Chinese democrats do not hesitate to load their goods and chattels on donkeys and ox-carts and sling babes on backs, to take refuge in the hills until the Liberation armies march in again. General Liu Po-cheng said in November: "Within the past three months in the Lunghai Railway area, we have exchanged 17 empty towns for more than 60,000 of Chiang's troops. It is said that Chiang considers this a good trade and intends to continue making such exchanges. That is fine. Let him keep on. Soon we will sum up our account with him. His offensive has already reached its peak, and when we then wipe out additional numbers of his troops, we will go over to a general counter-offensive."

The tasks of Chinese democrats have always been formidable. In our era, they have had to fight three revolutions rolled into one—a revolution against feudal landlordism, brutally supported by the war-lords; a revolution against foreign imperialism and its compradores; and a revolution against

United action, based on a clear understanding of the issues, can win important gains for the working class and bring effective pressure on the Government for a progressive policy. Communist initiative is the key to united action, and it is necessary to increase the membership and activity of the Communist Party to help the movement forward. The present mood of the workers, as well as the urgent issues of today, requires a mass Communist Party, with a high level of political understanding inspiring the whole working class, and preparing the ground for achieving unity of the labor movement, which remains the indispensable basis for far-reaching social changes.

The struggle between rising Socialism and moribund capitalism has reached a new stage. Britain is in a key position. The Communist Party has the responsibility, in association with all that is best in the labor movement, of winning Britain for a positive, progressive policy in this struggle, and so helping the British people themselves to move forward to Socialism.

the big native capitalists like the Kungs and Soongs.

After 100 years of imperialist looting, 30 years of intermittent civil wars and 14 years of Japanese invasion, beginning with the 1931 Manchurian "incident," China appeared sufficiently devastated, weakened and confused to be an easy target for the new power of American imperialism. General Marshall, President Truman's Special Envoy and former US Army Chief of Staff, organised over the Communist-led Liberation armies that were mobilised Europe over the Red Army in 1941. Toward the end of the war, American Lend-Lease equipment began to pour into China, some of it in blood and money. A few months after V-J Day, the Americans had equipped 57 Kuomintang divisions with tanks, bazookas, machine-guns, heavy artillery and motorised equipment. Fifty-seven II standards, when it is remembered that Field-Marshal Montgomery deployed 25 divisions for the invasion of Normandy.

The Soviet Red Army had not finished routing the Japanese Kwantung Army in Manchuria and Chiang began moving these American-equipped and broad coalition governments for China were cynically discarded by Chiang and his American sponsors. US planes, ships and trucks transported 300,000 of Chiang's civil war troops to North-East

February, 1947

China and 160,000 to North China, to name only two fronts. Others were transported by the Americans to Central, South and coastal China and to Manchuria. US Marines took over the guarding of railways, because Chiang's troops could not hold them against the Liberation guerrillas. This put the Americans in the category of Lines of Communication troops, serving as combatants in the foreign KMT army. These American troops have been in action against Chinese Liberation troops.

By all the rules of war, as known to Chiang and General Marshall, KMT administration, under American overlordship, should have been imposed on all China in months or weeks. But there is an imponderable force seldom understood by "military experts"—THE PEOPLE. General Marshall, in June, 1941, had used that corny phrase, "like a hot knife through butter," when asked how the Nazi armies would fare in Russia. The Soviet peoples blunted and broke the hot knife, and rammed the pieces down Hitler's throat in Berlin. Likewise in China the "imponderable force"—counted there in hundreds of millions—beat back the KMT-American attacks of 1945. Chiang and Marshall found no desire among the Chinese people to exchange their hard-won freedom for corrupt Kuomintang fascists and Wall Street colonialism. In Manchuria and Japanese-occupied China, Chiang hadn't even been able to find reliable Chinese to take over the administration when Japan surrendered. With American approval, Chiang called on the Japanese troops and quisling puppets to "maintain law and order" and continue ruling till his KMT thugs arrived. But the Communist-led partisans, who hadn't stayed a few hundred miles from the anti-Japanese war like Chiang's best divisions, were on the spot everywhere. Supported by the people, they overthrew this Japanese and puppet rule, tried the quislings, took what Japanese arms they could and established democratic governments. Factories were lifted, industry reorganised, the workers unionised, clothed and fed and the peasants freed from usurers and rent racketeers.

To meet this popular upsurge of China's millions, the American imperialists had to provide Chiang with still more aid. Already Wall Street had given its pliant KMT tool 1,335,632,000 dollars in postwar aid, which was about double the Lend-Lease aid given to KMT forces for their "war" on Japan. To this was added another 2,000 million dollars worth of supplies. US arms stockpiles came from Iwo Jima, Okinawa and the Philippines. Many of these arms had been mustered to equip a million Allied soldiers for the invasion of Japan. In quantity and modernity the arms should have been more than sufficient for General Marshall to smash "a bunch of goddam Chinese Reds," particularly as US Marines had already taken over Teing-tao, the Shantung capital liberated by the Communists, and had poured other troops and air units into areas like Shanghai, Tientsin and Peiping and

on to the vital rail lines. This was in flagrant violation of Chinese sovereignty, but for the big-time gamblers of Wall Street and the inbreds of the Kuomintang the stakes seemed sufficiently high to warrant acres in the sleeve.

