

COMMUNIST REVIEW

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

No. 68.

APRIL, 1947.

Price 6d.

LIST OF CONTENTS

THE WAY FORWARD	R. Dixon	483
THE SOUTH AUSTRALIAN STATE ELECTIONS	L. Aarons	485
EMPIRE COMMUNIST CONFERENCE DECLARATION		487
SHIFT OF POWER PROPS IN INDIA	Rupert Lockwood	489
STATE ELECTIONS AND THE A.C.P.	H. B. Chandler	491
TROTSKYISM — INSTRUMENT OF FASCISM	Etienne Fajon	493
FIGHT FOR THE ABORIGINES	T. Wright	498
DISSENTING SOVIET JUDGMENT AT NUREMBERG		501
CONFERENCE OF SYDNEY COMMUNISTS	S. Purdy	503
CONTROVERSY ON "BASIC CRITICISM"		505
COMMENT ON KEYNESIAN THEORIES	I. Trachtenberg	506
BOOK REVIEW	Julio Latter	508
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS	L. H. Gould	510
ANAESTHETICS	Prof. J. B. S. Haldane, F.R.S.	511

ORGAN OF THEORY AND PRACTICE OF THE AUSTRALIAN
COMMUNIST PARTY

Editor L. L. Sharkey

THE WAY FORWARD

R. DIXON

WE have always maintained that one of the important reasons for the economic policy of the Chifley Government, which is lowering standards of living in this country, is that in the post-war world Australian capitalists would be faced with more competition on both the Australian and overseas markets. Already the shape of the new trade war and its effects on Australia are becoming apparent.

An International Trade Conference to be held in Geneva in April will discuss Empire preference, tariffs, restrictions on imports and subsidies to help develop industries, and these are all matters that concern Australia.

The American Government, in the interests of Yankee Imperialism, are determined to force open the Empire market for the products of American industry. They will seek to have Empire preference abolished, and Australian tariffs reduced. They want equal access with the Dominions to the British market and the freer entry of American goods to Australia and other Empire countries.

Tariffs, preferences, import restrictions and currency manipulation are all methods the capitalist class have resorted to in order to combat trade rivals, promote trade wars, and to increase their profits. Nevertheless, any sudden reversal of these policies under pressure from American imperialism can only have serious results for Australia. Export industries would be hard hit, unless alternative markets were found, and the reduction of tariffs, under pressure, could so interfere with factory production as to cause widespread unemployment.

Thus the working class are directly concerned in finding the correct solution to these problems.

Australia, in so many directions, is being tied to American Imperialism, which is a most unsatisfactory state of affairs. Our foreign policy, to an increasing extent, is being influenced by the decisions taken in Washington. This is suicidal not only because we will be drawn willy-nilly into the war plans of Yankee Imperialism but also because we become more dependent economically on the U.S., thus opening the way for Wall Street to interfere in the internal affairs of this country, as they are now doing in Greece and Turkey. The closer our economy is linked with that of America, the more certain are we to be affected by the economic crisis that is already developing in the U.S.A.

The ratification of the Bretton Woods Agreement by Federal Parliament will also have repercussions. Bretton Woods gives the American monopolists a dominating position in world trade, and therefore a privileged position in the world's

markets. Mr. Chifley says that the U.S. will hold this dominating position whether Australia signs the Bretton Woods Agreement or not. The facts are that adherence to Bretton Woods is consistent with various other decisions the Labor Government has taken which link Australia more closely to America, to the serious disadvantage of this country.

We are being asked to accept the ridiculous view that Australia must have a foreign and trade policy that will inevitably bring us under the domination of American Imperialism. This is a viewpoint the Communist Party will never accept and will always fight against. We are opposed to it because it means disaster for Australia. While granting that the U.S. commands an outstanding world position, as Mr. Chifley says, we insist that it is neither necessary nor inevitable that we should accept the role of a junior partner to American Imperialism.

It is well to remember that the United States is not the only world power of gigantic dimensions. There is also the Soviet Union. These are the two major powers in the world today and next in line are Britain, France and China.

Today, Britain, with the Australian Labor Government's support, is ganging up with Yankee Imperialism against the Soviet Union. If the world is divided along these lines a new world war is inevitable.

To gang up with America means to subordinate ourselves to America, to be dominated and crushed by America. Is this what Australia wants?

Obviously we need a new approach to foreign affairs and international trade, and the working class movement is the force to sponsor this new approach.

We believe that Australia should pursue an independent foreign policy instead of being tied to America. We should aim for collaboration between the Great Powers instead of division and for a world trade policy that would help the small powers instead of harming them.

Instead of hostility to Soviet Russia, we should place our relations with the Soviet on a firm and friendly basis, develop trade with her, and also with the new democracies of Europe and the colonial peoples now fighting for their independence from imperialist control. With America striving to dominate world trade we should understand that Soviet Russia, the new democracies of Europe and the colonial peoples offer a vast alternative market for our goods, a market without strings, that will not lead to our subordination, as is the case of America.

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

In other words, there is no need for Australia to go down the drain with U.S. Imperialism, to submit to economic crisis, unemployment and lower living standards, providing there is a fundamental change in our foreign and trade policy, as well as a new approach to our internal problems.

While fear of overseas competition is a factor in the economic policy of the Chifley Government, it is not the whole story. The Labor Government's policy aims at stabilising and strengthening the position of Australian capitalism. Mr. Chifley's economic policy is increasing the profits of the monarchs of industry at the expense of the workers' living standards. Profits are higher than in pre-war years, the purchasing power of wages is lower. Inflation of prices is the chief means of bringing about this result.

Now this policy is also headed for disaster. It stands to reason that if production and profits increase, while the purchasing power of the big majority of the people declines, goods will soon begin to bank up, overproduction will be inevitable and an economic crisis will break out. Thus by tying Australia to American Imperialism, on the one hand, and restricting the purchasing power of the masses on the other, the Chifley Government is acting against the best interests of the Australian people. If these policies are persisted with they will cause confusion and division in the labor movement and play into the hands of the reaction.

In short, the Chifley Government's policy seriously menaces the working class because it threatens to destroy the economic, political and organisational gains of the labor movement made during the war.

Disunity is growing in the labor movement. The decision of the McGirr Government in N.S.W. to bring down legislation for the 40-hour week is a blow at the Chifley policy of leaving the 40 hours question for the Arbitration Courts to decide. Although the approach of the N.S.W. elections influenced the McGirr Government, there is no doubt that the major factor in its decision on the 40 hours was the campaign of the Communist Party and the growing pressure of the Trade Union movement. The hostility of the Trade Union movement to the Chifley Government's policy was shown in the decisions of the Federal conference of trade unions convened by the A.C.T.U. to organise a nation-wide stoppage of work on May 1st and to work no more than 40 hours per week after that date. When the Trade Unions, upon

which the Labor Party is based, came out so forcibly against Labor Party policy, we got some indication of the discontent and division within the labor movement. The McGirr Government's decision could only serve to strengthen the hands of the trade unions and reveal the extent of the differences and division within the leading circles of the Labor Party itself. It is true that certain right wing Trade Union leaders, who achieved notoriety for strike-breaking during recent strikes, are doing all they can to sabotage the A.C.T.U. decisions, but nothing they can do can overcome the growing hostility to the Federal Government's policy and to the apathy of the Labor Party in face of the workers' demands. It is essential to expose and defeat the right wing saboteurs, otherwise it will be impossible to create that firm unity in the labor movement that will bring victory.

Let us be clear that the conflict and disunity within the labor movement arise mainly from the policy of the Labor Party and especially of the Chifley Government. The fight for a united working class front, therefore, demands the further development of the struggle to overcome the present trend of Labor Party policy, to wage the struggle for a policy that is in the interests of the working class and corresponds to the needs of the majority of the Australian people.

This means that in the field of foreign policy and trade, we must bring to an end our dependence upon American imperialism and instead develop our relations with all nations, including Soviet Russia, the new democracies of Europe and the peoples of Asia, striving for world collaboration, for peace and for friendly trading relations between all peoples. It means that insofar as the domestic scene is concerned we need a policy that is designed to raise wages at the expense of profits, or in other words, wages must rise whilst prices are pegged. We need the 40-hour week and still further tax reductions on all the lower income groups.

Coinciding with these measures steps are necessary to curb the trusts and monopolies, and to bring about the nationalisation of the coal, steel and shipping industries.

These changes in policy are fundamental to the future of Australia. They will strengthen the economy of the country, help offset the crisis now developing in the United States, which threatens to envelop us also, and at the same time they will unite the working-class movement and bring greater cohesion among the people.

THE SOUTH AUSTRALIAN STATE ELECTIONS

L. AARONS

THE South Australian State Election results must sound a warning call to the Australian labor movement. Although the "Liberals" have long gerrymandered the electorates in their favor, the salient feature of the voting was the decided swing against the A.L.P. The loss of three seats for sure (possibly four) was in itself a near-debacle, but worse still was the tremendous decline in the Labor Party vote.

Comparisons between the votes in several electorates will show just how much the Labor Party vote has declined compared with both the 1944 State and the 1946 Federal Elections:

Norwood:	Labor	Liberal
1944 State	8212	7095
1946 Federal	9741	5385
1947 State	7688	7960
Nett:		
1944 State	8793	8025
1946 Federal	9481	6698
1947 State	7593	8945
Torrens:		
1944 State	8635	8308
1946 Federal	8917	7047
1947 State	7463	8857
Unley:		
1944 State	7657	9051
1946 Federal	8482	7305
1947 State	6865	9545

There was a big decline in the A.L.P. vote in every electorate where they opposed L.C.L. candidates, and by the time that all votes are counted, the L.C.L. will have won an election in South Australia with about as many votes as the A.L.P., instead of with less, as is usual with these champions of "democracy."

Menzies and the capitalist press are treating the vote as the beginning of "the ebb in the Labor tide." To see the figures as an indication of the way South Australia would vote in a Federal election would be a mistake, however, for there are many State factors which go to make up the A.L.P. defeat.

Nevertheless, the swing away from the Labor Party does reflect the growing division within the whole labor movement, nationally and not only in this State. The division is between the Left and Right, but not just between the Communist Party and the leaders of the Labor Party. It is expressed in the growing divergence between the trade unions and the Labor Party leadership, and in particular with the growing discontent with the Chifley policy of pegging the workers' living standards and aiding the monopolists to increase their profits and their stranglehold on Australian economic life.

With the aid of the right wing in the trade union movement, the A.L.P. leadership has succeeded in holding back the development of major

united struggles which would result in the winning of big improvements in living standards. A growing movement of militant struggle has won sectional gains and at least one national gain (the 7/- basic wage rise), but in the main the right wing has succeeded in preventing the full use of the united strength of the trade union movement to raise living standards.

The propaganda of the monopolists has found ready response and echo from the right-wingers in the union movement. The political leaders of the Labor Party are trying desperately to hold back the movement for struggle and have called in their aides in the union movement. The result is to be seen in the growing discontent and in the weakening of the potential strength of the union movement, causing frustration and sometimes cynicism among large sections of the working class.

Nett result is the loss of support among the middle class, who are always very sensitive to weakness and division in the working-class movement. The policy of the Chifley Government, and of the right wing in both the trade unions and the A.L.P. has therefore resulted in loss of the State elections in S.A. and threatens further losses unless there is a great change.

All the factors present in the balance of relationships between the various class forces and political parties throughout Australia exist to a marked degree in South Australia, plus other factors which operate still further in favor of the L.C.L.

Weakness and immaturity in the labor movement are most evident, while the A.L.P. is in the grip of a reactionary, C.A. dominated clique. The S.A. bourgeoisie have embarked on a deliberate policy of creating a legend around Playford as an impartial and brilliant Premier, and the Parliamentary Labor Party have not only failed to destroy this myth, but have given valuable aid to its creation.

The Playford myth is built up on the basis of the growth of industry, on the freedom from industrial conflict, on a purely imaginary superiority in home-building, and on Playford's "impartiality."

The Labor Party has failed to expose the blatantly biased policy which goes hand in hand with "encouraging" Big Business in this State. The continued tenderness to B.H.P., with its Steel Empire in the Whyalla-Iron Knob area, such evidences as the "aid" to Phillips Industries (145,000 to help their transfer), granting to Aspac Industries of a part of Finsbury "bigger than the Adelaide Oval" at a ridiculously low rental (nothing for the first six months), and so on, have all been allowed to pass without a word of protest by the A.L.P., either inside or out of Parliament.

As far as freedom from strikes is concerned, the A.L.P. competes with Playford to assure that

April, 1947

there is no strife in industry. A.L.P. candidates stressed this. Borthwick, A.L.P. candidate for Unley, in a press statement, said, in pointing out he was opposed to the May 1 stoppage, "I'm all for co-operation and collaboration." He succeeded in converting a Labor majority at the Federal Election of 2,177 into a minority of 2,680 while Bardolph (who lost Torrens) made the proud boast that he had been a union secretary for many years and had never had a strike. Such boasts of Labor weaknesses apparently did not win middle class support!

In the trade union movement itself, the right wing conducted a bitter campaign against the May 1 stoppage, and although defeated, organised a big minority vote against the move.

Thompson (A.S.E. Secretary) and other leaders of the right wing have been opposing the foundry workers' struggle, going so far as practically to advocate sabbery under the polite fiction of "allowing" ironworkers and moulders to leave their unions and join others so they could return to work—on the bosses' terms.

Thompson himself goes to businessmen's luncheons and tells them that all strikes are caused by Communists and there must be no more strikes with their interruption of production.

The position in the trade union movement is redeemed by the growing strength of the left wing led by Communists. Only intensive organisations won a narrow right wing majority in the Trades and Labor Council elections. A real cleavage took place in the Council elections, in which personalities were subordinated to policies, and the struggle on the Council has reached a new level, with the right wing holding a precarious ascendancy.

There are no such invigorating features at work in the Labor Party. With a small Local Committee membership, an Executive of right-wingers and no effective union voice inside the Party, the right wing is dominant.

As a result, the A.L.P. campaign was weak and ineffective. Their propaganda was weak, concentrating upon electoral reform and the negative aspect of "Make S.A. in tune with the rest of Australia." There was no fighting programme, no mention of the 40-hour week and the \$1 wage rise, no answer to the housing shortage perpetuated by Playford's policy of private enterprise first, homes last; no fighting policy for countryside, cheap water, real decentralisation.

To convince the electors that the A.L.P. was an alternative to Playford, we have the A.L.P. campaign to convince the electors that they, and the Adelaide Electric Supply Company. This is a time when it seems sure that a regional power plant will be established at Pt. Pirie and cheap supplies of electricity will be banded to Broken Hill Associated Smelters so they can recover 1,000,000 worth of minerals from their slag. Playford's acquisition of A.E.S. was merely to aid

the monopolists with cheap power, while the consumer continued to pay through the nose.

The negative nature of the A.L.P. propaganda could be seen most clearly in their designation of Playford's legislation as "socialistic," and their statements that if Playford was returned, he would not carry out the same "socialistic" policy. Conclusion was "Therefore, if you want a continuation of Socialistic legislation such as Playford has been carrying out, vote for the A.L.P."

There was an almost complete absence of active campaigning by the Labor Party; very few leaflets were issued, few meetings held and very little canvassing done. Only on polling day was there any sign of rank and file activity, and there we saw the feeling of the A.L.P. workers, and there every booth, there were friendly relations between A.L.P. and A.C.P. booth workers. In Adelaide, where A.L.P. second preferences were given to Bardolph, so-called Independent Labor, A.L.P. workers said they couldn't understand it, they were not in agreement with it, but it was done by "them" (the A.L.P. Executive).

