

COMMUNIST REVIEW



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

No. 75.

NOVEMBER, 1947

Price 6d.

Vyshinsky Spotlights Warmongers

FULL SPEECH

ORGAN OF THEORY AND PRACTICE OF THE AUSTRALIAN
COMMUNIST PARTY

Editor L. L. Sharkey

FOR PEACE AND FRIENDSHIP OF THE PEOPLES—AGAINST THE INCENDIARIES OF A NEW WAR

Speech of A. Y. Vyshinsky at the Plenary Session of UNO General Assembly on September 18.

ONE year has passed since the first session of the General Assembly. It is necessary to look back upon the road traversed during this time, to analyse the work performed during this period by UNO, to draw certain conclusions and to outline possible prospects. Each delegation, each member country of UNO, is bound to discharge this duty impartially and conscious of its great responsibility in this matter, which requires perfect clarity, impartiality and respect for truth which should reign supreme.

Looking back, the Soviet delegation is bound to note that during the period under review the work of UNO has been marked by grave shortcomings. These shortcomings should be resolutely and consistently exposed and named. They consisted mainly in a departure from the most important principles placed at the foundation of the Organisation, and, on a number of occasions, even in a direct violation of several important decisions of the General Assembly.

These shortcomings are to a considerable extent

U.S.A. AND GREAT BRITAIN AGAINST REDUCTION OF ARMAMENTS.

Among the most important shortcomings in the activities of UNO one must note in the first place the unsatisfactory progress of the work for the implementation of the decision of the Assembly of December 14, 1946, on a general reduction of armaments. The resolution on a general reduction of armaments, passed unanimously by the General Assembly last year, meets the vital interests of the masses of the people who continue, despite the termination of the Second World War, to shoulder the burden of war expenditure and the enormous hardships caused by the ceaseless growth of armaments.

The Assembly's decision on a general reduction of armaments was at the same time an expression of the desires and demands of the peace-loving peoples for the establishment of enduring peace and international security, an expression of the demands dictated by the suffering they experienced and the sacrifices they made. It was precisely for this reason that the decision was received by the peoples of the world with profound satisfaction and the hope that it would be carried out rapidly and fully.

This hope, however, was not justified.

When attempts were being made in the Security Council and the Commission for Ordinary Armaments to outline practical measures for implementing the decision of the General Assembly on the

due to the efforts of such influential member States of UNO as the U.S.A. and Great Britain to make use of the Organisation in their narrow group interests, in disregard of the interests of international co-operation on the basis of the principles formulated in the Charter.

The policy of exploiting the organisation by various States in their selfish and narrowly conceived interests leads to the loss of its prestige, as was the case with the League of Nations of sad memory. On the other hand, the unsatisfactory state of affairs in UNO, which unfavourably affects its prestige, is a result of the fact that the abovementioned States ignore the Organisation and attempt to take a number of practical actions outside UNO and over its head.

It is necessary to turn our attention to the grave danger UNO is facing as a result of such a policy, which is incompatible with the principles of the Charter and with the aims and purposes the United Nations set themselves while forming the Organisation.

general regulation and reduction of armaments, the representatives of the U.S.A. and Great Britain advanced such conditions for the reduction of armaments as could not but disrupt the implementation of the abovementioned decision of the Assembly.

All the activities of the American and British delegations in the Commission for Ordinary Armaments prove that the U.S.A. and Great Britain refuse to reduce their armaments, refuse to disarm, and hinder disarmament, which gives rise to alarm among the peace-loving nations.

The statement made by Mr. Bevin at Southport to the effect that he does not intend to assist in disarmament provides a convincing answer to the question as to the causes of the unsatisfactory state of affairs with regard to the implementation of the Assembly's decision on a reduction of armaments.

The same thing is revealed by the recent speech delivered by Mr. Truman in Petropolis, when the American President emphasised that the armed forces of the U.S.A. would be preserved, and when he did not mention by a single word the undertaking to effect a reduction of the armed forces — an undertaking assumed by the United Nations in accordance with the decisions of the General Assembly.

LIST OF CONTENTS

SPEECH TO U.N.O. ASSEMBLY	A. Y. Vyshinsky	707
WARNING ON INFLATION DANGER	E. W. Campbell	719
DEMOCRACY OF A NEW TYPE	Prof. Eugene Yarga	721
YOUTH AND THE COMING CRISIS	"Youth Activist"	725
SELF-GOVERNMENT FOR SCOTLAND	W. Lauchlan	727
THE OBSCURITY OF PICASSO'S ART	Len Fox	729
THE THOUGHT OF MAO TSE-TUNG	Anna Louise Strong	730
RESOLUTION OF THE C.P. OF BURMA		735
SCIENTISTS UNDER HITLER AND SINCE	A.C.P. Science Committee	738
BOOK REVIEW	J.W.	740
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS	L. H. Gould	741
SEARCHING FOR THE BLUE STARS	Prof. J. B. S. Haldane, F.R.S.	743

As we have said, this attitude of the U.S.A. and Great Britain with regard to the reduction of armaments and the absence of positive results in implementing the tasks formulated in the resolution of December 14, 1946, engenders justified alarm and anxiety about the success of the cause which we have launched; and this is especially intensified

U.S.A. DISRUPTS THE WORK FOR THE

Millions of common people are especially alarmed by the unsatisfactory state of affairs with regard to the prohibition of atomic and other main weapons of mass destruction. This alarm is further justified in that the atomic weapon is a weapon of attack, a weapon of aggression.