Equipped, transported, fed and shoved forward by the Americans, the KMT troops made penetrations of the Liberated Areas, which had embraced nearly half China's population at one stage. The Communist-led troops could not prevent some advances, but, as Communist General Chu Teh explained, the KMT troops got the cities, only to have the Communist-led troops and the local populations close a trap around them. The KMT troops, mostly conscripted peasants, deserted in large numbers to the people's armies. KMT progress was dangerously slow, supply problems intensified, morale wore down. Marshall and Chiang decided to mobilise vast forces for an all-out assault on Yenan, the capital of the Communist-led Border Region, which had provided an embarrassing example of social progress to the Chinese living amid the hunger and chaos of KMT China. The latest information from the excellent bulletins of the Communist-led East River Column and Yenan showed the Communists confident of holding Yenan, but evacuating some of the population in case of accidents. Applying typical Chu Teh strategy, the Liberation troops launched victorious offensives in KMT zones that had been weakened to provide troops for the Yenan battles. There is every possibility of the initiative passing to the Communists and a series of heavy defeats for the KMT-American forces.

Hence General Marshall's angry outburst against the "provocative policies of the Communists" on his departure from China to become a militarist Secretary of State. Any policies which prevent China's 430 millions being turned into colonial slaves of Wall Street would be rated "provocative" by an American envoy who has seen billions of good dollars going down Chinese drains.

General Marshall made the curious admission that there is a "dominant reactionary group" in China's KMT Government. The US militarist hypocritically deplored military influences in Chiang's Government and declared that KMT cliques were "interested in the preservation of their own feudal control of China." Thus General Marshall admits that he has been backing with American money and arms a regime which he knows to be reactionary, feudal and anti-democratic.

The endangered American stake in China is already colossal. The 2,000 million dollars of arms in the big deal were given to Chiang in the knock-down price of 500 million dollars in return for virtual surrender of China's air sovereignty to the Americans. The Americans have just about pushed the British out of Shanghai and the rich Yangtze Valley, and, through KMT agencies,

February, 1947

are trying to edge the British out of the opium-smelling colony of Hong Kong. Vast Wall Street capital has been invested in China since the war's end.

The Americans made their economic grab in China so blatant that they roused the native Chinese merchants to revolt, and thus broadened the national front against Chiang and his interventionary backers. Chinese merchants and middle-class intellectuals are joining workers and peasants in organized opposition to the bartering of China on the Wall Street Stock Exchange.

When the Sino-American Trade and Commerce Treaty was signed three or four months ago, Chinese merchants got very hot under their silken gowns. The treaty granted "equal rights" to both countries in export and investment. As China has very few goods to export and no capital to invest abroad, the "equal rights" applied only to the mass-producing export industries of America.

Echoing the opinion of Shanghai merchants, the Shanghai **Ta Kung-pao** said: "Just as an unequal treaty with England after the Opium War governed the semi-colonial future of China for 100 years, so this Sino-American unequal treaty threatens to exercise the same influence over China's future for another 100 years." Speaking for the intellectual groups in KMT areas, the famous Chinese author Mao Tun said: "No treaty in the history of China has so nakedly and thoroughly damaged the sovereignty of the nation." Ma Hsu-lun, famous educator and former official of the Kuomintang Ministry of Education, said that "the result of this treaty will be that China travels the road to American colonization."

Ta Kung Pao revealed that the treaty does not even allow the myth of "equal rights." Articles 2 to 5 open all Chinese commercial and industrial enterprises to American investment, development and management. Articles 6 to 8 establish the right of free entry and exit to and from China for all American citizens. On the other hand, Chinese citizens will still be subject to the harsh restrictions of the American immigration laws and of various US State laws. Articles 9 to 21 prohibit customs barriers and protective tariffs—meaning a free go for US exporters. **Ta Kung Pao** points out that China has neither goods to export nor ships to carry exports.

This American policy, of course, is not as smart as it looks. American exporters are already driving Chinese merchants out of business and closing Chinese factories, by their flood of export goods. This leads to mass unemployment and lowered purchasing power. On top of this the American-sponsored civil war has disrupted communications and trade and impoverished the people, thus destroying the export market the Americans have paid so much to monopolize. The East River Column bulletin points out that this Marshall policy is against the true interests of the American people and the average American trader. "Chinese economists," says the bulletin, "say that making a silk purse from a sow's ear is a light task compared to making a good market of KMT-controlled China, where the entire economy is being crushed and the buying power of the people driven lower and lower by the semi-feudal and semi-colonial civil war regime."

Now even General Marshall fears an impending political and economic collapse in Kuomintang China. He leaves behind him a sticky mess in which America's name has been muddied in the eyes of the democratic world. Perhaps if General Marshall and his running dog Chiang had studied more closely the history of the "Long March" of the Chinese Red Army, he would have been less optimistic about pushing over Yenan and Chinese democracy with dollar bills and a mechanized Kuomintang horde. Chu Teh, Mao Tse-tung, Liu Po-cheng and other Communist leaders arrived in Yenan in the 'thirties, after the "Long March" of 6,000 miles. "Long March" battles were counted in hundreds and skirmishes in thousands. Only 10,000 Communist troops were left, with two rounds of ammunition per man.

The total Border Region population supporting them was only 300,000 and there was practically no industry. Chiang sent 100,000 of his crack troops against this footsore, bleeding remnant of Communist heroes. The 10,000 Communists—plus the people—smashed the 100,000. Today, the Yenan Border Region is eight times greater in size, four times greater in population. In addition the Communist-led armies hold vast areas of Manchuria, of North and Central China and they hold formidable "islands" of territory far below the Yangtze.