From the very start to finish, there appeared no real desire on the part of the A.L.P. heads to win the elections. Federal help was limited to brief visits by Chambers and Pollard.

The voting pointed to A.L.P. weakness and to the dangers of a turn back to the bankrupt "Liberals," due to a drift by the middle class resulting from the split in the labor movement.

The only answer to this danger is a strengthening of the work of the Communist Party, to create unity between Communist and Labor Party workers, unity in action and struggle, unity which will revitalise the labor movement and win back the middle class who appear to be turning again to the "Liberals."

Dimitrov puts it: "The strengthening of the Communist Party is not a narrow Party concern but the concern of the entire working class. The unity, revolutionary coherence and fighting preparedness of the Communist Party, constitutes its valuable capital which belongs not only to us but to the entire working class."

Even in the narrow election sphere, some deep-seated opponents of unity should have learned some lessons, or would have done if they could ever learn anything.

Mr. A. J. Shard, ex-M.P. for Prospect, was elected in 1944 on Dr. Finger's 2,644 preferences. At the poll declaration, he said, "Labor-Communist unity will come only over my dead body." He is a politically dead body now, and because there was no Communist to really fight the capitalists and their party and help put Shard in as a result.

Again, in Adelaide we saw that H. J. George (Adelaide) was the only A.L.P. candidate to increase his vote. D. H. Bardolph, brother of K. E. J. Bardolph (Past President of the A.L.P. and right-wing power behind the throne), had only just been defeated (on A. Watt's preferences) in 1944.

April, 1947

487

This year George, a near-octogenarian, was selected as A.L.P. candidate after the ruling clique disbarred a younger, more vigorous candidate over a ballot formality.

No campaign was run for George—some say because it was hoped he would be a "pushover" for Bardolph, twice-expelled from the A.L.P., Langite and disruptionist of the worst type. The Communist campaign scotched this plan, for Bardolph was our target and he was destroyed as a force in S.A. politics.

How did the Communist candidates fare, and what encouragement is there for the future?

Without any spectacular figures, there can be no doubt that the votes showed a steady advance.

Dr. Finger polled the highest vote ever for a Communist State candidate, raising his percentage of total votes cast for Pt. Adelaide from 11% in the Federal Elections to 17.2% (polling 3206 with more to come).

Stuart, huge country electorate, 22 year old Peterson polled an exceptionally good vote of 17% (841 at writing) of the votes counted. In Hindmarsh, J. Moss, with 2091, increased the Communist vote from 1 in 11 for Dr. Finger in the Federal Elections to 1 in 9.

In the Adelaide seat, the Communist vote showed a decline over the 1944 State Election, although there was a 50% increase over the vote in the Federal Election. Main cause for the decline was probably the determination of working class voters to defeat Bardolph as a result of the determined campaign of the A.C.P. against this renegade. The Communist campaign was a good one, and shows great possibilities for future work and elections.

The Communist votes show steady progress overall but the true picture is revealed more clearly in the great interest taken in the campaign. In under four weeks of campaigning, Communist

speakers addressed 2015 workers at factory gates, while hall and street meeting audiences totalled 1420.

Response to and interest in the Communist campaign shows how much our policy expresses the feelings of the working class; good receptions, with intelligent questions, show how valuable our work is in this period. But our votes still reflect a hesitancy to go beyond the A.L.P. in sufficient numbers to win us seats.

This will come, when events further expose the barrenness of reformism and our work shows the revolutionary alternative.

The best guarantee of this development coming quickly is the improvement of our work, the building of the Party, in the factories first of all, and strengthening of our influence in the union movement.

A stronger, more vigorous Communist Party, based in the factories and unions, will also make possible a reinvigorated A.L.P. which will throw out the right-wing leadership, and work in unity with the Communists against the common enemy, the monopoly capitalists. This is a vital necessity, otherwise the L.C.L. will continue to dominate the State.

The present A.L.P. leadership has indicated its willingness to "co-operate as an opposition" with Playford since the elections. This easy acceptance of L.C.L. ascendancy finds no place in the Communist policy.

Workers still want wage rises and shorter hours; the people still need homes; health and education need a new deal in S.A. The fight goes on for higher living standards and for the Socialist objective, and it must be fought not just at elections but always. It is fought not by politicians but by the masses, through their organised strength.

To the Communist Party falls the role of organising and leading this fight and we must not fail.

DECLARATION OF EMPIRE COMMUNIST CONFERENCE

(A Conference of all Communist Parties of the British Empire was held in London, February 26-March 3, 1947, to discuss common problems.)

WE, the representatives of the Communist Parties in the countries of the British Empire, have met in conference in London from February 26th to March 3rd, and having considered the problems of the common fight of the peoples against imperialism, for national independence, world peace and security and for co-operation of all nations based on equality, make the following declaration:

We greet with enthusiasm the unprecedented upsurge of the colonial and subject peoples in the great struggle for liberation and pay our homage to the countless martyrs who have laid down their lives in this just and noble cause. We send our fervent greetings and solidarity to the national

movements of the colonial countries and express our ardent support for unity for the uncompromising aim of national independence.

The victory of the peoples in the war against fascism, a victory to which the colonial peoples greatly contributed, has led to the strengthening of the democratic forces throughout the world. The Socialist Soviet Union is stronger than ever, the New Democracies have been firmly established in Europe, the United Nations founded and the ranks of the workers in all lands consolidated by the World Federation of Trade Unions. The defeat of Germany, Italy and Japan has undermined the old imperialist order everywhere. We see the struggle

for national independence as a continuation of the aim for which the war against fascism was fought. The immediate advance of the peoples of the subject countries to national independence is now on the order of the day.

Anglo-American imperialism is everywhere seeking to preserve and extend its grip on the colonial world, suppress the rising tide of colonial revolt, split and disorganise the national movements and by political manoeuvres deny real independence. It seeks to maintain privileged imperialist exploitation by its arms and police and is building up strategic bases in Palestine, the Arab countries of the Middle East, India, Malaya and parts of the Far East to kindle another world war aimed at the Soviet Union and the peace-loving peoples of the world.

These policies are an expression of the crisis of the colonial world and above all the crisis of the British Empire. The United States, now the dominant world imperialist power, with huge material and strategic resources, is out to dominate the world and to absorb the British Empire countries as the richest prize. British imperialism, weakened by the war, is more and more forced into the position of a junior partner of America. The crisis in Britain and the crisis in the Empire go hand in hand. Britain's imperialist policies and commitments, draining her manpower, intensifying the enormous deficit in the balance of payments, still further increase the dependence on American strategic and military superiority in the Anglo-American bloc.

We condemn the continued occupation of Greece, the subjection of Cyprus and Malta, the holding down of Palestine, the bolstering up of reactionary feudal puppet regimes in Iraq and Transjordan, the retention of British troops in Egypt, the categorical refusal to recognise the national independence of India and Burma, and the maintenance and use of British troops in these countries to suppress their freedom movements and the military aid given by British Imperialism to crush the liberation struggle of the peoples of Indonesia and Viet-nam.

A great responsibility rests upon the working class and peoples of the British Empire countries in the struggle between the forces of reaction fomenting a new world war and the forces for peace and progress. The imperialist policies continued by the British Labor Government are a betrayal of its election pledges. Aided and abetted by the Dominion Governments, it is stimulating and encouraging the warmongering elements everywhere. These policies are not only a denial of the just rights of the colonial peoples, but a negation of the real interests of the working people of Britain and the Dominions.

The Communist Parties will ceaselessly strive to rouse the working masses and all freedom-loving peoples within the countries of the Empire to struggle to defeat the war makers.

The fight for the peace of the world, the advance of the subject peoples to independence, the struggle of the workers for Socialism are all part of a common fight. The alliance of the freedom movements of the subject peoples and the working-class movement is vital for the victory of the aims of both.

The common interests of all the peoples of the Empire countries require:—Abandonment of the Anglo-American Bloc and the restoration of the unity of the Three Great Powers and full support for the United Nations; strengthening and extension of the British-Soviet Treaty, close co-operation with the Soviet Union and democratic nations for disarmament, democratic advance and international co-operation; withdrawal of troops from all except ex-enemy countries in accordance with the peace settlement; acceptance of the principles of democratic self-determination; international economic co-operation.

We declare that the democratic right of self-determination of all peoples is the cardinal principle of Communist policy. We demand immediate unqualified independence of India, Burma and Ceylon.

We express our solidarity with the Arab peoples in their fight for the evacuation and independence of Egypt, Palestine, Iraq and Transjordan and we oppose all imperialist schemes such as those for a "Greater Syria," the Near Eastern Bloc and Anglo-Arab Joint Defence Committee, which are a menace to the national existence and future of the Arab people.

We demand the recognition of the right of Cyprus and Malta to complete self-determination so as to enable these countries freely, in accordance with the wishes of their peoples, to re-unite with their respective motherlands, Greece and Italy.

We condemn the denial of elementary rights and liberties, the widespread practice of racial and color discrimination in Africa and other British Empire territories. We demand the repeal of all repressive and discriminatory legislative ordinances and laws; the provision of popular legislative assemblies based on universal suffrage; freedom of speech, movement, association and organisation and declare our full support to these peoples in their aspirations for freedom and the right of self-determination.

These measures can be effective only if the monopolies which operate in the colonial countries are rendered unable to dominate the economic life of the peoples, squeezing out their wealth and enforcing conditions of starvation, disease and misery on the peoples. It is the duty of the Labor Governments in the Metropolitan and Dominion countries to abolish these monopolies and to aid the peoples of these colonies to develop their resources in their own interests so as to win them as allies on an equal basis in the fight for the achievement of socialism. This will lay the basis for international economic co-operation of these countries with the advanced industrial coun-

tries of the world on the basis of equality, ensuring their rapid economic development and the onward march of the advanced countries towards Socialism.

We welcome the growing solidarity between the movements of the workers in Britain and the Dominions and the subject peoples of the colonies. Our joint struggles will strengthen the bonds of fraternal assistance between the trade unions of Britain and the Dominions and the colonial peoples.

The British Communist Party has a special responsibility in association with those forces of the Labor Movement now struggling for a complete change in the Labor Government's foreign, colonial and empire policy. The Communist Parties of the Dominions also have special responsibilities along similar lines, particularly in Australia and New Zealand where Labor Governments are in power.

SHIFT OF POWER PROPS IN INDIA

RUPERT LOCKWOOD

THE British Government says that it is about to leave India. Australian commercial representatives are preparing to move in. Increased Australian trade with India, sufficient to offset lost British markets for our exports, assumes a British withdrawal from India, because only a free India can industrialise and lift buying power adequately.

The pukka sabhis, of course, don't intend to carry out any "Operation Scuttle," as promised by Mr. Attlee and assailed by Mr. Churchill, in June, 1948. When the Indian Communist Party General Secretary, P. C. Joshi, described the June 1948 dateline as "the cleverest imperialist trick to keep the Interim Government going and to raise new illusions among Indian leaders and put on a pious face before the world outside," he had in mind the history of other imperialist promises—and perhaps the dictum of Adam Smith: "No nation ever voluntarily gave up the dominion of any province."

Not long before his quit-India offer, Mr. Attlee told the Commons that the British Government had decided "freely and unconditionally" to withdraw from Egypt. Egyptians, like Indians, can be forgiven for displays of cynicism and disbelief when they hear "withdrawal" offers. W.W., a "World News and Views" columnist, says: "Egyptian people have a great sense of humor, but you cannot expect them to raise even a semblance of a smile for the grandson of a joke that was first cracked in 1881, even before their country was occupied." A year before British troops occupied Egypt (1882), Lord Dufferin, a leading diplomat, scoffed at "fantastic fears" that Britain intended occupation. A few months after the occupation, on December 19, 1882, Mr. Joseph Chamberlain said: "Once order is restored, we will withdraw."

In 1895, Mr. Gladstone said that "the Government is resolved not to remain in the Sudan a day

Our conference in London has strengthened the bonds of fraternal solidarity of the Communist Parties within the countries of the Empire. The leading role in building the solidarity of the peoples of the empire countries must be borne by the working class in Britain, the Dominions and the colonial countries. Foremost in this task will be the Communist Parties, with their socialist understanding and internationalist spirit.

We are confident that the outcome of our Conference will assist to strengthen practical co-operation between the working-class movement and the peoples of the Empire countries in the struggle for our common aims, against imperialism and reaction, for liberation and democratic advance, for peace and for social progress, preparing the way towards the world victory of Socialism and the equality and brotherhood of all nations.

longer than necessary." As W.W. says, the day has lengthened to 51 years.

India, of course, is vastly more important to British imperialism than Egypt and withdrawal promises count for even less among Indians. That arch-imperialist Lord Curzon's warning is often repeated in the Tory press—"If the Empire loses any other part of its Dominion we can survive, but if we lose India the sun of our Empire will have set."

Ever since the East India Company and other buccaners prepared the way for India's subjection, the various peoples of this sub-continent have been in ferment. At times, open warfare has flared, lading into "passive resistance," then developing into mass strike struggles and mutinies in the armed forces.

Dominance of British commercial and armed power allowed the imperialists to hold India by direct methods. After the bad scare given to them by the Indian Mutiny of 1857, the British tended to lean on feudal Princedom to maintain their rule. The rise of an Indian nationalist bourgeoisie stripped much of the power, if not the pomp and pretence, from the maharajahs, and, in addition, development of organised working-class peasant and middle-class resistance to Britain forced Whitehall to seek new props for its rule. Congress, whose social roots are among the textile looms, bank vaults and metal industries of Hindu capitalists, had to be won over. The Muslim League, allied with the Mohammedan landed magnates, had also to be used—and kept divided as widely as possible from Congress.

The Hindu capitalists of Congress are more powerful than the semi-feudal Muslim landlords, and have more political initiative than the princes. The main concentration of imperialist effort was designed to bring the Congress capitalists into line,

to save British rule in return for a bigger share of the booty. British firms like Nuffield and Imperial Chemical Industries have entered recently into commercial alliances with Indian industrialists like Birla, reputed to be the biggest textile magnate in the British Empire today, and the Tata family, who control the Empire's largest steel-works. The British, in hiring the Congress fifth column, used the same tactics that were used to create a fifth column in France. Whitehall played on the Congress capitalists' fear of the rising trade union movement, key sections of which elected Communist leaders.

Indian capitalists like trade unions no more than American, British or Australian capitalists like them. Trade union solidarity in strikes, the willingness of Indian working-class martyrs to face gaol and gallows for the liberation of India's down-trodden millions, frightened the Birlas and Tatas, and their political agents in Congress. They became willing listeners to British proposals for partnership in the exploitation of India's wealth and of her 400 million people. To the Muslim League leaders, the imperialists could point out the growing strength and the surprising capacity for political organisation of the vast mass of poor and landless Indian peasants. The puppets of princedom were, of course, willing to stick to their old British allegiance. Mutinies of armed forces in Hyderabad, playground of the fabulously wealthy Nizam, and in other princely States, reinforced the allegiance. Without the British, the maharajah's thrones would soon topple.

However, all this planning by the imperialists could not dispose of the Indian people's vigorously expressed desire for complete independence. The Indian Communist Party, whose numbers are small but whose influence is great, the trade unions, the peasant unions and other progressive groups naturally refused to be a party to these plans. They kept on fighting for independence and—through strike struggles, land seizures and demonstrations—for economic emancipation. The Congress capitalists quickly showed their hands. Congress police bashed and shot the workers. In some troubled areas, Congress politicians and governors ousted General Dyer of Amritsar in the spilling of Indian blood.

Shootings, like "spy" scares, never solve basic social crises. The Indian workers went on fighting, and the muscles of British imperialism grew fatter. The British ruling-class had been converted from the leading creditors of the world to the leading debtors. Wall Street had plucked London of its dollar reserves and a good deal more; Britain owed vast sterling accounts to Egypt, Iraq, Australia, the Argentine, India. When the account with India was totted up, it was found that Britain owed India something like double the total "British investment in India. This Indian sterling balance in London became a cause of dispute with the Indian capitalists. The Indian capitalists were

not slow to note the golden opportunity of taking over for themselves the rich British holdings in India, by a book entry.

Wall Street, anxious to exploit the British Empire through London compradores, intervened in an effort to prevent this move, which would have strengthened Indian capitalism against America as well as against British imperialism. Under the Anglo-American Loan Agreement, the USA and British Governments agreed that England's accumulated debts be divided into three categories: (1) part to be paid immediately, (2) part to be released slowly in instalments beginning in 1951 and (3) part to be written off. This amounts to repudiation of debts to a country which suffered great privations—including disastrous food and cloth famines—in providing Britain with food, textiles and other goods and services during the war.

America's interest in having sterling debts heavily cut or wiped off is to curb Indian purchases from Britain. On the other hand, Britain is trying to prevent Indian purchase of capital goods in America, by refusing to convert any of the Indian sterling balances into dollars. There is a three-cornered conflict, with the odds heavily in favor of the Wall Street Colossus. Several leading Indian capitalists already show signs of capitulating to American (and British) pressure for scaling down of the sterling debts, in return for a few more crumbs.

Pte Segar Gupta writes in the Indian Communist Party paper, "People's Age": "Behind the backs of the Indian people, Indian capitalists like Birla, Tata, Walchand Hirachand and numerous others have already entered into shameful partnerships with British capitalists, giving them a share in the capital, for joint exploitation of the Indian market. Their spokesmen like A. D. Shroff and K. C. Mahendra (former head of the Indian Purchasing Mission in the USA) have already publicly urged the acceptance of a scaling down on the grounds of expediency. . . . Some of the Indian industrialists are even paying 2,500 times the nominal value for British companies wanting to sell their assets in India with a view to gaining personal profit. In such cases, of course, they do not even mind the serious depletion their dealings might cause in the sterling balances for which otherwise they show such a big concern."

The Indians have been able to get a little return on the sterling balances by buying grain in sterling areas. Also, Indian capitalists have not only bought up some British properties in India but are buying shares on the London Stock Exchange. Among British companies mentioned by "People's Age" as targets for Indian share-buyers are Dunlop Rubber and Imperial Chemical Industries. "I've often wondered how the London Stock Exchange keeps a firm tone in the present British economic crisis. Perhaps Indian and American buying partly accounts for it. If Indian capitalists can use sterling balances this way, Australian Gov-

ernments could certainly use them to pay off bonded debts in London, and lift interest burdens from our trams, trains, waterworks and other utilities.

The fact that Indian capitalists can buy a British share on the London Stock Exchange gives some idea of British imperialism's decline. When a crisis becomes so deep, all kinds of desperate measures and manoeuvres can be expected. Congress must be kept on side by the British at any cost, otherwise the British would quickly be out of India, dateline or no dateline. Congress in opposition, says Communist leader Joshi, would bring the British rulers face to face with revolt "here and now". "Not only the British but only the Congress can keep the country peaceful because the Indian situation is so explosive today, anti-British hatred so universal, the demand for freedom so urgent," Mr. Joshi declares. "The biggest wave that India has known is sweeping the rural centres, popular struggles are breaking out in State after State, even the traditionally backward peasant is rising to his feet, all seeking the solution of problems that British rule has created. The British need is desperate that Indian Ministers should face the rising Indian people, while they themselves get behind the scenes to plot how to stay on in the new situation."

"Divide and rule", Joshi adds, "is not dead, as communal rioting and the plan to partition and

weaken India show. The Princes have been declared 'sovereign'.

"Thus," says Joshi, "British imperialists get their own puppets lined up inside either the united or partitioned India of the future, while the British remain free to use the Princely territories as their own permanent bases, military, economical and political, studded all over our vast country. It is thus not an offer to quit India after a year but an open plot to carve our common Motherland into a number of satellite States of Great Britain. . . . The British policy of divide and rule is thus reaching its final culmination in the real threat of partition and a bogus offer to quit."

Joshi speaks not only for Indian Communists but for millions of other Indian progressives, who won't be taken in by this latest trick to salvage British rule in India. Once the plans of British imperialism were founded on bulging coffers of gold, on the world's richest economy and strongest navy. Today, the plans are built on sand. The Indian people will continue their march to freedom. The British imperialists will leave, whether they like it or not.

Indians, who have been through enough trials in the last three centuries, will have to watch that there is no mere change of masters. When British imperialism fades out in Greece and Turkey, the Wall Street boys are invited to take over. There must be no similar invitations to India.

STATE ELECTIONS AND THE A.C.P.

H. B. CHANDLER.

PARLIAMENTARY elections have already been held in three States of the Commonwealth this year and will be held in two more, Queensland and N.S.W., before May. In Tasmania, South Australia and West Australia the Labor Party has lost seats to the representatives of monopoly capitalism, but still in power in all States with the exception of South and West Australia.

In South Australia the conservative liberal party has maintained power mainly because of the jerry-mandering of seats which for many years has seriously curtailed any democratic advance in the South Australian Parliament. In 19 electorates held by Liberals prior to the elections, the average number of voters was 8447 compared to an average voting population of 15,000 in the 17 electorates represented by Labor. About 60% of the electors reside in the metropolitan area and return 13 members to the House of Assembly, while about 40% reside in the country and elect 26 members.

The Playford Government has a very bad record of maladministration and inefficiency. The Labor Party leadership, by its inactivity and failure to rally the masses around a fighting working-class policy, has not contributed to changes long overdue

and wanted by the people. The Australian Communist Party candidates, who increased their votes, have alone exposed the reactionary policy of the Liberal Party and are gradually building up mass support which must ultimately lead to the recognition of the Communist Party as the real alternative to the Liberal-Labor influences in the South Australian Parliament.

In New South Wales and Queensland a different situation exists. Labor Governments have been in office for many years in these States. Both have been moved to some action in respect to the 40-hour week, promises of amenities for the coalminers and other piecemeal legislation because of the demands of the Trade Unions and masses of workers, farmers and middle class people, all of whom are becoming disillusioned about the Labor Party. But it is equally true that anti-working class legislation such as the Queensland Arbitration Act, which aims a blow at the democratic rights of the trade unions, and the "do-nothing" policy on housing, transport, social amenities, hospitals and health, have raised the ire of broad sections of the people.

Since the changes in leadership in N.S.W., there are signs that a more progressive policy is being

pursued by the McCarr administration. But this still falls far short of the requirements of the toiling people.

Labor Governments in State legislatures represent the same party and stand for the same policy as that pursued by the Chifley Labor Government and they must share the blame for the failures of the Labor Party in the Federal sphere. Maintenance of wage-pegging, inefficient control of prices, taxation on workers' wages, on the one hand, and mounting profits of the monopolists on the other, continue to be the policy of the Labor Party, and this policy reflects itself in State as well as Federal politics. State Labor Governments must also be indicted by the working class for their dithering over the housing muddle. Building projects in the States are quite inadequate. At the present rate of building, even the yearly lag in home building will not be overtaken, much less provision made for the countless numbers unable to obtain a place in which to live decently. Failure of State Labor Governments to use their powers to nationalise industry, especially coal, gas, and breweries, has earned for right-wing politicians the dissatisfaction of a wide section of the working people, including members of the Labor Party.

The State elections give an opportunity to change much of this. The working class is looking for an alternative. The two-class face of the Labor Party is being revealed in all its reality. The bourgeois philosophy of right-wing politicians is reflected in their collaboration with monopoly interests at the expense of the workers, and their attempt to find a capitalist way out of the developing economic crisis is all too apparent.

Workers are beginning to see, as Lenin wrote some 20 years ago, "what a peculiar capitalist country this is in which Labor predominates (in the legislatures) . . . and the Capitalist system does not suffer any danger."

The Labor Party is rapidly fulfilling its role "of establishing an independent Australian capitalist State," and as it accomplishes this task so does it more rapidly reach the point where it must and will make way for a real Socialist Party, a party opposed with all its power to monopoly, which will fight valiantly for a Socialist Australia. That Party is the Australian Communist Party, which today gives the electors the opportunity of voting for a party with a working-class policy as a real alternative to the Labor Party.

At the elections, the Australian Communist Party will stand 16 candidates in N.S.W., and seven in

Queensland, led by F. W. Paterson, M.L.A. These candidates do present the alternative to the Liberals, who have already exposed themselves as incapable of serving the people, and to the Labor Party around which much discontent is already developing. But the A.C.P. will be recognised as the alternative working-class party only when its policy is taken to the people on a mass scale. The election campaigns present this opportunity.

Thousands of people can be contacted during the campaigns and many of the more progressive sections of the working class can be won into the struggle for the A.C.P. policy of no taxation on the workers' wages, 40-hour week, £1 increase in the weekly pay envelope, penalty rates for week-end work, speedier building of homes, better transport to and from work, democratic education and modern school buildings, equal pay for women and a fair deal for the youth; nationalisation of industries, such as coal, iron, steel, gas and the breweries; the development of public works such as roads, hydro-electric, water conservation and land settlements; and a better deal for the farmers with increased prices for butter, eggs and milk, debt reductions and the establishment of co-operatives controlled by the farmers themselves.

This is the urgent task of the A.C.P. in the elections, which must be approached with a revolutionary determination to win the masses into action, to intensify the struggle for unity and for progress, by raising to ever higher levels the mass work of the party.

To develop the biggest propaganda campaign possible, the election campaigns will be based on three main points:—

- First: A real blitz on the factory and place of work.
- Second: Special efforts to win the women, especially the housewives.
- Third: Personal approach to every elector rolled.

This method is a working-class method. It needs the enthusiasm and determination of people trained in the class struggle; it needs bolshevik initiative and self-sacrifice. To win parliamentary representation for the Australian Communist Party, to present the party as a real fighting alternative to the liberal-capitalist Labor Party, the masses must be won for the struggle. That task falls equally upon every member, as it does upon candidates and those trusted with the task of organising for the election campaigns in N.S.W. and Queensland.

TROTSKYISM — INSTRUMENT OF FASCISM AND REACTION

ETIENNE FAJON

(From "Cahiers du Communisme," May-June, 1946)

AT the general elections of June 2nd, last, Trotskyist lists were presented in twelve electoral divisions. Their candidates claimed to belong to a so-called "International Communist Party" and to a would-be "Fourth International." No one on the Trotskyist lists was elected. Their suppliers of funds did not ask that much of them. The electoral aim that was allotted to them in the general assault made by the forces of reaction upon the Communist Party was to make our Party lose some seats. That aim was attained in four provinces. In Finisterre, the Communist list needed 1915 votes to obtain a seat. The Trotskyist list there obtained 4168 votes. The seat lost on this account went to the M.R.P. In Gironde, we needed 4750 more votes to gain two seats. The Trotskyist list received 7698 votes. The M.R.P. gained the seat we lost. In Puy de Dome, the 2891 votes obtained by the Trotskyist list deprived us of the second seat for which we needed 1650 more votes. That seat was gained by the Varenne list. In Lot et Garonne, we lacked only 328 votes in order to obtain two seats, while the Trotskyists obtained 970 votes. Thanks to them the Rassemblement list obtained a seat.

So the Trotskyists played their role in the recent electoral battle. Taking votes from the Communists is a job that Fascism cannot accomplish by showing itself in its true light; it inspires too much horror in the workers and democrats. In order to deceive some, to turn them off the correct path (in elections and outside elections) it is obliged to disguise itself, to present itself in the garb of a workers' movement, in the garb of a variety of communism.

Trotskyism is nothing but the instrument of this last action and fascist lying.

That is a familiar idea to all who know even a little of the history of Trotskyism. However it will be quite useful to illustrate this by the recall of some facts, for the sake of the few workers who have been led astray by masked fascism and also to forewarn the tens of thousands of young adherents to our Party.

In the Soviet Union, the liquidation of the remnants of Trotskyism took place in 1936 and 1937. In the course of three famous trials in which the principal lieutenants of Trotsky appeared amongst the other accused, Trotsky was not there, he had been expelled from the country several years before.

These trials were held publicly, in the open. The before representatives of the world press. The criminal activity of the Trotskyists was exposed there by the accused themselves to the exact extent that they were compelled thereto by proofs.

Before the Soviet Tribunal, the Trotskyists, who were allowed all safeguards of defence, acknow-

ledged in front of the world that they had organised the assassination of eminent leaders of the USSR such as Kirov, Menzhinski and Kulbyshvay, and the celebrated writer Gorky (not to speak of the earlier attempt on Lenin in 1918). They also acknowledged active participation in sabotage in the factories, mines, Soviet agriculture, under the most varied forms (disorganisation, explosions, etc.). They admitted that the objective of Trotskyism in the USSR was the restoration of the trusts. For example, the Trotskyist Radek, in his deposition, states the programme that Trotsky submitted to him in December, 1935, in the following terms:

"Not only concession of important industrial enterprises to the imperialist states, but also the alienation to capitalist elements of important economic undertakings which they will designate."

Finally, the accused at the Moscow trials had to acknowledge that they were guilty of betraying State secrets and of delivering information to Hitler's secret service agencies. In the deposition of the Trotskyite Piatakov, ex Joint-Commissar of Heavy Industry, one reads:

"Trotsky said that without the indispensable support of foreign States, the government of the bloc would not be able either to come to power or to maintain itself in power. That was why it was necessary to achieve a preliminary agreement with the most aggressive foreign States such as Germany and Japan; and that also was why he, Trotsky, had taken steps with a view to contact as much with the Japanese Government as with the German Government."

Commenting on the depositions and the overwhelming admissions at the Moscow trials, the great Bolshevik paper "Pravda" was able to write on February 14, 1937, regarding the Trotskyists:

"They sell their Fatherland wholesale and retail to its worst enemies, they spy and sabotage in concert with the agents of Fascist espionage, they give themselves to individual counter-revolutionary terrorism, they prepare unheard-of acts of treason if war occurs. Such are the methods of 'activity' of the Trotskyist pack."

In sum, caught in the very act of ten years ago, the men most representative of Trotskyism in the Soviet Union themselves stated their titles and qualities: "Criminals at common law, acting on behalf of trusts and under the orders of foreign secret services."

Trotskyism was predestined to this infamous role by all its past. Originally, it appeared as a petty bourgeois current in the Russian Social-Democratic Party.

As the fascist adventurers who base themselves to-day on Trotsky push their lies so far as to represent him as a companion or fellow-worker of Lenin, it is necessary to recall that the history of Trotskyism at that time is part of the history of the struggle against Lenin and the Bolsheviks. The struggle against Leninism, against Communism within the workers' movement, was the first step on the road which in the end was to lead Trotsky and his like to become simply instruments of Hitler Fascism. Exactly as was the case in France with Doriot, Belin and Paul Faure.

From the 2nd Congress of the Russian Social-Democratic Party held in 1903, Trotsky opposed with the Mensheviks the Leninist concept concerning the necessity of a disciplined Party of the working class. Immediately after the Congress, with the Menshevik leaders Martov and Axelrod, he formed an anti-Leninist faction to boycott the decisions of the Congress.