Chiang may have the empty shells of cities; the Americans may have their military and economic bases. But the Communists have the people of China—the most impregnable base of all.

February, 1947

THE SHAPE OF WORLD POLITICS

EUGENE VARGA, Moscow

THIS essay does not propose to analyse the causes of the Second World War. I shall limit myself to mention of the fact that the Second World War differed from the first in that it did not begin between countries similar in type. On one side stood the fascist aggressors and on the other the democratic countries, while on the democratic side there were both highly developed capitalist countries and the Soviet Union. Obviously this circumstance was bound to have a tremendous effect on the whole domestic and foreign policy of the capitalist countries.

The fact that the Soviet Union and highly developed capitalist countries were together in one group of powers fighting against the fascist aggressors meant that the struggle between the two systems in the democratic camp eased up temporarily, was suspended, although this, of course, did not mean the end of the struggle. At the same time the struggle between the two systems entered its sharpest phase when the fascist aggressors attacked the Soviet Union. The allies helped the Soviet Union but it cannot be said that in doing so they had forgotten the difference in social systems. One example of this is the manner in which the atomic bomb was kept secret. In the sphere of domestic politics the Communist Parties of the countries in the democratic camp, Great Britain, America, etc., in view of the just nature of the war, helped their governments against the fascists, urged them to open the second front, which was opposed by the reactionary elements in the allied countries. They defended their people from the danger of German fascism.

It goes without saying that the Anglo-American contradictions—the major contradictions between imperialists—were relegated to the background while the contradictions between the democratic countries and the fascist aggressors came into the foreground. The Anglo-American contradictions did not disappear, however, and even during the war the struggle between America and America continued. During the war the Americans took good care that the goods exported from Great Britain did not contain more than ten per cent of those items which Great Britain obtained by lend-lease. During the war American capital tried—and not without success—to drive British capital out of the position it had held in the Latin American countries, and to obtain markets in India and the British dominions. The Americans included in their black list of firms not only purely Argentine firms but also enterprises in which British capital played a part. In the Middle East the struggle for oil also continued during the war.

After this war the struggle for the preservation of the capitalist system once more assumed the proportions of a major problem in the domestic

policy of the capitalist countries, just as it had after the First World War. The bourgeoisie is scared by the general leftward trend in the working-class movement of the whole world since the war. The leftward trend has developed to varying degrees and takes different forms in different countries. If we examine such leading capitalist countries as Great Britain and the US we see that the leftward trend took the form primarily of a strengthening of the reformist labor movement. In Great Britain the Labor Party won a victory in the parliamentary elections. In the US there have been mass strikes and the trade union movement has become stronger. Although the Communist Parties of these countries have grown, they are still not an important factor in domestic politics. The capitalist system in these countries was not shaken as a result of the war. The reason for this is clear. The bourgeoisie of those countries that emerged victorious from the war was not discredited, the state apparatus remained unchanged and the army was even increased in strength as compared with the pre-war army. One of the characteristic features of post-war policy is the increased militarism of the Anglo-Saxon countries, especially of the US, which has become the most powerful military state in the capitalist world.

The situation is quite different in the countries of the European continent. The bourgeoisie of these countries has been discredited. Within the life span of one generation the peoples of the countries in continental Europe have experienced two wars. Now the people are hungry; naturally it is primarily the industrial workers, intellectuals, the townspeople, who suffer hunger and not the bourgeoisie and well-to-do farmers. Under such circumstances a radical leftward swing of the working class and the working people in general was inevitable. Another factor which must be added to this is the marked polarization which took place in capitalist society during the war. Millions of middle class people, craftsmen, shop-keepers, lower bourgeois ranks, lost their independence during the war and became workers. Inflation during and after the war is devaluating the savings of the middle classes. The tendency towards polarization, the formation of two camps, the big bourgeoisie and its immediate adherents on the one hand and the workers, clerks, intellectuals—those who possess no property—on the other, is a very strong one in modern society. This tendency was reflected in the defeat of typical middle class parties in town and country, as, for example, the Radical Socialists in France and the Liberals in Great Britain.

The bourgeoisie of the countries that suffered German occupation was discredited to a greater extent than others because of the fact that in the main the bigger bourgeoisie of France, Belgium,

Holland, Czechoslovakia and Hungary collaborated with the fascist occupants. There were, of course, isolated exceptions; there were capitalists in all countries who took part in the resistance movement. In general, however, the bourgeoisie collaborated with the occupants and this was, in addition to the military defeat, the chief factor of its discrediting.

Apart from this, however, there are a number of important new political factors which distinguish the present situation from that obtaining after the First World War. One of these factors is the changed role of the Communist Parties of Europe.

The Communist Parties of Europe achieved great popularity because of the leading part they played in the organisation of the resistance movement in all European countries. "The growth of the influence of the Communist Parties," said Stalin in an interview with a Pravda correspondent on March 16, 1946, concerning Churchill's speech, "cannot be regarded as fortuitous. It is a perfectly normal phenomenon. The influence of the Communists has grown because in the trying years of fascist domination in Europe the Communists showed themselves to be reliable, courageous, self-sacrificing fighters against the fascist regime and for the freedom of the people."