At the moment of the 1905 revolution, while Lenin and the Bolsheviks were working for an alliance of workers and peasants, the primary condition for victory, Trotsky launched the criminal slogan "Workers' Government," a slogan which tended to oppose millions of peasants to the working class and in consequence played into the hands of Tsarist reaction.

During the difficult years following the defeat of the 1905 Revolution, while Lenin and the Bolsheviks worked underground to preserve and consolidate the organisation of the Party, the Mensheviks proposed to absolutely liquidate the Party. Once again Trotsky supports the Mensheviks.

In 1912, Trotsky forms and leads an unprincipled bloc of all the anti-Marxist elements (the August bloc) to combat Lenin and the Bolsheviks. That was the time when Lenin, in a famous article, printed "the scarlet brand of shame on the forehead of Judas-Trotsky." It was also the time when, in opposition to the Mensheviks, Trotskyists and others who joined them, the Bolsheviks built an independent Party.

Next, in the 1914 war, the imperialist war, an unjust war, while Lenin organised the revolutionary struggle in Russia against Tsarism and internationally against the imperialist bourgeoisie, Trotsky was on the opposite side, on the side of the men of the imperialists who model themselves on the himself at a "centrist" point of view, he condemns the class struggle and revolutionary action against imperialist war.

"All those who support the Trotskyist group," wrote Lenin in 1911, "support a policy of falsehood and deceit with respect to the workers."

The October Socialist Revolution, which opened a new era in the history of mankind, was led by Lenin. Trotsky at first did everything to prevent the success of the insurrection and to crush it after it was accomplished.

October 10, 1917, the historic meeting of the Central Committee of the Bolsheviks was held, the meeting which decided to begin the insurrection, a decision which was openly opposed by Zinoviev and Kamenev. Trotsky, who had been admitted into the Party two months before (it was not known till later that his mission was to disrupt it), proposed that the uprising should not be begun before the opening of the Second Congress of Soviets, a proposition which Lenin characterised "as either folly or complete treason." Fortunately Lenin's opinion on the choice of the time won and the insurrection was victorious.

During the stern years of civil war and foreign intervention (1918-1921), Trotsky's behaviour was unceasingly that of a traitor. In February, 1918, when the young Republic had offered peace to all the world powers, Trotsky, in opposition to Lenin, caused the failure of the negotiations at Brest-Litovsk. He furnished the Germans with the excuse for an offensive against the new Russia which was still without military strength. The infant Red Army succeeded in stopping the Germans before Narva and Pskov, and Germany consented to sign a peace. But Trotsky's treason cost the Soviet Union vast territories. In Lenin's own words:

"It, in fact, helped the German imperialists and hindered the progress and development of the German revolution."

July, 1918, a counter-revolutionary putsch was attempted at Moscow. Eighteen years later, the trial of the Trotskyists established that it had Trotsky's assent. Then in 1919 and 1920, it was necessary, in order to save the Russian Revolution, to relieve Trotsky of his military responsibilities, one after the other. This was the case in the spring of 1919, when Trotsky proposed to cease the offensive against Kolchak, which Lenin wrote, "would amount to betraying the revolution." Again in the autumn of the same year, when Trotsky proposed to choose as battle ground against Denikin the territory the most hostile to Soviet Power. And in 1920, in the Polish campaign, Trotsky increased the difficulties of the Red Army by treasonous orders.

After 1921, during the struggle for the building of socialism, Trotsky, inside the Communist Party, expressed the opposition of the counter-revolutionary classes; camouflaging this sometimes with left phraseology.

Left phraseology, dear to Trotskyism, is a current method of reaction. The resolution of the Tenth Congress of the Bolshevik Party (1921) on Unity of the Party denounced this tactic of the class enemy:

"The Whiteguards desire and know how to disguise themselves as Communists, and even more 'left' than Communists, with the sole aim of weakening and overthrowing the bastion of the Russian proletarian revolution."

In 1921, the Bolshevik Party on Lenin's appeal had to condemn the criminal stand taken by Trotsky

on the matter of Trade Unions. Trotsky proposed to "Statise" them, to abolish their internal democracy. This could only have led to a split in the working class. At the same period, on the occasion of the correct transition from the methods of "War Communism" to N.E.P., Trotsky, Zinoviev and Co. demanded that big concessions should be made to private capital and to foreign capitalism. The Party condemned, isolated and defeated them.

In the following years, the Trotskyist position may be resumed in three points:

(1) The impossibility of building Socialism in the USSR while the Socialist Revolution had not broken out in other countries (which amounts to turning the Soviet workers away from an "irrealisable" task and to suggesting interference of the USSR in the affairs of capitalist countries in order to give the latter an excuse for anti-Soviet interventions).

(2) The impossibility of getting the essential basis of the peasants to participate in the building of socialism (which amounts to opposing the workers and peasants to each other in the interests of the counter-revolution).

(3) Freedom of factional work in the Party (which amounts to depriving the Party of all strength and efficiency).

The provocative character of such a position is self-evident.

In order to ensure the building of Socialism and establish the necessary conditions for that, it was necessary to politically crush Trotskyism. This was achieved by a great political campaign led by Stalin in the Bolshevik Party and in the working class of the USSR. This concluded at the 15th Congress of the Party in 1927 by the exclusion of Trotsky and his like by 720,000 votes to 4,000. Trotskyism no longer represented the slightest trend in the workers' movement.

Beaten on the political terrain, no longer supported by the slightest fraction of the Party or the working class in their anti-Communist struggle, the Trotskyists adopted henceforth other forms of activity and sought other support. From then on duplicity became their line. Zinoviev, Kamenev and their companions made their apologies, asked to be received again into the Party, while at the same time they continued an underground struggle against the Soviet regime. Henceforth acts of sabotage and diversion, and terrorist attempts were their main methods of action, as the Moscow trials later on revealed.

Finally as the vestiges of capitalist exploitation and of the class which personified it were eliminated in the USSR, the Trotskyists, a detachment of that class, became simply instruments of foreign reaction, of Hitler and Japanese fascism, as they themselves acknowledged in the course of the Moscow trials.

Thus at first a petty-bourgeois political current in the worker's movement; later a detachment of the vanguard of the bourgeoisie in the struggle against Soviet Power; finally a band of common criminals in the service of Hitler Fascism. Such

are the three principal stages of the history of Trotskyism and its final degradation.

Stalin, who led the victorious struggle for the construction of Socialism in the USSR and at the same time the struggle for the crushing of counter-revolutionary Trotskyism, first emphasised in March 1937 the ending of the history of Trotskyism in complete infamy.

"Our Party comrades have not remarked on the fact that Trotskyism has ceased to be a political current in the working class; that, from the political current that it was seven or eight years ago, Trotskyism has become a furious and unprincipled band of saboteurs, agents of diversion and assassins acting under the orders of foreign secret espionage services."

Naturally, the fascists' utilisation of Trotskyist provocateurs and saboteurs could not limit itself to the territory of the Soviet Union.

In his report of March 3rd, 1937, to the Central Committee of the Bolshevik Party, Comrade Stalin, speaking of the reserves of Trotskyist saboteurs of the USSR, declared:

"The Trotskyist saboteurs possess reserves. They are composed in the first place of the remnants of the exploiting classes that have been defeated in the USSR. They are composed of a whole series of groups and organisations beyond the frontiers of the USSR and hostile to the Soviet Union."

And Stalin cites as an example:

"The counter-revolutionary Trotskyists' 4th International, composed, to the extent of two-thirds of it, of spies and diversionary agents."

Actually, since before the last World War, the Trotskyist groups that existed in the various countries of the world adopted an activity conforming in every way to the interests of Hitlerism and Fascism. Two examples that are typical in this respect are those of Spain and France.

Spain, during the stern years of the national democratic struggle against the aggression of Hitler and Mussolini and their agent Franco, saw the actions of a Trotskyist group designated by the initials P.O.U.M., which admirably served the designs of Fascism.

(1) It fought against the Spanish Government, formed of all social shades and classes, the absurd accusation that it was directed by the Soviet Union, thus giving Hitler and Mussolini a pretext to legitimate their intervention in Spain.

(2) It busied itself in disorganising the front and in disrupting the workers' movements and the bloc of national and republican forces which were opposed to Franco; at the moment the Communist and Socialist Youth united, it created a dissident Youth movement; it opposed the People's Front and repeated the Francoist calumnies directed against the International Brigade.

(3) In May, 1937, at the time of the Franco offensive on Bilbao, the P.O.U.M. supported this offensive by organising a bloody putsch in Barcelona. To the Republic's soldiers in the line against

the Francoists, the P.O.U.M. paper launched this criminal appeal on May 7th: "Leave the front and come to fight in Catalonia against the Government."

(4) June, 1937, the leaders of P.O.U.M. were arrested by the Republican police and convicted of military espionage on behalf of Franco. There is no need to continue. These facts clearly expose the Spanish Trotskyists as agents of Franco.

In the same period in France, the Trotskyists had the mission of preventing the progress of the unity of the working class, the unity which is essential to Fascism's defeat. Expelled formerly from our Party, a certain number of Trotskyists had joined the Socialist Party. There they never ceased overbidding the enemies of unity of action, combating the People's Front and slandering the Soviet Union.

Others of them were spread into various little groups such as the French section of the so-called 4th International. In these little groups the espionage bureaux of the various reactionary powers intermingled. The common characteristics of these little groups were furious opposition to the Soviet Union and the People's Front, the defence of the Francoist agents of the P.O.U.M. and of disruptive and provocative action in the ranks of the working class.

The occupation of France by the Hitlerites was marked by systematic utilisation of the Trotskyist sects and phraseology by the Gestapo. In the April 1945 number of "Cahiers du Communisme" you can read the text of a document summarising the views of the Nazi police in this utilisation.

To combat the resistance activity of the Communist Party, it is necessary, says the document:

"To employ clandestine methods identical with their own in order to gain contact with both the Communist Party and its minor militants and sympathisers and the mass under the Party's influence; not forgetting the numerous neutrals whom the word collaboration renders mistrustful."

It was on this task that "La Verite" and other Hitler-Trotskyist papers were employed. Distributed in the factories, often feigning secrecy, these papers in the first place endeavoured to protect the Hitlerite army by luring the workers away from armed actions and every kind of struggle, and the pretext that there were workers in the ranks of the Wehrmacht. In the midst of the occupation "La Verite" wrote:

"The Stalinists' appeals to hate prevent fraternisation between French and German workers."

They followed this up by participating in the propaganda for the "Relief," supporting by "left" arguments the activity of avowed collaborators in sending French workers to labor in Hitlerite Germany.

In "La Verite," the departure of workers for the Hitlerite goals is presented as propitious to the development of the revolutionary movement in Germany.

"Lenin," it wrote, "taught us to take advantage of the possibilities of liaison between the proletarians of different countries. The French proletarians who go over yonder will do good work for the world revolution."

According to the Trotskyist paper "L'Étincelle," the departure to the front of German workers freed by the arrival of French workers did not help the Nazis — but favoured the disintegration of the German army.

"For every French worker who arrives," this paper triumphantly proclaimed, "there is a German worker who leaves for the front."

In the months which preceded the national liberating insurrection, the Hitler-Trotskyist papers intensified their campaign in order to weaken the action of the F.T.P. and the F.F.I. against the Hitlerite army. Thus it was at the moment of the Anglo-American landing in Normandy that "L'Étincelle" wrote for the fighters of the interior:

"The German soldier is not your enemy."

This anti-French and fascist job was continued in the period which elapsed between the liberation of France and the capitulation of the Hitlerites.

In that period, the Hitler-Trotskyist papers limited themselves to reproducing (be it understood without any indication of origin) the appeals of the German radio intended for French workers.

Let us recall three samples of this work which have already been quoted in our journal.

December 30th, 1944, the traitor Doriot said on the German Radio:

"The workers should not work for the cannon merchants of England and America; our factories should work for peace."

Four days afterwards the Trotskyist paper "La Carmagnole de Puteaux" reproduced the substance of this appeal:

"We should not fatten the capitalists. . . . Let us change war industry into peace industry."

January 31, 1945, "La Verite" reproduced completely an appeal of the same Doriot. February 22nd, 1945, the traitor Herold Paquis declared on Radio Berlin:

"Thorez and de Gaulle are inviting you to the slaughterhouse. . . . Resist the Communist mobilization."

Three days later "La Verite" translated as follows:

"Rejoin the magus rather than the armies of the imperialists."

Let us add that on March 17th, 1945, at the height of the war, when the Red Army was dealing the Hitler Army further decisive blows which gave freedom to the world, "La Verite" wrote:

"Under the banner of Stalin, the Red Army no longer serves the Revolution as it did in the time of Lenin and Trotsky. On the contrary it has turned its back on the cause and has become the instrument of the counter-revolution."

It goes without saying that the activity displayed during the war under the Trotskyist ensign was not limited by the Gestapo to journalism. In the occu-

ption it included informing on anti-fascist patriots. After the liberation, sabotage of war production was added. By way of example let us recall the arrest by the Air Police in the beginning of 1945 at Gnome et Rhone of a distributor of Trotskyist tracts, who was caught in the act of sabotage (he was putting sand in the bearings of an aeroplane engine). In the saboteur's dressing room arms and a "Manual of Street Fighting" were found.

Since the end of the war, the Hitler-Trotskyists continue to serve as tools of international and French reaction.

It is well known that in the matter of the German problem the most reactionary attitude is taken by the Anglo-American Trusts. As supporters of the raising again of Germany as the principal centre of reaction in Europe, as in 1919 and at Munich they urge help to Germany, the abandonment of reparations and of all measures of security such as economic and political internationalisation of Ruhr, and they also urge the liberation of prisoners of war and the ending of occupation.

If one omits "left" phraseology, that is exactly the position of the Trotskyists as laid down in the Manifesto of the European Executive Committee of the 4th International published in the Review "Quatrième Internationale" (Dec.-Jan. Number, 1946):

"We International Communists of the countries said to be victors," this document affirms, "we consider you, German workers and peasants, as victims whom it is our duty to aid."

"We protest with you against the partition of Germany, against the contributions, the requisitions and against the reparations amounting to billions."

"We are for the right of the German people to self-determination."

"With you we demand that prisoners of war should be treated according to the Red Cross agreements and that their liberation should not be delayed."

"Take note that 'Anti-fascism' in itself means nothing."

Of course, the review in question does not contain a single word about Spain or Greece.

In the matter of internal problems, the Trotskyist adventurers work servilely on behalf of the trusts and reaction. When reaction sabotages economic recovery with a view to favouring the adventures of personal power, the Trotskyists call for strikes (in the form of production and provoke strikes) in order to bring about a broad action for a legitimate and general improvement in wages and salaries, the Trotskyists forbid it and attempt to provoke rash and disorderly action in order to bring about failure.

When the Communists appeal for assembling of all democratic forces against the reactionary danger, the Trotskyists adjure the workers to turn away from it, this of course in the interests of reaction;

and at the same time they spread the same anti-Communist insults and slanders as the open fascists use. And thus it is in all spheres. Finally, besides the open provocative activity of the tiny Trotskyist groups whether belonging to the "Internationalist Communist Party" or to the so-called "Communist Union," it is necessary to draw attention to the present efforts of these fascist agents to infiltrate the democratic organisations, including our own Party, in order to do the enemy's work, the work of reaction from inside.

The Trotskyists are attempting to occupy responsible positions in the Trade Unions, in most of the Youth Movements (particularly in the United Movement of Youth Hostels) and in the student organisations. Their object is to give a false orientation to the groups which they penetrate and, at the same time, disrupt them. A number of Trotskyists are members of the Socialist Party, in which unfortunately the anti-Communism of certain leaders, who see the Trotskyists as precious auxiliaries in the struggle against unity, affords them important opportunities of activity.

When one remembers that during the Moscow Trials the leaders of the 2nd International manifested their sympathy, not to the memory of the Bolsheviks who had been assassinated by the Trotskyists, but on the contrary to those who had to confess their crimes, one cannot be astonished at this toleration any more than at seeing the services of the Minister of the Interior in the June, 1946, elections set up Trotskyist lists with the object of depriving the Communist Party of some seats.

Certain Trotskyists are trying and will continue to try to penetrate into our ranks by dissimulation, pretending to approve the Party's policy. Their mission is to spy on the actions of our organisations, to import the germs of concepts foreign to Communism to echo inside reactionary slanders against the Party leaders, to stir up any discord and to push members into rash actions contrary to the interest of the working class and the Party.

This Trotskyism, which pretends to be a variety of Communism, is in reality a particularly dangerous form of Fascist activity. The failure of the anti-Communist campaign at the last elections, the progress of our policy of gathering together the democratic forces, may impel reaction to take extreme measures, to use provocation which means an increased utilisation of Trotskyist agents.

Communists must checkmate all enterprises of that order:

(1) By fulfilling their permanent duty of defence of the workers' claims. This obliges the agents of reaction to unmask themselves sooner or later.

(2) By becoming fully seized of the correct policy of the Party and explaining it clearly to the masses so that every political provocation will be immediately revealed and defeated.

(3) By ceaselessly studying, as we have just done in the case of Trotskyism, the various forms of the enemy's action against democracy and the

working class, so that an uncompromising struggle is carried on against the enemy's men and they are never confused with comrades who are in error.

(4) By keeping a careful supervision with respect to the principles of Party organisation, and with respect to the control over the carrying out of tasks. So the workers and honest democrats will be recruited in mass and at the same time any doubtful person who has infiltrated into the Party will be rapidly discovered.

Such are some of the things that must be put into practice if fascist provocations are to be checked

FIGHT FOR THE ABORIGINES

T. WRIGHT

(Report to Central Committee meeting, 14-16 February, 1947)

A CONFERENCE was recently held in Canberra of representatives of six nations, to deal with the economic and social welfare of 1,700,000 South Pacific natives who come under their jurisdiction. One million of these natives come under the control of the Commonwealth of Australia. At this conference, which concluded on February 6th, the Australian Government came forward as the would-be leader; but the Australian Government has no qualifications for such leadership, as has been demonstrated by its treatment of the Aborigines.

Surely Marx must have had Australia in mind when he said: "The native races know us chiefly by our crimes." Recently there appeared in the Sydney 'Sun' a series of articles on the Aborigines by Dr. Donald Thompson of the Department of Anthropology, Melbourne University. He quoted the statement of Deputy Prime Minister Forde when he attended the United Nations Conference in San Francisco: "The Australian Government argues that the Charter of a World Organisation should recognise that the main purpose of the administration of dependent or undeveloped territories is the advancement of the people of those territories." Dr. Donald Thompson asks: "Why this curious discrepancy between domestic and external attitudes towards natives?"

He gave a concrete exposure of the actual position of the Aborigines in Australia and their ill-treatment, and raised a demand which, except by ourselves, is never raised on behalf of the Aborigines, and that is that surviving native tribes should have ownership over their hereditary lands.

The series of articles by Dr. Donald Thompson was replied to by Professor Elkin of the Sydney University, who attempted to belittle Dr. Thompson as an authority and claimed that his information was out of date. Professor Elkin exposed his own wrong approach to the question of the Aborigines when he stressed that in parts of Australia the squatters depend on the Aborigines and that, therefore, because they are dying out, some measures were necessary so that this source

in the ranks of the working class and the democratic movement.

Doubtless the Trotskyists are only represented in France by a tiny handful of adventurers in the enemy's service. But if it is true that in a factory a single saboteur is sufficient to compromise the work of a thousand good workers, for the same reason it is indispensable to-day, in order to ensure victory in the great battle of the forces of democracy against reaction, to put the Trotskyist vermin where they can do no harm.

of labor for the squatters would not dry up. He denied that ill-treatment continues, boosted the missions, and then attacked the idea that the Aborigines should have their own territory, put forward by Dr. Thompson, condemning this as a policy of "segregation" that would be harmful to the natives themselves.

Dr. Thompson is correct, and Professor Elkin, the chief anthropological adviser to the present Government and their predecessors, is wrong, and in the course of the fight on behalf of the Aborigines we find ourselves in conflict with the views of Professor Elkin.

In the early days of White settlement the Australian Aborigines were not even regarded as human beings. A resolution was carried at a public meeting in Sydney to the effect that the Aborigines had no souls and consequently it was not murder to kill them, and they were killed in large numbers. So, today, out of a population of hundreds of thousands at the time of white settlement, there are only 47,000 full blooded Aborigines left in Australia.

In a recent "Sydney Morning Herald" there was a cable item about a booklet published in England, "Black Chattels." This booklet gives a thorough exposure of the situation of the Australian Aborigines and in my opinion its circulation should be assisted by us. It is in line with our own views on this question.

The cable item gave a quotation from individuals here . . . (that is in Great Britain) . . . they cannot accept its claim to be regarded as a spokesman for democracy until it accords human rights to the natives of its own country, they will be speeding the day when the Aborigines cease their miserable forced march to extinction."

The picture given in this booklet, like the picture given by Dr. Donald Thompson, is a picture not of ill-treatment and bad conditions of years ago, but conditions as they exist right at this very moment. It is quite correct to say that the natives,

when they are used as laborers, are really slaves; in the main they are not wage workers, not rural proletarians, they are, as the booklet says, "Black Chattels." In some cases they receive no money payment at all. They receive food of poor quality, and of inadequate quantity, and, on the little allowance they get, have to keep their dependents.

There is also brutal treatment, not only in regard to housing and health, but also actual physical violence. This booklet "Black Chattels" states: "To most aborigines Australia is the absolute police State." That is correct. It seems to me the main purpose of the police in the North and North West of Australia is to act as slave masters for the black population. There is a terrible condition in regard to health, they are still dying off very quickly, not only because of ill-treatment and starvation, but because of the inroads of disease.

Unfortunately the ill-treatment of the aborigines due not only to the property owners and the police, but includes also the workers who live in those areas, workers who have been poisoned with the chauvinism and ideas of the "inferiority" of the Aborigine population fostered through the whole period of white settlement. The white employees of stations are usually single men, and it is the common practice to make sexual use of the native women. The native women are often infected with venereal disease which not only brings premature death but makes the women barren, and so helps the process of extermination. When the native women have half-caste children, the father has no responsibility for them and the State usually takes them away from their mothers.

So far as justice is concerned, there is no real justice for the Aborigine when they infringe the white man's laws. On the other hand when a white man is charged with ill-treating Aborigines there is practically no chance of having punishment inflicted. If a white man is charged with a serious offence, white property owners constitute the jury and there is little chance of securing a conviction. Where a conviction is recorded there is usually only a nominal penalty imposed. The system of "justice" helps cover up the crimes that come to light.

Where the Aborigines are charged with offences, for example when a property owner says the natives have killed one of his bullocks for food, it is these property owners who are the dispensers of "justice" as well as being the accusers. Furthermore the representatives of the judiciary who deal with the most important cases are themselves so lacking in understanding of the Aborigines as to be incapable of dealing justly with Aborigine "offenders" and are even prejudiced against them and on the side of the white prosecutors.

The Federal Labor Government has absolutely no policy of its own on the Aborigine question. They have simply taken over the policy their predecessors were operating. There is no member of Parliament who has ever spoken intelligently in

public on the question of the Aborigines, and the administration of the Aborigines under a Labor Government continues as previously, it is left in the hands of the permanent state officials, of the Department of the Interior, and any new appointments that are made are chosen by the full-time State officials apparently assisted by their advisers of the Sydney University. There is a very close link-up with the church, and it is unfortunate for the natives that even where Government stations are established, they are really camouflaged missions.

The more enlightened of the missionaries have said that their task is really only to "smooth the dyine pillow" of the Aborigine.

Basically the official policy is to accept as a fact the inevitability of the complete dying out of the Aborigine population of Australia. They profess also the opinion that in the course of the "passing" there will be a development of a substantial half-caste population. In the place of the Aborigine many of them see or hope to see this substantial half-caste population. This is another aspect of Government policy, that they do not regard the sexual use of native women by whites as altogether an evil as it promotes the "inevitable" extinction and replacement by mixed bloods. Although there are regulations against the sexual use of native women by whites there is never any question of punishment, unless in exceptional circumstances. The authorities take away the half-castes who may result from these alliances to bring them up as "useful citizens," in other words to make them useful for the station owners.

And so I repeat one aspect of official policy is to permit this sexual use of native women and exterminate the Aborigines in this way. We are entirely opposed to such a policy.

The Aborigines do not constitute a nation, they constitute tribes and within the tribe the clan is the unit. The hereditary lands belong to the clans. If we spoke of the natives as a "reserve of the proletariat" it would also be making a wrong approach. It is true that in the North and North West of Australia they constitute a majority of the population, and that their welfare is of great importance to the working class in those areas, but if we speak about our movement as a whole we cannot say that the Aborigines represent a reserve of the proletariat. We take up the fight of the Aborigines because they are oppressed, as oppressed as any people in the world, and our task is to fight for all the oppressed.

There have been some important developments in recent times, for instance last year there was a strike of natives employed by stations in the Pilbara area of West Australia. This strike was led by a D. McLeod, a white who champions the cause of the Aborigines. The strike had some measure of success in the face of severe persecution. Following that strike there has been a second example, just the other day, in Darwin. This strike appears

to have taken place without the prior knowledge of any of the whites or of the North Australian Workers' Union. Apparently the Aborigines obtained some information about the strike in W.A. and they themselves, mainly municipal workers in the town of Darwin, came out demanding the same conditions as the whites, and the right to handle their own money; because where money payments are given it is not only a very small amount, but a proportion is retained by the authorities.

Following the strike in W.A. a large number of these natives, under the leadership of McLeod, have started a co-operative enterprise at Port Hedland. It will be extremely difficult for this movement to succeed, as they have the Government, squatters and Police in Western Australia out to destroy it, but nevertheless they have started to work for themselves in obtaining pearl shell and other activities, and their effort should be given attention and assisted.

There has also been the recent agitation concerning the proposed rocket testing area. The Australian Government, because of its foreign policy, has decided it will undertake, in conjunction with the British Government, big expenditure in the testing of rocket weapons, and that the range for testing these weapons will be a belt from South Australia through to the coast of North West Australia. The indications are that the agitation against this proposed rocket range, because of the harmful effects it would have on the Aborigine population, received very widespread support, and the Government has given some assurances the natives will be protected. However if this area is going to be used as a rocket testing ground, there will be various centres established, the authorities will use native labor, and there will be a number of depots and points of disintegration established among the remnants of the aborigine race in this part of Australia. Despite the decision already made by the Government we should continue our agitation against this rocket range.

The North Australian Workers' Union has commenced to take up the fight of the Aborigines. The North Australian Workers' Union officials demanded that they be given representation at the Conference which the Department of the Interior held in Alice Springs on the 8th January. This conference was to discuss the question of the conditions of employment of Aborigines. The Union sent, but this was refused. It was refused only because the Minister for the Interior is the President of the A.W.U., which is hostile to the N.A.W.U., but also because the policy of this Government is to allow the permanent officials and their clerical advisers to continue in absolute control.

The published report of the proceedings of the Alice Springs conference, which was held in camera, indicates that there is no intention of doing anything really substantial to improve the conditions of the Aborigines. Decisions were made about wages for

the qualified Aborigines and smaller payments for the "inefficient" Aborigines, which means there was no real sincerity in the declared intention to bring about improvements for the Aborigines.

The N.A.W.U. reacted to this incident by planning to organise a conference to which they would invite representatives from all interested organisations throughout the country. They have selected individuals in the various States to act as convenors, and plans are in hand which should receive all the support we can give.

Recently the Sheet Metal Workers' Union adopted a resolution demanding: "That a Royal Commission to be appointed to enquire into the position of the full blood Aborigine population and to make recommendations for ensuring its survival and development. The scope of the inquiry to include:

1. The numbers and distribution of the Aborigines according to tribe, and the location of the territory of each tribe.
2. The best area of each tribe's territory to be made an inviolable reserve of the tribe with full legal ownership of the land and its mineral and other resources.
3. The establishment of special native courts, with a new approach to native defendants, based on consideration of native laws and customs.
4. The organisation of a complete medical service for the Aborigines.
5. The administration of the Native Affairs Department and of all Government and mission establishments concerned with the Aborigines. The suitability of present personnel.
6. The best means to secure supervision and centralised control of native affairs for the Commonwealth, under the Commonwealth Government, and a complete scheme of organisation and for training suitable personnel of both sexes for service in the Administration.
7. Such additional questions as the Royal Commission may consider of importance to the inquiry.

This resolution went from the Sheet Metal Workers' Union to the A.C.T.U. and should be endorsed by that body. We should take up a campaign for its adoption by the Government.

In addition to the Aborigines there are 25,000 persons of mixed blood in the Commonwealth. In our work we have endeavoured, without being completely successful, to impress on our members and others who are working for the Aborigines, and the problem of these half-castes, who live in Sydney/Melbourne and other centres, is not the Aborigine question at all. One of the demands of "riginal" and "native," terms "Aborigine," "Aborigine," should not be used in the various Acts and ordinances, should not be applied to persons of mixed blood. However we find people of mixed blood, particularly in N.S.W. and Victoria, who think it is necessary and correct to represent themselves as Aborigines in conducting a campaign for full civic

rights. These persons of mixed blood confuse the fight of the Aborigines with their own problem, which is not the Aborigine fight. In Victoria, there are probably not more than 50 or 60 full blooded Aborigines, and there may be about seven hundred persons of mixed blood. In New South Wales there is a somewhat similar situation, a small number of full blooded Aborigines and comparatively large number of half-castes or persons of mixed blood.

The "Tribune" recently had an article about the position of the half-castes at the Moree settlement, and the main question here is that of full citizen rights. The "Telegraph" had a picture of a half-caste who would not vote in the liquor referendum because he is not permitted to go into a hotel. These people are discriminated against in a way that is barbarian and completely unjustifiable. They live in depressed areas, in houses of

the worst possible kind, and ramshackle huts; they do not get proper education, are excluded from some schools or find it very difficult to get into them. To demand citizen rights for these people is absolutely correct and we must also demand special measures for rehabilitation and assistance, but many supporting this fight generalise from this, that the demand for citizenship rights is the demand for the Aborigines, as well as the half-castes.

To demand citizen rights for half-castes is one thing and to demand it for Aborigines has a different significance entirely. For the Aborigine the main demands must be for ownership of their hereditary lands for each of the tribes, inviolable reserves, medical services, various forms of assistance to develop economic activities under their own control, etc., as set out in our programme.