It is enough to examine only the data of the elections that have taken place in the European countries since the war to convince ourselves of the tremendous growth of Communist Party influence in Europe. In France the Communist Party is the strongest political party in the country; at the elections on Oct. 21, 1945, and July 2, 1946, the Communists obtained over 5,000,000 votes. In Italy the Communist Party numbers some 2,000,000 members and is one of the leading political parties in the country. The influence of the Communists has increased very considerably in Holland, Belgium, Norway and Luxemburg. In Czechoslovakia the Communists polled 2,700,000 votes and have become the strongest party in the country. In Hungary 800,000 people voted for the Communist Party. In almost all the countries of continental Europe the Communists are participating in the government and are playing a leading part in restoring the economy of their countries. Lastly, outstanding achievements have been made by the Communist Parties of Poland, Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia and Bulgaria, where they are the leading force in the People's and Homeland Fronts.

In all those countries which suffered Hitlerite occupation and where the big bourgeoisie collaborated with the occupants the resistance movement was inevitably directed both against the occupants and against the big bourgeoisie of the country concerned. The Communists were successful because of the policies which their parties are now pursuing in all countries and which take into consideration the experiences of the First World War. The Communist Parties defend the interests of all working people

—factory and office workers, peasants and intellectuals. Such a policy makes impossible the old reactionary tactics of isolating Communists from the masses.

The second new factor which distinguishes the present situation from that obtaining after the First World War is the radical change in the position of the Soviet Union and its role in world politics. The growth of the influence and prestige of the U.S.S.R. as a world power is something that even the enemies of that country have had to admit.

Since the end of the Second World War the main line in the domestic and foreign policy of the capitalist countries is once more, as it was after the First World War, the defence of the capitalist system.

It must be mentioned that this line was followed by Great Britain while the war was still in progress. Reactionary exile bourgeois governments found asylum in Great Britain. Preparatory work was carried out to enable them to return to their countries after liberation as the lawful bourgeois rulers.

After the liberation of a number of West European countries the question was raised of disarming the Partisans and of the possibility of excluding the leaders of the resistance movement from the newly-formed governments. Naturally it is much more difficult today than it was after the First World War openly to defend the capitalist system in the form in which it existed before the war. It is true that in America there are some influential groups and individuals, like Eric Johnson, Senator Vandenberg and those behind them, who preach a return to pre-war capitalism. These, however, are exceptions. In general it is everywhere admitted that a profound reform of the capitalist system is essential; everywhere there are ideological tendencies such as the striving for planned economy under capitalism, the introduction of social insurance, the increase of state capitalism, etc.

In Great Britain, as we know, a start has been made on the nationalisation of some of the more important branches of industry. The very fact that the bourgeoisie itself is forced to begin nationalising the means of production is an admission that the system of private ownership is already outmoded. Naturally there is a great difference between nationalisation in Great Britain and in those countries of Eastern Europe that might be called countries with a new type of democracy. The remnants of feudalism in these countries in the shape of large landed estates have been abolished, a considerable part of the means of production has become state property and the state itself is not an apparatus of the rich for the suppression of the working people, but operates in the interests of the latter.

In countries of the old type of democracy, such as Great Britain, nationalisation does not bring any changes to the distribution of the national wealth and the national income because the owners are receiving compensation which is about equal to

their former incomes. In the new type of democratic countries, on the contrary, nationalisation means profound changes in the distribution of the national income at the expense of the former owners of the nationalised means of production.

What methods are at present being used in the struggle for the preservation of the capitalist system, first and foremost in Europe?

First, efforts are being made to increase reformism in the working class movement and once more turn the Social Democratic Party and the labor movement of Germany, Hungary, Italy and France into the chief social support of the bourgeoisie.

In the European countries an intense struggle is developing between progressive and reactionary forces for control of the Social Democratic movement. This is the major content of the domestic policy of the capitalist countries. At the same time it naturally implies a struggle inside each of the social democratic parties, between the left and right wings, between the masses of Social Democratic workers who are much more inclined to cooperate with the Communists, and the reformist leaders of the Social Democratic parties who are trying to give Social Democracy its old pre-war forms.

This struggle is to be seen most clearly in Germany. A considerable part of the Social Democratic Party has rejected the former policy of the party and has spoken in favor of unity with the Communists. On April 21 and 22, 1946, there was a unity congress of the Social Democratic and Communist Parties of Germany at which a single working class party was formed — the Socialist Unity Party of Germany. The vast majority of the Social Democrats in the Soviet zone of occupation favored the union of the two working class parties. Despite the counteraction undertaken by the British and American occupation authorities, the union of Social Democrats and Communists in the Soviet occupation zone met with a lively response in Western Germany.

The creation of a united working-class party in Germany is a serious blow to the reformist movement. It is, therefore, only natural that all reactionary elements should have declared war on the new party. The ruling circles of Great Britain and the United States came out immediately against the union of the Social Democrats and Communists and are giving very vigorous support to the group of reactionary Social Democratic leaders headed by Schuhmacher who are trying to revive, in the western zones of Germany, the old, reformist Social Democracy for the defence of the capitalist system of society. It is significant that the majority of the old, compromised Social-Democratic leaders such as Severing, Noske, Paul Loebe and other tried and tested supporters of the bourgeoisie are connected with this group. The British press gives its preference to this wing of social-democracy. On April 26th, 1946, the London Economist said: "The

Social Democrats are closer to the British conception of democracy in their aims and their methods than anybody else. . . . In our opinion the first urgent decision to be made is to afford open support to the Social Democratic Party in the British occupation zone." (Retranslated from the Russian.)

There is no doubt that the further development of domestic policy in the capitalist countries depends to a considerable degree on the outcome of this struggle for the control of Social Democracy and the struggle within the Social Democratic parties.

Capitalism's second line of defence is in increasing the influence of religion and the church. The Catholic Church, headed by the Pope, is creating something in the nature of a "Catholic international." The Vatican recently conferred the title of cardinal on thirty-two prominent Catholics in various countries in order to increase its influence in those countries. The same striving also characterises the Protestant Church. Definite attempts have also been made to use the Moslem religion as a means of political struggle. This is to be seen most clearly in India.

In those European countries where the extreme Right reactionary parties have been forbidden the tactics of the bourgeoisie are rather unique. In these countries the bourgeoisie tries to influence elements farthest to the right in the Left parties and tries to get into its own hands the leadership of those parties and win for them a majority in the country. A classic example of this is the tactics pursued by the reactionaries during the last elections in Hungary. The Left party closest to the Right in Hungary is the Smallholders Party. After the elections it was seen that in Budapest, in districts where there is not a foot of land suitable for tilling, this party obtained the majority of the votes. The whole bourgeoisie and those who still follow the bourgeoisie voted for it.

Capitalism's third line of defence, apparent so far only in veiled forms, is the encouragement of the fascist movement. If it is true that fascism is the political expression of the deepening crisis of capitalism it is to be expected that fascism will be revived. Lenin pointed out that the rule of monopoly capitalism must inevitably engender reaction. In an article entitled a "Caricature of Marxism" he wrote: "The political superstructure for the new economy, monopoly capitalism (imperialism is monopoly capitalism) is a swing from democracy to reaction. With free competition goes democracy. With monopoly capitalism goes political reaction."

In the capitalist countries today there is undoubtedly a certain revival of political reaction and fascism. There are fascist countries like Spain and Portugal. Apart from that there are illegal fascist movements in countries where fascism formerly ruled—Germany, Italy, Hungary, etc.

There are also undoubted signs of a revival of the fascist movement in the democratic countries. Evidence of this is to be found in the activities of the fascist party in Great Britain, the Ku Klux Klan and other fascist groups in America. In Greece, where policy is actually controlled by the British, the rule of monarchist reactionaries has been established after dozens of changes of government; these reactionaries are difficult to distinguish from fascists either subjectively or objectively.

In countries with the new type of democracy the revival of fascism is, naturally, made difficult by the fact that the land reforms have done away with the landlord class, and the nationalisation of the major means of production has undermined the power of the bourgeoisie. If we add to this the fact that state power in these countries is in the hands of progressive forces it becomes clear that the revival of fascism there is a matter of great difficulty.

The domestic policy of the capitalist countries at this stage is, as always, closely intertwined with foreign policy.

Methods of struggle against the Soviet Union are naturally different from those employed after the First World War. "Intervention" in the old sense of the word is impossible. The reactionary forces in various countries, however, are conducting an intensive campaign against the Soviet Union, are attempting to isolate her and build up an anti-Soviet bloc. In his May Day Order for 1946, Stalin said: "While developing peaceful socialist construction we must not for a minute forget the intrigues of international reaction that are pregnant with plans for a new war. We must remember the admonition of the great Lenin to the effect that in going over to peaceful labor we must remain constantly on the qui vive and preserve the armed forces and the defence potential of our country like the apple of our eye."

In his statement made on May 27th, 1946, Molotov pointed to some of the characteristic tendencies in British and American post-war policy which had come to the fore during the preparation of the peace treaties. "It has become clear," said Molotov, "that the so-called 'peace offensive' proclaimed in certain American circles is sometimes expressed simply as a desire to impose the will of two governments on the government of a third state."

Molotov repulsed the attempts of the reactionary forces to belittle the importance of the Soviet Union and underestimate its role in the post-war world. "In certain foreign circles," he said, "there is a desire to oust the Soviet Union from the honorable place which it by right occupies in world affairs and to undermine the world prestige of the USSR. This can be the action only of short-sighted circles and it is doomed to failure. They cannot understand that the Soviet state that bore the main burden of the struggle for the salvation of mankind

from the tyranny of fascism has every title to occupy the position it does today in international affairs, a position which is in the interest of the equality of all countries, great and small, in their striving for peace and security."

The way the British reactionaries are making use of the right wing of Social Democracy in Europe for the struggle against the USSR is typical of the policy of the bourgeoisie. Naturally the Labor Party and the Labor government are the most suitable media for using this wing of Social Democracy for the purpose of achieving the foreign political aims of the British bourgeoisie. In this respect the Labor government is more useful to the British bourgeoisie than a Conservative government would be. To this we must add the fact that whereas members of the Labor Party sometimes came out against the policy of the Conservative government and in this way formed a potential opposition, the Conservative Party has no grounds for opposing Bevin's foreign policy. The British workers, of course, do not approve this reactionary policy of Bevin and the Labor government. This disapproval finds expression in an opposition to Bevin's policy within the Labor Party parliamentary group.