DISSENTING OPINION OF SOVIET JUDGE AT NUREMBERG WAR CRIME JUDGMENTS

[Following is a summary of the dissenting opinion of Major General of the Judicial Service Nikitchenko, member of the International Military Tribunal from the U.S.S.R., delivered at Nuremberg on October 1, 1946, on the judgment of defendants Schacht, Von Papen, Fritzsche and Hess and the indicted organisations: the German Cabinet, and the General Staff and the High Command of the German armed forces. General Nikitchenko throughout quoted the supporting details from the stenographic record and the specific documents submitted to and accepted by the Tribunal.]

THE Tribunal has decided (a) to acquit defendants Hjalmar Schacht, Franz von Papen and Hans Fritzsche; (b) to sentence defendant Rudolf Hess to life imprisonment, and (c) not to declare the Cabinet and the General Staff and the High Command of the German armed forces to be criminal organisations. I cannot concur with this section of the Tribunal's decision inasmuch as it does not correspond to the factual aspect of the case and is founded on erroneous deductions.

Re SCHACHT: The evidence submitted with regard to Schacht corroborates the following facts: (a) Schacht established contact in 1931 between the leadership of the Nazi Party and the leading representatives of the German industrial and financial world.

On November 12, 1932, Schacht wrote to Hitler: "I have no doubt (as) to your appointment as Reichschancellor. We are endeavoring to collect a large number of signatures in industrial circles to ensure your appointment to this post."

In February, 1933, Schacht organised the financing of the election campaign conducted by the Nazi Party, demanding at a meeting Hitler and Goering had with the industrialists that the latter put up 3,000,000 marks for this purpose.

Schacht, as soon as the Nazis had seized power, took charge of the planning and building up of German armaments. Schacht, as Minister of Economy, was granted unlimited authority, and, to use his own words, "played a colossal role in the arming of Germany."

Making full use of his powers, Schacht carefully worked out and carried into effect a far-reaching plan of economic mobilisation which enabled the Hitlerite leaders to launch an aggressive war.

Schacht saw clearly that not a single country had any intention of fighting Germany. He made use of Germany's military might, which was growing under his guidance, to make territorial demands which grew in proportion to the increase in armaments.

In September, 1934, in conversation with the American Ambassador Dodd, Schacht said that he desired annexation if possible without war, but with war if the United States would stand aside. In 1935, Schacht told Puller, the American consul: "Germany must have colonies. If possible, we shall acquire them through negotiations; if not we shall seize them."

Goering testified that Schacht's withdrawal from the Reichsbank "had nothing to do with the programme of rearmament." Puhl, vice-president of the Reichsbank, confirmed that Schacht's resignation from the Reichsbank was explained by a desire to extricate himself from the situation which had arisen owing to the fraudulent financial manipulations he had conducted. The reason was not Schacht's disagreement with the Hitlerite mass terror.

Witness for the defence Giesevisius testified that he constantly informed Schacht of the terrorist activities of the Gestapo.

It is irrefutably established that: (1) Schacht actively aided the seizure of power by the Nazis;

(2) Schacht closely collaborated with Hitler for 12 years; (3) Schacht ensured the economic and financial basis for the creation of the Hitlerite war machine; (4) Schacht prepared German economy for the conduct of aggressive wars; (5) Schacht took part in persecuting the Jews and in plundering territories occupied by the Germans. The decision to acquit Schacht clearly runs counter to the proofs in the possession of the court.

Re PAPAN: The judgment does not dispute the fact that Von Papan paved the way for Hitler to the post of Reichschancellor and actively facilitated the seizure of power by the Nazis. During the 1934 putsch, Papan ordered his co-worker Tchirski to appear at the Gestapo, knowing beforehand that Tchirski was to be killed. Papan played a tremendous role in fulfilling the Hitlerite plans for the seizure of Austria.

He proposed the various tactical methods which should, on the one hand, lull the vigilance of world public opinion, and, on the other, give Germany the opportunity of completing her military preparations.

After the seizure of Austria Hitler rewarded Papan with the gold badge of the Nazi Party. Later, for his activity as German ambassador to Turkey, he was decorated by Hitler with the Knight's Cross.

Papan utilised all his powers and connections to establish and strengthen the Hitlerite terroristic regime in Germany. He served Hitler faithfully to the very end, utilising his powers and diplomatic cunning to fulfil the Nazi plans of aggression. Consequently, an extremely large share of the responsibility for the crimes of the Hitlerite regime falls upon him. For these reasons I am unable to agree with the verdict of acquittal in respect of defendant Von Papan.

Re FRITZSCHE: The acquittal of Hans Fritzsche stems from the fact that Fritzsche allegedly had not occupied a position which would have made him responsible for the crimes of the Hitlerite regime.

But Fritzsche was the person who up to 1942 did the actual directing of the Reich press and, beginning with 1942, became, as he himself put it, "commander-in-chief of the German radio."

The radio propaganda service was always approved by Hitler as one of the most important and basic factors of conducting aggressive war. Without propaganda founded on the total abolition of freedom of the press, of the air and of speech, aggression into effect, prepared and carried out mass war crimes and crimes against humanity. The most important elements in the propaganda system of the Hitlerite States were the daily press and the radio.

Fritzsche was familiar with Hitler's orders providing for the murder of Russian workers and intellectuals and for the annihilation of Jews in Europe.

On April 7, 1945, Fritzsche, in his last radio speech, urged the civilian population to participate actively in the underground terrorist organisation of the Hitlerites. "We shall call it the 'Wetzwolf,'" he said.

Re HESS: The judgment of the Court gives a correct and exhaustive appraisal of the special position defendant Rudolf Hess occupied in the system of the leadership of the Hitlerite Party and State. Hitler's decree, appointing Hess his deputy, stated: "I hereby appoint Hess my deputy and give him full power to make decisions in my name on all questions of Party leadership."

Hess's crimes against peace are reflected in the judgment of the Court. The last of these crimes should be considered the mission Hess undertook when he flew to Britain with the aim of facilitating the aggression against the Soviet Union by temporarily making peace with Britain.

Hess as well as Himmler founded those SS police organisations which subsequently perpetrated the most brutal crimes against humanity.

Taking into account that Hess was the third in importance as political leader in Hitlerite Germany, that he played a decisive role in the crimes of the Fascist regime, I consider that the only correct punishment for him would be the death penalty.

Re THE GERMAN CABINET: The Committee of prosecutors placed before the Tribunal the question of declaring the Government Cabinet of fascist Germany a criminal organisation. The judgment unfoundedly rejected the proposal. I am unable to agree with this decision. The Tribunal has recognised as established the fact that the Hitlerites committed innumerable monstrous crimes according to plans and directives worked out beforehand. The Tribunal declared criminal several mass organisations set up by the Hitlerites to execute their plans. Under these circumstances all the more unfounded and incorrect in principle is the refusal to declare a criminal organisation the Hitlerite Government which took a direct part in drawing up those criminal plans.

The trade unions were destroyed, their property confiscated, and most of their leaders imprisoned. The Gestapo and concentration camps were set up for the suppression of any resistance to the Government. Without any concrete charges or trial whatever, hundreds of thousands of people were arrested and killed.

The activity of the Hitlerite Government led to war which resulted in the loss of millions of lives and inflicted incalculable material damage and immeasurable suffering to the nations.

Re THE GERMAN GENERAL STAFF AND HIGH COMMAND: The judgment incorrectly rejects the charge of criminal activity as applied to German armed forces and the High Command of the traitors the actual state of affairs and the proofs submitted in the course of the trial.

The leaders of the German armed forces were not merely officers. They were primarily a well-knit group, which was entrusted with the most confidential plans of the Hitlerite leadership.

At the head of the High Command of the Air Forces stood the second man of the Fascist Reich, Goering. The High Command of the Naval Forces was headed by Doenitz, subsequently appointed by Hitler as his successor. The High Command of the Armed Forces was in the hands of Keitel, who signed most of the directives for the annihilation of war prisoners and of the peaceful population of the occupied territories.

In a democratic country no self-respecting military experts, in drawing up purely military plans, will at the same time prepare measures for the murder of war prisoners. Indeed the aggressive plans of Hitlerite Germany could not have been carried out had they not been fully supported by leading corps of the armed forces.

On May 31, 1941, the OKW instructed the troops to employ any terrorist measures against the civilian population of the Soviet Union.

The OKW and the General Staff issued the most brutal decisions and orders concerning inhuman measures against the unarmed peaceful population and war prisoners.

One decision of the OKW laid it down that "... suspected elements must be immediately taken to the officer. The latter decides whether to shoot them or not. . . . It is categorically forbidden to hold suspects for trial." The same

decision gave officers and men freedom to deal as they liked with the civil population. It also granted immunity to soldiers guilty of terrorism, "even when these actions constitute a military crime."

A directive of the OKW dated Sept. 16, 1941, stated: "It should be borne in mind that human life in the countries in question is worth absolutely nothing and that a terrifying effect may be obtained only by the use of unusual brutality." Another directive said: "The troops . . . have the right and are in duty bound to employ . . . any means without any reservation against women and children should this facilitate success . . ."

Extensive evidence on the application of these OKW orders was submitted in the course of the trial. One example was the killing of 50 British air force officers. There is no room for doubt that this crime was instigated by the High Command. Similarly the OKW issued an order on the annihilation of Commando detachments. This latter order was undeviatingly carried out by army groups commanders.

The evidence presented fully established the fact that the General Staff and the High Command of the Hitlerite Army constituted a highly dangerous criminal organisation.

I deem it my duty as a judge to put down in writing the special opinion concerning the important questions on which I dissent with the decision of the members of the Tribunal.

CONFERENCE OF SYDNEY COMMUNISTS

S. PURDY

THE annual conference of Communist Party branches in Sydney and suburbs was held on February 21, 22 and 23. A total of 115 branches (39 industry, 70 locality and 4 others) were represented by 136 delegates (113 men and 23 women), with only 2 branches absent. Delegates averaged six years party membership, 115 were members of trade unions and 55 of other mass organisations. By secret ballot, a new District Committee of 21 members was elected, of whom 6 are leading trade unionists. District Committee members have an average of 12 years party membership, and its executive of six, an average of 15½ years.

Conference discussed, exhaustively, the growth and broadening of the strike movement; and the increasing dissatisfaction with the Labor Party as a result of its protection (through six governments in seven Australian parliaments, and with a Senate majority) of the greedy, profit-hungry employers, especially the monopolists; conference welcomed the now almost unanimous demand of the labor movement for the abolition of wage-pegging; it underlined the liberal nature of Chifley's price control and his government's generosity to employers in allowing price increases, especially

in those important items in the family budget whose prices do not influence the movement of the basic wage, and decided to intensify our fight for more strict and rigid price control at the expense of the profits of the big companies and the black market; we greeted with extreme enthusiasm the decision of the Federal Conference of unions, called by the A.C.T.U., for a general 24-hour stoppage in all industries next May Day, to secure the maximum 40 Hour Week, and determined, by special resolution, that Premier McGirr's later announcement in N.S.W. should only give an added impetus to all of our activities and plans that are directed towards making the May 1 hold-up an outstanding and magnificent demonstration of working class might and solidarity.

In addition to the 40 Hour Week, the following was the main economic programme endorsed for Sydney:

- At least, a further £1 increase in the basic wage.
- Satisfactory increases in all marginal rates, and in rates of pay for women, juniors and apprentices.
- Week-end and other penalty rates for all workers so affected.

● The abolition of direct taxation on all incomes of £300 per annum and under, and a substantial reduction on all middle group incomes.

The realisation of this programme would, in the words of one delegate, "at least, start to modify Mr. Chifley's golden age for the employers and golden syrup for the workers."

"If the economic demands of the workers are seized upon correctly," said J. B. Miles, "they are the link to move the whole chain."

Conference decided that we must immediately press forward to raise still higher the fighting spirit of the working class to win their economic demands and to rally our Party organisations to quickly support, morally and materially, every section of workers engaged in strike struggles and other militant demonstrations.

The recent demonstrations organised by our Party against high prices are to be continued and broadened. At the same time, attention was drawn to the serious shortcoming, that the trade unions had hardly been drawn, as yet, into the campaign, without which, victory cannot be won. Unless the trade unions make the Prices Campaign part and parcel of their Wage Campaign, neither will secure the maximum results.

The new economic depression which is rapidly approaching (especially in the United States, where all restrictions on so-called free enterprise have been removed) is an additional reason why higher wages and lower prices are urgently needed. They would delay the over-production that inevitably and periodically arises in the present system of private ownership of highly mechanised industry, with its economic capacity to produce. In this regard, the failure of the Labor Party to implement its own policy to nationalise the key industries of coal, iron and steel, as well as others like gas, tobacco and the breweries, was vigorously condemned and the demand made that it be done quickly.

Conference was concerned that the growing dissatisfaction with the Labor Governments, especially the Chifley Government, should be met by a strengthening of the United Front of the labor movement and the building of the Communist Party, and not allowed to swing back to the Menzies and Faddens, to the Liberal and Country Parties. In this connection, our N.S.W. election campaign is very important, and it was a good omen that our Communist candidates, and our members, were already going into action.

Delegates cheered the political activity of the Building Workers' Industrial Union in preventing

additions to Rosehill racecourse, and similar actions against privileged interests; and also the ban placed by Sydney waterside workers on the export of soap and tallow until the home market is satisfied, as well as their ban, in line with the decision of the World Federation of Trade Unions, on all goods for Franco's fascist Spain. We were proud of our leading members, who initiated the actions in these two unions.

The post-war struggles of the working class, for fulfilment of the lavish, war-time promises of a prosperous, happy and secure life, have been led by our Party, and in order to guarantee their continuation to complete victory, conference was very emphatic that we need a bigger and stronger Party, especially in industry; that we require many more members trained, by theory and practice, in "the Leninist style of work," a much bigger circulation of our "Tribune" and other literature; and last, but not least, a larger Party income, without which all other problems cannot be satisfactorily solved.

Practical decisions were made accordingly.

Conference showed that during the past twelve months our Party has really started to take our fighting policy to the Sydney masses, as demanded by post-war conditions; it now rests with us to continue this way, and to win the masses. Conference showed that we have numerous branch leaders and other members who are maturing into excellent cadres, and the primary responsibility to give them the quality of leadership necessary for the fulfilment of Conference tasks now lies with the new Metropolitan Committee.

Every District Committee member, trade union official, area organiser, branch secretary and executive member; every group leader and branch member has a big responsibility to the working class, and to our Party and its Leninist Central Committee. We are all faced, now, with the tasks of leading the working class to win substantial improvements in their living standards and working breaks; of building their own confidence in their own organisation, fighting strength; of deepening and widening our influence and organisation in the factories and trade unions; and along this path, and through working class unity, to prepare the preliminary conditions for the final liberation of the working class from the exploitation of man by man.

Sydney was the cradle of our great Australian Communist Party; Sydney Communists must make it the cradle of a free, Socialist Australia.

CONTROVERSY ON "BASIC CRITICISM"

The Editor,
"The Communist Review,"
Dear Comrade,

Of the three examples of "basic criticism" given by Comrade L. H. Gould in the January, 1947, issue of the *Communist Review* (p.p. 413-4), the third seems a flat contradiction of the other two. In the first two, Comrade Gould shows the how lying propaganda was answered by facts. In which "the imperialists skilfully use . . . for their own ends"; at all events, he fails to show any reason for believing that it is not a fact. Surely, "basic criticism of atom bomb diplomacy" involves facing up to the facts, however unpleasant or inconvenient, and showing what are the correct conclusions to be drawn from them, as against the false conclusions drawn by the imperialists.

Imperialist propaganda based on the impossibility of defence against the atom bomb usually takes one of three forms:

(1) The pretence that the "know-how" of this irresistible weapon is an Anglo-American monopoly. The purpose of this pretence is to inculcate defeatism in the face of atom bomb diplomacy.

(2) The claim that atom war would be so overwhelmingly horrible and destructive that no power would dare to make war in the atomic age. The purpose of this is to inculcate complacency and under-estimation of the danger of war preparations.

(3) The argument that, since no defence against atomic weapons is possible, our only hope of survival in the event of aggression in the atomic age is to carry the war into the aggressor's country and try to knock him out before he can do us irreparable damage. The purpose of this is to justify an atomic armament race.

The answer to (1) is that even in the atomic age no power can effectively make war against the determined opposition of its own people, hence there is no need for defeatism, but rather for more determined struggle against the imperialists.

The answer to (2) is that misapprehended science had been making war ever more horrible and destructive for many years before the discovery of the atom bomb; similar arguments were advanced during 1918-38, but history showed that a sufficiently desperate ruling class will go to war even at the risk of destroying its own civilisation, if permitted.

To (3) we can reply:

(a) At present the only people threatening aggression are sections of the British and American ruling classes. So far from being designed to restrain these aggressors, atomic research in capitalist countries is largely under their domination. The Soviet Union has made concrete proposals for international control of atomic energy, contrasting sharply with American proposals to halt research in other countries while building up her

own atomic armaments, hence it is sheer hypocrisy to pretend that the U.S.S.R. is the potential aggressor against whom we have to arm ourselves.

(b) Whatever preparations we make would be of very doubtful efficacy once an atomic war had started. The first attack might conceivably be so overwhelming that the victim's war potential would be practically annihilated before a single weapon could be launched. Hence the logical development of argument (3) is that any power which has a temporary advantage in atomic armaments (at present the U.S.A.) must in self-defence get its blow in first and embark immediately on a plan of world conquest; a prospect that cannot be tolerated except by Yankee jingoes and their Fifth Columnists.

(c) No capitalist government can be trusted with unrestricted atomic armaments.

Hence the only real answer to atom bomb diplomacy and the danger of atomic war leading to the virtual extinction of civilisation is to redouble the struggle against war, and especially to press unrelentingly for effective international control of atomic energy, along the lines proposed by the Soviet Union, and for an immediate cessation of the atomic armament race.

Of course, the whole problem might be considerably simplified if there were an effective defence against the atom bomb, or any conceivable line of research that might lead to the discovery of such a means of defence; but if Comrade Gould knows of any such defence, or any such possible line of research, it is up to him to tell us what it is. Merely to brush aside the considered unanimous opinion of all nuclear physicists because it happens to be inconvenient can only lead scientists to think that Communists are impractical dreamers and doctrinaires who cannot face up to unpleasant facts.

Yours faithfully,

A.W.R.

REPLY BY L. H. GOULD

The passage to which A.W.R. objects is as follows:—

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

All the points raised by A.W.R. hinge upon the opinion he expresses in the final paragraph. He enquires "if Comrade Gould knows of any such defence against the atom bomb." He appears to deny categorically that there is an effective defence against the atom bomb, or "any conceivable line of research that might lead to the discovery of such a means of defence." He then

warns against brushing aside the "considered unanimous opinion of all nuclear physicists because it happens to be inconvenient."

This is what I do know about the atom bomb:

While the bomb undoubtedly possesses enormous destructive power, Stalin and other Soviet leaders emphasize that it is not the decisive weapon in war. Current military and naval theory and practice in all States confirm this view. Allowing for certain obvious modifications, the construction of bases, training of infantry, and the continued manufacture of land and naval weapons are proceeding quite "normally." Examination of the war appropriations of the capitalist countries and of the defence budget of the Soviet Union provides no warrant for the views expressed by those physicists, however sincerely they may believe that there is no defence against the atom bomb.

It is most important to guard against the mistake of completely identifying two distinct questions: Is there a scientific ("military-scientific") defence against the atom bomb? Is the atom bomb the decisive weapon in war? These ques-

tions are certainly intimately related, but they are far from being identical.

I personally don't know of any (military-scientific) defence against the atom bomb!

As a matter of fact, A.W.R.'s arguments, if valid now, would have been equally valid 10 years ago, that is, on the eve of the 2nd World War. At that time the scare propaganda, so useful to the Munichers, stressed the "overwhelming" power of Goering's Luftwaffe ("the bomber always gets through"). Similarly with the "invincible" German tank armies.

In short, A.W.R.'s argument lends itself to the new "theory" of atom bomb blitzkrieg. While agreeing, as above, that the atom bomb does provide its possessor with immense advantages, I consider that A.W.R.'s views are not tenable, and I again repeat that the scare propaganda ("no defence"), however innocent of evil intent some of the physicists may be, does play into the hands of the imperialist warmongers.

A useful reference on this matter is M. Rubenstein's article, "The Atomic Age as American Scientists Picture It," in *New Times*, No. 12, June 15, 1946.

COMMENT ON KEYNESIAN THEORIES OF FULL EMPLOYMENT

I. TRACHTENBERG, Moscow

[I]t is possible that our description of the economic scene which has arisen since the war is incorrect and our calculations inadequate. We have taken as our starting point the existence of the general crisis of capitalism, one of whose characteristic traits is the presence of chronic mass unemployment. But in England and the United States, it is well known, various plans have been worked out for full employment of workers, and attempts at putting these plans into effect have been made.

Plans of the sort have been proposed by individual scholars, by social organisations, and even by governmental agencies.

Attempts are being made to realise plans of full employment by means of government projects; but the success of these plans is, to say the least, doubtful. The fate of the full employment bill introduced by Senator Murray is illuminating. It was introduced into the House of Representatives at the beginning of 1945, and has not yet come up for consideration. Even in England, despite the sweeping promises of the Labor Party, the Government's attempts to carry out those promises have been tinorous, and could not be otherwise, since the Labor Government endeavors to attain full employment and still not destroy private property in the means of production.

But the difficulty is not merely that attempts to attain full employment run up against the opposition of the industrial monopolies, which cannot be

overcome while preserving the "sacred prerogatives" of private property. The plans themselves, which in essence aim at the elimination of crises under capitalism, are radically fallacious. They are based on erroneous theoretical conceptions.

The authors of most of these plans base them on Keynes' theory, developed in his *General Theory of Employment, Interest and Money* (London, 1936); they start from the premise that the level of production and therefore the level of employment are determined by the dimension and direction of expenditures.

Keynes says: "When employment increases, aggregate real income is increased. The psychology of the community is such that when aggregate real income is increased aggregate consumption is increased, but not by so much as income. . . . To justify an amount of current investment there must be absorbed the excess of total output over what the community chooses to consume when employment is at the given level. . . . It follows, therefore, that, pending to consume, the equilibrium level of employment. . . will depend on the amount of current investment. . . . The amount of current investment will depend, in turn, on what we shall call the inducement to invest; and the inducement to invest will be found to depend on the relation between the schedule of the marginal efficiency

of capital and the complex of rates of interest. . ." (op.cit., p. 27f.)

Thus it turns out that the cause of unemployment is the fact that expenditures for consumption are always less than incomes, and the excess income is not used for current investments. Keynes' followers conclude from this that an increase of expenditures, rather than that of all income, provided it be in suitable ways, can make full employment attainable.

Beveridge (who considers that Keynes' book initiated a new epoch in the development of the science of economics) says in his book *Full Employment in a Free Society* (London, 1944): "Employment depends on outlay. . . when employment falls off, this means that someone is spending less; when employment increases this means that in total more is being spent." (p. 29). There are two forms of outlay: for consumption and for investment. Saved incomes, that is incomes not used for consumption, can help increase employment if they are used for investment.

Instability of investment is therefore the chief cause of crises, and hence of unemployment. Beveridge proposes a number of measures to raise demand and especially to increase investments, the authenticity of the investments being made sure of. The execution of these measures should lead to the elimination of mass unemployment.

Beveridge is an advocate of the active intervention of the government in economics. In his opinion, full employment can be achieved only by vigorous governmental action, which would stimulate demand and investment and give investment suitable direction. "Who is to secure that the first condition (of full employment, viz. high level of total outlay) is satisfied?" he asks. "The answer is that this must be made a responsibility of the state. No one else has the requisite powers; the condition will not get satisfied automatically. It must be a function of the state in future to ensure adequate total outlay and by consequence to protect its citizens against mass unemployment, as definitely as it is now the function of the state to defend the citizens against attacks from abroad and against robbery and violence at home." (Ibid. p. 29.)

At the same time, private property in the means of production must be preserved. The policy of full employment is a policy of the socialisation of demand, not of the socialisation of production. In Beveridge's opinion, "war experience confirms the possibility of securing full employment by socialisation of demand without socialisation of production." (Ibid., p. 29.)

The same ideas are basic to the White Book published by the English Coalition Government in May 1944 (*Employment Policy*). Its authors too start from the premise that high level of production and, therefore, of employment is determined by the volume of expenditures: "The country will not suffer from mass unemployment if the public demand for goods and services is maintained at

a high level. . . The more money is spent on goods and services, the more money will be spent on wages and the more employment will increase."

The authors of the White Book propose a number of measures, directed fundamentally at increasing investments.

We cannot dwell extensively here on the concrete nature of these measures; but we will observe that they do not envisage a direct, immediate action of the government: preserving the freedom of private enterprise, the authors of the White Book consider it possible to achieve increased investment by indirect measures such as a suitable credit policy (policy of cheap money). In part, they propose to increase employment by means of public works.

The same ideas are at the basis of those measures which are being put into operation by the Labor government, and also underlie the majority of American projects for abolishing unemployment.

A special supplement to the *Nation* of November 27, 1943, carried an article by Amlic devoted to the problem of full employment. His plan, although it does not fully coincide with the plans of Beveridge and the Labor Party, is nevertheless based on the same Keynesian theoretical conceptions. Amlic says in this article that unemployment can be wiped out either according to Marx or to Keynes. The author chooses Keynes' method, by applying which it is possible to annihilate unemployment while keeping private property in the means of production, that is preserving intact the capitalist mode of production. "Russia's experience during the past fifteen years suggests that communism is one possible answer to the problem of how to attain full employment. The experience of this country and of England has shown that full employment may be attained for the purpose of prosecuting a war. . . what the state does in time of war is not to socialise the means of production, but to socialise the purposes of production, to the end of winning the war."

In the same way, that is by socialising the goals of production, we can, in Amlic's opinion, do away with unemployment in peacetime as well. What is the goal of production in peacetime conditions? "In time of peace," says Amlic, thereby disclosing the essential fallaciousness of his whole conception, ". . . the purpose of production ought to be to get all citizens the high living standards that our production capacity makes possible."

We cannot here go into the criticism of all these theories, which reproduce, in a somewhat modernised form, adapted to present conditions, the familiar "theory of underconsumption," of "insufficient capital," and so forth. The difference is that the old theories of underconsumption started from the premise that the development of production ran up against an absolute insufficiency of capital, while the new theories start from the

April, 1947

premise that capital funds are on hand, but are not spent or not spent in a suitable way.

We will make only a few observations.

First. The goal of production under capitalism is not consumption and not the assurance of a high standard of living to all the citizens, but the obtaining of a maximum profit. "If capitalism could adapt production not to obtaining the maximum of profit, but to the systematic improvement of the material position of the masses of the people, if it could devote its profits not to satisfying the whims of the parasitic classes, not to the perfection of methods of exploitation, not to the exportation of capital, but to the systematic raising of the material position of the workers and peasants, there would be no crises. But then too capitalism would not be capitalism. In order to do away with crises, it is necessary to do away with capitalism." (Stalin, *Questions of Leninism*, 9th edn., p.492f.)



BOOK REVIEW

ENGLISH CHAMBER MUSIC

Ernst H. Meyer
JULIE LATTER.



An "attempt to represent a period of musical history as a natural part of a general social development" is the author's description of this work, which reveals the richness of an almost unexplored wealth of Chamber Music.

Racial and political persecution drove Ernst Meyer from Germany and later led him to settle in England. His interest in English Chamber Music, however, dates from a much earlier period, stimulated by his researches at the British Museum and Christ Church, Oxford, libraries; in 1931 he obtained an academic scholarship from Germany to enable him to pursue these studies.

Among the problems which the book seeks to answer are these: "What was the reason for the appearance of so extensive and significant a period of art and why was its music unknown on the continent? Why was it not the pride and boast of at least the English people?"

The work is based on a dialectical view of the position of the composer in society, and Meyer takes as his first premise a "disagreement with the theory that the individual genius alone, by virtue of his own personal endowments, makes advances or moulds the history of art."

"The direction in which the artist develops his function, style and talent," says Meyer, "is largely conditioned by the social factors of his time, its fashions and conventions (with which he may or may not find himself in harmony) the ascendancy of one set of ideals, the suppression of another, all play their part in influencing his development. The general state of a society is thus reflected in the art it produces.

Second. Every social formation is characterised by definite forms of apportionment. It is an unachievable Utopia to try to alter the apportionment of the national income which is inherent in capitalist society while maintaining private property in the means of production and the anarchy which follows it.

Third. Under capitalism, the state can influence the national economy, but that influence has a very limited range because of the presence of private property in the means of production. The extreme narrowness of these limits was seen even in time of war, when government interference reached its maximum.

Amie prefers Keynes' method to Marx. But the method of Marx has been borne out by actual events: there can be no unemployment in the USSR; but the method of Keynes is a theoretical figment, which is used for demagogic ends.

... A creative artist is no mere photographer of conditions, but a living human being in his own right, reacting to all important tendencies of his time; a great work of art often contains elements which are mere undercurrents in contemporary society.

The vital creative role which the composer fulfils for the people places on him a heavy responsibility. The more truthfully he faces the realities of life—in all its aspects—the more will be the enduring inspiration he gives to his fellowmen, turning many of them towards the progressive undercurrents which the dominant interests of the day may studiously ignore or positively suppress. There is in every classic work of art an element of protest, more, there is in each artist something of a revolutionary. The relationship between the artist and his society is a mutual one... the quality of his awareness will be the measure of his greatness through which his creative power may influence and mould society afresh.

"To represent all composers as consciously 'political' artists and their best work as what is called 'propaganda' art would be a gross mistake equivalent to ignoring the fact that each of the arts has its own distinct medium of imaginative expression.

"During the lifetime of many a composer there are occasions when he makes use of his art for an immediate political purpose (although such occasions have been comparatively rare in the career of most recent composers). Mozart, the composer of the freemason cantatas, is a

April, 1947

political composer, but the Mozart of the C major symphony is not Chopin's Polish national dances, the mazurkas and polonaises were so his piano preludes.

"To try to explain the artist's work in isolation from the social life around him," concludes Meyer, "would be like first strangling a man in working of the breathing organism."

This approach to musical history will be readily appreciated and accepted by Marxists and must prove thought-provoking to the many non-Marxists who will read the book with close attention for the extremely valuable and detailed study which it gives of the music of the period. An appendix gives full scores from many of the composers mentioned.

Two musical trends developed during the middle ages: clerical, and secular or middle-class. The Gregorian chant was codified, fixed and authorised and choral polyphony by which three, four, five or six voice-groups of the choir, each moving along an independent melodic line, announced the clerical message, evolved to a very high degree. The music had a hypnotic effect of magic ritual. The tyranny of three beats to the bar, "symbolising the Holy Trinity," prevailed, and the polyphonic form produced the "eternal melody" which is a feature of this church music.