The struggle between the two systems is not the only feature of foreign policy in the capitalist countries today. Imperialist contradictions between the big capitalist countries, notably between Great Britain and the United States, are reviving despite the fact that on a number of international questions these two powers act as a common diplomatic bloc. The British-American contradictions, which were the basic contradictions of the capitalist world before the Second World War, or rather before German fascist aggression became a menace to Great Britain and the US, have since the defeat of Germany again become the most important contradictions within the capitalist world. American policy is today aimed primarily at smashing the British colonial empire and winning equal conditions for American capital in the competitive struggle throughout the whole world. This is its major aim.

The desire to put an end to the British, French and Netherlands empires takes the most varied forms. One manifestation of this during the war was the project for an Anglo-American alliance, the proposal for joint trusteeship over all colonies, etc. This tendency sometimes even assumes comical forms. A certain American publicist recently wrote a book in which he sharply criticised British, French and Netherlands colonial policy. After such criticism it was to be expected that he would propose giving the colonial peoples their independence. Instead, however, the author of the book said that the colonial peoples are not yet ripe for independence and proposed that they should themselves choose their trustees; but they were not to have the right to select that imperialist power which at present rules them—that is, British colonies, for

example, could not select Great Britain. The author assumes that all would naturally choose the Americans because they are so well-intentioned toward the colonies and can ensure their prosperity.

The movement against the colonial system has become stronger. The fact that the British, French countries play an important role in the colonial people no longer feel their former fear of them. The colonial peoples took part in the armed struggle side by side with the troops of some imperialist countries against other countries; they witnessed the defeat and capture of American, British and Dutch soldiers.

Economic causes are also having their effect in stimulating the anti-imperialist movement. Some of the countries became economically much stronger during the war, some of them became independent of Great Britain financially, some of them became Great Britain's creditors. It goes without saying that opinion in the Soviet Union is in favor of granting the just demands of the colonial peoples.

The plan for a western bloc is also connected with the colonial problem: the idea of a western bloc, which would unite in one political alliance Great Britain, France, Belgium, Holland, Portugal

and perhaps some of the Scandinavian countries, is directed primarily against the Soviet Union and is an attempt to re-establish the notorious cordon sanitaire — this time not on the frontiers of the Soviet Union, where it is now politically impossible owing to the presence of a number of friendly countries, but in western Europe.

It must also be remembered that there is another side to the western bloc. A western bloc composed of Great Britain, France, Belgium, Holland and Portugal would embrace ninety-five per cent. of the colonies of the whole world. The establishment of the bloc would be an attempt to defend the colonies against the efforts of the United States to smash the old colonial regime and achieve an economic penetration into the colonial territories and would also be an attempt to strengthen methods of counteracting the national liberation movement in the colonies.

Naturally within the limits of this article it is only possible to outline the most important features of domestic and foreign policy in the period of the general crisis of capitalism. A fuller elaboration of this theme, especially of the political consequences of the Second World War, will require a series of special essays.



BOOK REVIEW



ON LENIN (STALIN).

W. A. WOOD, M.A.

NICELY timed for the twenty-third Lenin Anniversary comes this collection of Stalin speeches (Stalin, On Lenin, Pioneer, 6s) in which the greatest statesman and military strategist of our time tells us his teacher and leader.

Lenin's stature grows with the years. Every new addition to the mighty Soviet structure arouses more interest in the man who laid the foundations. In this volume Stalin pictures him as the Communist Party's founder, organiser and theorist, as successful social scientist and as the ideal workers' member of parliament.

The short speech to higher educational workers is particularly good. Lenin is here shown as a scientist with the same courageous and revolutionary qualities as Galileo and Darwin. This may be a new idea to some of our bourgeois scientists who are ready to be scientific about everything except class and social relationships, which they shun as "politics."

In telling of Lenin, Stalin naturally shows what sort of a man he is himself. No honest reader of these speeches could see their author as either a dictator or a mystery man. Stalin could not so

earnestly and persistently emphasise Lenin's, and his own, faith in the mass of the people if he were not, heart and soul, one of the people himself.

"Here, sitting at this table," Stalin says to the educational workers, "are Comrades Stakhanov and Papanin. They are unknown in the scientific world, they have no scientific degrees. . . . But who does not know that in their practical work they have upset the existing standards, which were established by well known scientists and technologists?" A notable remark by someone pictured abroad as a cast-iron dogmatist, spurning the multitude.

The book is beautifully printed, illustrated and bound, another affront to the bourgeois anarchists who will have it that nothing can be "really revolutionary" unless it is circulated furtively on ragged newspaper.

They could still get Communist literature that way in Spain, Greece or Cyprus, for instance. But in the workers' State, nothing is too good for the workers, so this volume is pleasant to handle and will ornament any bookshelf.



Questions & Answers

conducted by
L. H. GOULD

With reference to the **MANIFESTO OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY** which was written exactly 100 years ago (1847), what was its central teaching, and what are the main practical lessons for us today?—M. Stokes.

The central teaching of the Manifesto is "the theory of the class struggle and of the world-historic revolutionary role of the proletariat as the creator of a new Communist society" (Lenin).

Brilliantly applying their method of historical materialism, Marx and Engels outlined social evolution from primitive Communism to capitalism. The capitalist mode of production, though it had "accomplished wonders far surpassing Egyptian pyramids, Roman aqueducts and Gothic Cathedrals," entailed no less deprivation and suffering for the masses than earlier social forms. More than that. The gigantic means of production and exchange of capitalism brought into the world "an epidemic that, in all earlier epochs would have seemed an absurdity—the epidemic of over-production"; the masses starved in the midst of plenty. But capitalism also produced its own grave-diggers, the proletariat, or industrial working class.