During the Elizabethan era the gap between these two trends closed and a new form of chamber music arose. The great development of chamber music took place when the struggle between the conservatism of the feudal era and the demand for individual freedom put forward by the middle classes was reaching its decisive stages.

The Catholic church of the middle ages, itself built on the system of fixed land ownership, was the strongest bulwark of conservatism, through its influence on the minds of its adherents. Music played an essential part in this creation of a mentality which regarded the external world as unchangeable and unchangeable—something from which man should free his soul, but only by escape—by flight into the supernatural. This music was vocal music, and the use of instruments was forbidden by many an edict. The church was, however, unable to prevent the secular use of instruments, and in spite of its disapproval of the element of pleasure and individualism which they introduced, after 1150 the church was forced to compromise. The organ hardly ever incurred official disapproval, but from this date some soft-stringed instruments made their appearance in church services. A hundred years later, however, church opposition to instrumental music again stiffened. The church, which had relaxed its ban when it no longer had to fear pagan influences, was now faced with a new and more deadly threat, the rising progressive middle classes, and their denunciations were particularly directed against the itinerant musicians who formed the vast majority of minstrels in later mediaeval England.

Instrumental music, however, continued to gain favour with kings and powerful barons, and in 1469 permission was granted to minstrels to form a guild like that of other trades. These minstrels, who held official court or municipal positions, developed a typical "craft" outlook and despised the wayfarer minstrels who became known as "common fiddlers." From this time dates the practice of playing some voice parts on instruments. Motets, both secular and religious, of fourteenth century origin contain contrapuntal parts without words which apparently were played on instruments. Instrumental music was still unable to develop freely until the new forces for its development, its patrons the progressive and popular mercantile classes, were freed from feudal domination.

It was in the reigns of Henry VII, and Henry VIII, the age of discovery, when the merchants gained decisive influence, that the great change took place in the sphere of music. "The attitude of the new individual towards life was... to change it, to create possibilities of personal freedom, of individual development, economic, political and social." The isolation of town and country, the insularity of the manor house were broken down, and leisure, luxury, and appreciation of the arts developed in the country seats of the new gentry who divided their time between town and country. The first chamber music of this type began to appear about the time that Elizabeth came to the throne.

To the development of the new form of music all parts of the community contributed. The Fantasias and In Nomines (a form with a somewhat obscure religious origin and an invariable theme, of which every well-known composer wrote at least one example) became more secularised, while dance music became more complex and highly developed. The reason for this unity is to be found in the national unity which existed in the Elizabethan age, stimulated both by its resistance to the Spanish attempt at invasion, and by the tremendous colonial and commercial expansion which was taking place. The cultural life of the nation reflected this unity. It was considered part of the attributes of the gentleman of the time to "sing your part sure and at the first sight; withal to play the same upon your viol or the exercise of the lute" (Henry Peacham); but the free yeomanry also had their part in this musical development.

But already an opposition was growing up to this practice of chamber music which was the vogue in every comfortable town and country dwelling. Puritanism, which, in the seventeenth century, was to contest the power of the monarchy, disapproved of this optimistic triumphant music which enjoyed official patronage. The Jacobean era soon brought about the old cleavage between aristocratic and popular music; as the cleavage developed between the absolute monarchy and sections of the rising bourgeoisie court music became artificial and over-intricate, and lost its popular appeal. William

Lewis was the one real genius among Charles I's composers, but the golden age of English chamber music was drawing to its close.

Meyer ascribes the collapse of English chamber music in the eighteenth century to a change in the "cultural climate" of England. He describes the bourgeois nobility of the time as "powerful men, calm and confident, thoroughly sure of themselves and their mission, enterprising, highly intelligent and above all practical in all things . . . practical even in their liberal patronage of fine arts. For they spent handsomely on those arts which a practical man can understand—upon paintings of their wives and daughters, and later upon landscapes showing the richness of their land." But the attitude towards music changed. Dr. Burney wrote: "Music is a Manufacture in Italy, that feeds a large portion of the people; and it is no more disgraceful

to a mercantile country to import it, than wine, tea or any other production of remote parts of the world. . . ." Music became a commodity purveyed to passive listeners at public concerts.

A feeling of inferiority in the musical sphere persists in most British minds, and it is one of the purposes of this book to dispel this feeling. Meyer sees a very hopeful future for English music, whose creative power has asserted itself strongly in the last fifty years, so that "new audiences have arisen; orchestras are growing; many new composers vie with one another in friendly competition to express the revolutionary changes that are taking place around them and in their minds and souls."

["English Chamber Music—The History of a Great Art—From the Middle Ages to Purcell," Ernst H. Meyer (Lawrence & Wishart, London).]

Questions & Answers

conducted by
L.H. GOULD

What is imperialism? If British troops really withdraw from India, will it mean that Britain is ceasing thereby to be an imperialist power? Also, is Australia imperialist?—S. Cathcart.

First, British imperialism is not going to withdraw so easily! Attlee's statement is a typical piece of imperialist provocation and deception. The idea that British imperialism will "voluntarily hand over power" must be rejected out of hand.

But in any case, the ending of military occupation of colonial lands by the "home" capitalist country does not alter the latter's imperialist status; it is affected only in a minor way, incidentally, but not basically. The withdrawal (more accurately the kicking out of imperialism) from India, Egypt, etc., will mark the further decline of British and world imperialism but not, to repeat for emphasis, a fundamental alteration in character. A burglar remains a burglar even though new circumstances make burgling more difficult, or if his stored-up loot is taken from him. So let no one be fooled by Attlee's pretensions, or by the nauseating propaganda of the imperialists that their only concern is whether the Indian peoples "will be able to govern themselves"!

Lenin briefly defines imperialism: "Imperialism is capitalism in that stage of development in which the domination of monopolies and finance capital has established itself; in which the export of capital has acquired pronounced importance; in which the division of the world among the international trusts has begun; in which the partition of all the territories of the globe among the great capitalist powers

has been completed." Imperialism, he emphasised, is the "eve of the proletarian revolution."

The factor which stamps capitalism as imperialism is, first and foremost, the replacement of free competition by monopoly domination. What Lenin called the quinquessence of imperialism is precisely this emergence of monopoly, this substitution of monopoly for the earlier free competitive stage of capitalism. Military occupation and direct political control of colonies are important aspects and consequences of imperialism; but the essence of imperialism remains the "concentration of production and capital developed to such a stage that it creates monopolies which play a decisive role in economic life."

So long therefore as monopolies dominate the economic life of Britain, so long will British capitalism continue essentially imperialist. And this is so, even though the domination is indirect and cunningly concealed in various ways, such as the spurious "nationalisation" policy of the Attlee Government. Furthermore, if British investments in India continue after the (forced!) withdrawal, then Britain's imperialist relations with India remain substantially in force; but now no longer by direct military power but by indirect financial influence and control. The only change will be the new method of extracting the super-profits from India's toiling masses; the native Indian bourgeoisie will serve as agents and dividend-collectors for their erstwhile white overlords.

This last point is very important, because it reveals the reality of imperialist exploitation beneath the facade of "independence" and "self-govern-

ment." A variety of new features of imperialism may be observed in this period of its declining power and the advance of the Socialist and the national-liberationist movements throughout the world. The traditional, the "classical," form of imperialist domination was conquest of the colony, seizure of its resources, brutal enslavement of the natives in the factories, mines and on the plantations, and the further extortions for payment of the army of administrators, magistrates, managers, tax-gatherers and other colonial bureaucrats. This form still operates generally in the central and southern areas of Africa.

But in Africa and elsewhere the imperialists cannot hide their parasitism and decay, their murderous rivalries, and their frantic attempts to stave off the day of doom. Here are a few interesting and instructive examples from the history of this epoch of imperialism and the proletarian revolution.

Argentina. This is one of several countries, politically independent, but which has been subject to a degree of imperialist domination by "financial intervention" from outside. British capital was heavily invested in the Argentine, particularly in railways, mining and meat-packing. Much of Argentina's internal life, its economics, its politics and also its culture, were strongly influenced by Britain. Every loan granted by London contained provisions covering what and where to buy, aspects of the country's trade and diplomatic relations with other countries, and so on. Nor must one forget the outright bribery of government officials. Of special interest in the past decade in Argentina has been what Chicago's gangsters, in their inter-gang wars, would term the "hijacking" activities of the USA monopolies. Britain, in short, has been hijacked by its rival imperialist gangsters, and made to hand over and clear out. The process developed in a "dignified" way, but it was hijacking just the same. Lately, a new lot of hi-jackers have come on the scene—

Peron dictatorship plus fugitive Nazis and Francoists fighting, and not unsuccessfully, to out the Americans.

Greece. At the moment of writing the proposal is for USA to find the cash, Britain to supply the troops. Here is something of world historical significance. In the past it was usually Britain who "paid money for flesh and blood", i.e., financed wars in which the soldiers of other nations did most of the fighting. The whirlwind of time is

bringing its own peculiar retribution. Or is it peculiar—when one considers the desperation of British imperialism in hanging on to its spheres of influence in the eastern Mediterranean? At any rate, the fact remains that British troops are to become mercenaries in the proposed "business deal."

Germany. The Germany following the imperialist world war (1914-18) offers in many ways the most important examples of imperialist oppression—and a warning for the future. The story is a long one, but these may be noted: (1). Although deprived of all her colonies after 1918, Germany soon advanced again as an imperialist Power, with the giant monopolies (Krupp, Thyssen, AEG, etc.) dominating the economy of the country. (2). By means of the fascist terror which the imperialists used from 1933 onward, the political status of the German toiling masses and those of Czechoslovakia and Austria were reduced virtually to "coolie" levels, i.e., to a deprivation of rights hitherto "reserved" mainly for the toilers of colonial and semi-colonial lands. (3). The imperialists of USA and Britain are now striving to revive German (and also Japanese) imperialism, this time of course not as rivals and threat to their own position, but as allies against the advancing Socialist movement.

Australia is also an imperialist Power, although only a second-rate imperialism when measured by the economic strength of USA and Britain. Australian economy exhibits all the characteristic features of imperialism, in particular, the domination of monopolies and the emergence of the financial oligarchy. All the other aspects of imperialism, the parasitism and decay, are present too: export of capital, brutal exploitation of the natives of the islands within the Australian jurisdiction, increasing exploitation of the Australian workers and farmers, the threatened extinction of the Aborigines, and, not least, the tie-up with the other imperialisms which are preparing for war against the Soviet Union and the new democracies. And here too, as abroad, the monopolists find Labor's right wing, the reformists, eager allies in their efforts to defeat the mass struggles led by our Party.

Australian imperialism also confirms the truth in Lenin's statement that imperialism is "moribund capitalism" and the "eve of the proletarian revolution."

[References: Lenin, "Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism."]

ANAESTHETICS

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

ON December 21, 1846, the first surgical operation under an anaesthetic was done at University College, London. The anaesthetic used was ether. This was almost certainly the first use of an anaesthetic in England for a serious operation.

The pioneer in this field was the great chemist

Davy, who showed that nitrous oxide, or laughing gas, was an anaesthetic. However, if you breathe it pure you get no oxygen and soon go black in the face. A mixture with air usually contains too little oxygen or too little nitrous oxide. So either you do not lose consciousness fully, or are

suffocated. There is no harm in being slightly suffocated during the extraction of a tooth, but it would be fatal during an operation lasting half an hour. So nitrous oxide can only be used in a major operation if it is mixed with the right amount of oxygen, and even in dentistry such a mixture is desirable.

The vapor of ether was first used as an anaesthetic in America. There is some doubt as to who was mainly responsible, though Wells probably deserves most of the credit. It is also said that the effects of ether were first observed at ether parties, where the guests used to breathe or drink ether to get drunk. This has the advantage over alcohol that one recovers much more rapidly, but it is certainly more dangerous.

Ether was probably used in Scotland a few months earlier than in England, and Simpson soon introduced chloroform at Edinburgh as a rival anaesthetic. Ether is very inflammable, and sometimes explosive, while chloroform is not. This was a very serious matter before the days of steam heating. Also ether is more apt than chloroform to cause coughing and struggling if it is used to "put the patient under." Nowadays the anaesthetist usually makes one unconscious with ethyl chloride or some rapidly acting vapor, and then switches over to chloroform or ether.

However, occasionally ether is used from the start. The last time I had a serious operation they used it on me, and I found the experience delightful. Still, many people dislike it.

Since then a number of other gases and vapors have been used, but none have been very widely adopted.

Other anaesthetics are injected into a vein in liquid form, sometimes in conjunction with ether or chloroform as vapor.

Finally, it is possible to block the sensory nerves leading from a part of one's body, without blotting out consciousness. This can be done by injecting a drug near a nerve, or inside the backbone.

No surgeon thinks of doing a serious operation without an anaesthetic. But unfortunately, although it is nearly a century since Simpson first used chloroform in childbirth, hundreds of thousands of babies are born every year in Britain without any attempt to alleviate the mother's pain.

The centenary of Simpson's first use of chloroform for childbirth will be coming round in 1947. I would like to see a nation-wide campaign led by the women of the Communist Party to see that an anaesthetic is available for every British mother to celebrate this centenary.

It is not always necessary, and it is often quite sufficient to dull the pain without making the mother quite unconscious. But an anaesthetic should always be available.

How do anaesthetics act? There are plenty of theories, but nobody knows for certain.

All anaesthetics show two properties. They

are soluble in water, and also in oily substances. Because they are soluble in water, the blood can take them up, and carry them round to all parts of the body. Because they are soluble in oil, they can get through the oily films which surround the cells, and penetrate into the watery protoplasm inside them.

Probably every substance with these two properties is an anaesthetic unless it has some effect before it reaches a high enough concentration to make one unconscious.

A substance like sugar or salt, which is soluble in water but not in oil, is seldom an anaesthetic, though magnesium chloride is one when injected into a vein. Nor is a substance like camphor or castor oil, which is soluble in oil but not in water.

Anaesthetics probably act by slowing down various processes, including oxidation, which take place in living cells. They can interfere with other organs besides the brain. For example, chloroform can damage the liver very severely, and many people have died in consequence. This is one reason why ether is more often used than chloroform.

How they act is far from clear. But a new light has been thrown on the subject by the remarkable discovery of Captain Behnecke, of the U.S. Navy Medical Corps, and his colleagues, that nitrogen and argon are narcotics. If you breathe pure nitrogen or argon you fall down unconscious with oxygen want. If you breathe them mixed with enough oxygen at ordinary pressure, nothing happens. But if you breathe them at high pressures, even with plenty of oxygen added, you become silly. No one has breathed them at a high enough pressure to become quite unconscious, but I have found that in air at ten atmospheres' pressure, the sense of pain is really greatly dulled.

Now nitrous oxide is about 40 times as soluble in water as nitrogen, and in consequence the blood takes up enough of it at an ordinary pressure to act as an anaesthetic. But weight for weight, nitrogen, nitrous oxide, and chloroform are about equally narcotic, and ether distinctly less so. Only you would need about 30 atmospheres' pressure to force as much nitrogen into your body as the amount of nitrous oxide or chloroform that you can take up at an ordinary pressure.

Since nitrogen and argon do not combine with anything in your body, this means that they simply act by getting in the way, and slowing down chemical processes.

It is quite possible that the rare gas, xenon, will prove to be the ideal anaesthetic.

At present xenon cannot be prepared in large enough quantities, but if air is liquefied on a vast scale, as it is in connection with the underground burning of coal in the Soviet Union, it may be practicable to use it.

However that may be, we have had other quite good anaesthetics for a century, and it is a scandal that we do not use them as they should be used.