All previous revolutions in history had resulted in the toilers exchanging one set of exploiters for another. But with capitalism, mankind had now advanced to the stage where the proletariat, in winning its own emancipation, would at the same time end forever the exploitation of man by man. Engels summarises:

"In every historical epoch, the prevailing mode of economic production and exchange, and the social organisation necessarily following from it, form the basis upon which is built up, and from which alone can be explained, the political and intellectual history of that epoch; that consequently the whole history of mankind (since the dissolution of primitive tribal society, holding land in common ownership) has been a history of class struggles, contests between exploiting and exploited, ruling and oppressed classes; that the history of these class struggles forms a series of revolutions in which, now-a-days, a stage has been reached where the exploited and oppressed class—the proletariat—cannot attain its emancipation from the sway of the exploiting and ruling class—the bourgeoisie—all emancipating society at large from all exploitation, oppression, class distinctions and class struggles."

The main lessons for today are fundamentally the same as when the Manifesto was written. These cover working-class unity, international solidarity, State power, purity of revolutionary doctrine, and the Party of the Revolution. Emphasis must naturally be placed on the method of applying the teachings to the current forms and conditions of the class struggle, that is, after a century of development of the working-class movement.

Unity. The call to struggle in the Manifesto is given under the slogan of Unity. The united working class, said Lenin, is invincible. Not only do the workers outnumber the exploiters, but they are the banner-bearers of the future. In the first decades of capitalism the workers were almost wholly disunited and unorganised. The principal reason was the competition for jobs among the workers. "The organisation of the proletarians into a class, and consequently into a political party, is continually being upset . . . but it ever rises up again, stronger, firmer, mightier." Competition for jobs remains to this day a basic factor in splitting the workers; it is important to note how capitalism, the capitalist State and the various agencies of the capitalists operate to maintain that disunity through job competition (the industrial reserve army, Arbitration Court awards designed to create friction between the workers, etc.).

But the main force today in preventing unity is Social-Democracy, reformism, Labor's right wing. A century ago, disunity bore a certain elemental character; today, the barrier to unity, to the United Front, is the deliberate policy of reformism, the "social bulwark of capitalism." Hence Stalin's declaration that the fight against reformism "was and remains an essential preliminary condition for a successful fight against capitalism."

Internationalism. The Manifesto is summarised in its concluding sentence, "Workers of all lands, unite!" The Manifesto describes how capitalism shapes the world into a single pattern of economic life, and how national one-sidedness and aloofness become more and more impossible . . . "the intellectual creations of individual nations become clearly made a historically progressive contribution to social development. But another tendency arises with the advance of capitalist production, namely, bourgeois nationalism with its "gloomy picture of national enmity, inequality, oppression, conflict, war, civilised brutality, both towards each other and towards non-sovereign peoples" (Stalin). The

proletariat of each country, states the Manifesto, "must first of all settle matters with its own bourgeoisie." But victory at home is impossible without linking up with the struggles of the toilers in all other capitalist and colonial lands. The emancipated peoples of Czarist Russia, and the present national and colonial revolutionary liberation movements are preparations for the "future amalgamation of the toilers of all countries into a single world economic system" (Stalin).

State Power. "The first step in the revolution by the working class is to raise the proletariat to the position of ruling class, to win the battle for democracy." So wrote Marx and Engels in the Manifesto. They had not at that time fully clarified their views on the all-important question of the State. Following the revolutions of the year 1848 and the Paris Commune (1871), Marxism taught the workers that they could not simply take over the bourgeois state machinery; they must "smash" it, and set up a new proletarian State apparatus. But the Manifesto was already clear upon the essential issue—the proletariat must seize full political power; as Lenin put it: "The State, i.e., the proletariat organised as the ruling class, is precisely the dictatorship of the proletariat."

The important task today is to search out the "forms of transition or approach to the proletarian revolution" (Lenin). Every country will obviously require an approach different from the road to the proletarian revolution in Russia. Recent events in Europe and Asia provide many rich lessons.

The Party. The Short History C.P.S.U. states: "Marx and Engels taught that the industrial proletariat is the most revolutionary and therefore the most advanced class in capitalist society, and that only a class like the proletariat could rally around itself all the forces disoriented with capitalism

and lead them in the storming of capitalism. But in order to vanquish the old world and create a new, classless society, the proletariat must have its own working-class party, which Marx and Engels called the Communist Party."

A vital revolutionary task that faced the workers after the death of Marx and Engels was the creation of the Party of the Revolution. It was to be a party "of a new type," new in the sense that it differed completely from the opportunist parties of the Second International. Lenin, who based himself wholly on Marxist teachings, was the founder of the Party, the Communist Party (and later of the Third International). It is the vanguard Party, guided by revolutionary theory, and advancing the cause of the workers by correct and resolute struggle against capitalism.

Purity of Revolutionary Doctrine. In the Manifesto, Marx and Engels settled accounts with various "socialist" trends of that time. These doctrinaire and reactionary movements ("True Socialism," "Bourgeois Socialism," etc.) strengthened capitalism by preventing the real development of the Socialist revolution. Some are still being peddled, under new guises of course, e.g., "peace in industry," the fascist-like "corporate state" so beloved of the R.C. Hierarchy, and others. The relentless struggle of the Communist Parties against Social-Democracy and other enemy ideological trends shows that the revolutionary vigilance of the founders of Communism has been fully maintained by their successors.

The fruits of the Manifesto are seen in the Soviet Union, in the mass and mature Communist Parties all over the world, in the advancing tide of struggle by the masses, and in the resultant enormous decline in the power of imperialism.

The best way to celebrate the centenary anniversary is to use the Manifesto, as never before, as a weapon in the final fight against the exploiters.

PREHISTORY

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

SOME day we shall have a readable history of Britain which will tell us how the ordinary man has lived at different times.

It is unlikely that there will be many names in it before the time of Caesar's invasion, which occurred just 2,000 years ago, though we do know the names of a few local British "kings" before his time.

Clearly there must have been a considerable political organisation, and widespread peace, to allow the transport of large blocks of stone from South Wales to Stonehenge on Salisbury Plain.

But all we know about the people of those days is the things they made, and their bones.

In fact, prehistory is the history of human production.

Fortunately, it turns out that if we know enough about production, we know the most important things about a people. Their social organisation depends in the long run on their daily work, and not the other way round.

One of the landmarks in English prehistory was the introduction of metals.

The first metal used in Britain was bronze, and the first bronze objects which can be dated with any certainty are found in the graves of a people whom archaeologists have called the Beaker Folk, after the earthenware vessels which they made. The Beaker Folk, who had rounder heads than the earlier inhabitants, came to eastern England from Europe, especially from what is now Belgium.

Another group of colonists, who introduced the custom of building with large stones, came northward along the Atlantic coast, but the Beaker Folk came from Central Europe.

The route by which their culture spread has been traced largely by Yugoslav and Czech archaeologists. It came up the valley of the Danube.

One of the main sites whose excavation has cleared up the story is at Vinca, a little below Belgrade, which was excavated by workers organised by Professor Vassits, of Belgrade. Vinca was occupied long enough to leave about 25 feet of rubbish. The first inhabitants lived in holes in the ground walled with wattle, and probably roofed with hides. They used stone-bladed hoes for gardening and horn harpoons for fishing.

But they made pottery which shows that their culture came from the south-east. For example the lids of their pots often had rough human faces. This type of lid is quite common in what is called Troy II, a city which was destroyed about 1800 B.C., and on whose ruins was built the city that Agamemnon and Achilles besieged. As time went on Vinca continued to reflect the civilisation of Troy. Later on its people had very beautiful images of a mother with a child, probably a goddess, and metal objects like those found in various parts of Greece.

The main reason for this northward expansion was the existence of gold in Transylvania, and later the discovery of tin in Czechoslovakia, which was used to harden copper into bronze round the Eastern Mediterranean.

The Danube was gradually opened up for navigation, and a fair number of objects which are commonplace in the ruins of Troy II have been found in Czechoslovakia. They include bronze pins, earthenware mugs, earrings of bronze wire, and so on.

Perhaps the most remarkable evidence of prehistoric trade in this region is the discovery, in graves at Lengyel, in Hungary, of ornaments made from the shell of a clam which lives in the Indian Ocean.

From Czechoslovakia these first users of bronze spread to the lower Rhine Valley and into Belgium. And from Belgium some of them sailed or rowed to Britain.

On their way through the forests of Germany they had lost a good deal of their culture. But they were enormously ahead of the original inhabitants. The Belgians whom they replaced had no domestic animals or plants, and were still chipping and not even polishing stone implements.

This migration of culture was certainly not organised conquest, though no doubt there was fighting, as there always is when agriculturists replace hunters.

Britain, 2,000 years ago, was not in any sense a Yugoslav colony. But we did get a very important element in our culture from Yugoslavia.

One reason why civilisation spread from the Mediterranean to Central Europe, up the Danube rather than across the Alps, was that four or five thousand years ago the Alpine glaciers and snow-fields came down a good deal lower than they do now, so that it was almost impossible to get from Italy to Austria.

Another reason was that along the Danube valley they are many patches of the fine soil called loess, which does not readily grow forests, but is easily cultivated, and forms for example the wheat fields of Ukraine and Hungary. So men could row or sail up the river and start a primitive kind of wheat growing without having to clear the forest.

Finally there were the gold of Transylvania, the tin of Bohemia, and the copper of Slovakia. There was similar mineral wealth in Spain, which was early opened up for trade with the Eastern Mediterranean, but not in France.

Later on, when iron⁸ began to be smelted, iron ore was found in many places, and the Danube became much less important. Moreover, tin was discovered in Cornwall, and a trade route from Britain to the Mediterranean by way of Western France was established.

Most of the facts of which I have written were discovered in the last 30 years. Doubtless many details will be filled in when archaeology starts up again in Yugoslavia, though I do not know how much, if anything, is left of the Belgrade museum.

It is perhaps timely to mention these facts, because we are all taught in school about the influence on British civilisation of Greece, Rome, Palestine, and so on. Probably not one person in a thousand realises that we owe a very considerable debt to the countries of central Europe.

It is likely that we are going to learn a good deal from the Czechs and the Yugoslavs in the next generation. The Czechs in particular are building Socialism in a way which we may find easier to follow in some of its details than the Russian way.

Our first metallurgy came from Bohemia, though not of course directly.

Our great English mediaeval reformer, Wycliffe, was a disciple of the Czech, Hus, and perhaps once more we shall learn a lesson in civilisation from the peoples of the Danube basin.

(World Copyright Reserved.)