After a year and a half of the work of the Atomic Energy Commission, not a single task set it by the resolution of the General Assembly of January 24, 1946, has been accomplished, and, moreover, no progress whatever has been made in its implementation.

The Soviet Government, on its part, took a number of steps to assist in a positive solution of this problem.

Supplementing and developing its proposal concerning the conclusion of an international convention on the prohibition of atomic and other main weapons of mass destruction, the Soviet Government moved for consideration by the Atomic Energy Commission a proposal on the main principles of international control of atomic energy.

This proposal, however, met with resistance, chiefly on the part of the United States. Expecting to preserve its monopoly in atomic arms, the U.S.A. resists every attempt to secure the destruction of its stocks of atomic bombs and prohibition of their further manufacture, and at the same time consistently extends production of these bombs.

The differences that arose on this basis among members of the Commission hinder its work and paralyse all efforts directed at an effective solution of the problem with which the Commission is charged.

There is no doubt, however, that many differences could have been eliminated if certain delegations, including the American, had approached the subject in a more impartial way. For instance, it would have been possible to eliminate the difference which arose in connection with the proposal of the Soviet delegation on destruction of the stock of atomic bombs after the convention on the prohibition of atomic weapons comes into force.

It is known that a majority in the Commission agreed in principle to the need for destroying stocks of the atomic weapon and for using the nuclear fuel they contain for peaceful purposes only. The delegation of the United States alone persists in objecting to the destruction of the stock of atomic bombs, thus preventing the adoption of the decision on this subject approved by a majority in the Commission.

by the race of armaments, including atomic weapons, and by the warlike preparations of certain States and by the warlike military and economic might. This undermines confidence in the sincerity of the peaceable declarations and statements of determination to rid coming generations of the calamities of war.

PROHIBITION OF ATOMIC WEAPONS.

The situation which has arisen in connection with inspection also merits attention. Until lately the American delegation emphasised the special importance of inspection. In the proposals of the Soviet delegation inspection also figures as a fundamental measure following the prohibition of the atomic weapon. At present, however, the American delegation has suddenly begun to belittle the significance of inspection and to push other questions to the foreground, such as the transfer of atomic plants to the possession of an international organ, their management, licensing, and so on.

In doing so the American delegation refuses to consider the opinion of competent scientists who — as stated, for instance, in a memorandum of the Council of the British Association of Scientific Workers, uniting prominent men of science — object to the possession of the means of production of atomic energy by an organ of international control.

It is known that in this memorandum the British scientists emphasised that the granting to this organ of full ownership of the means of production in the usual sense of this word would cause difficulties, since it would entitle the organ of atomic energy control to decide whether a given country has the right to build energy plants, and would also entitle that organ to prevent the utilisation of energy produced by such plants or lay down terms for the supply of such energy.

Criticising the principle upheld by the American delegation since the time when Mr. Baruch was active, the British scientists rightly say that such restriction would create an opportunity for interference in the economic life of each country to an extent not necessary for preventing the use of atomic energy for destructive purposes.

This is the voice of men of science who consider this problem from the angle of the interests of scientific progress, which is incompatible with unrestricted control by some centralised international organ over scientific research pursuing peaceful objects, those of discovering and increasing the supply of energy.

This is why the memorandum of the British atomic scientists advocates a plan which would provide a guarantee against the accumulation of dangerous materials without permission of the organs of atomic energy control and would at the same time enable all countries to display initiative in the construction on their respective territories of plants producing atomic energy in addition to their power resources.

THE SOVIET UNION STANDS FOR PROHIBITION OF ATOMIC WEAPONS AND STRICT INTERNATIONAL CONTROL.

In the interests of the consolidation of general peace, the Soviet Union proposed a convention be concluded prohibiting the use of the atomic weapon on all occasions. The proposal of the Soviet Union met with wide response and support in all countries. The memorandum of the British Association of Scientific Workers says that such a convention seems highly desirable and that it is difficult to justify the unwillingness of Great Britain and the U.S.A. to agree to it.

Dealing with the demand of the U.S.S.R. for the destruction of stocks of atomic weapons and for the discontinuation of their production, the British scientists write that this demand seems to them highly reasonable.

The Soviet Union favours strict international control over atomic energy plants, which, however, should not grow into interference in those branches of national industry and in those matters which are not connected with atomic energy.

Here, too, the British atomic scientists are right when they express the wish in their memorandum published on January 23 that the right of inspection be restricted as far as possible and that it should not become a means for expressing excessive curiosity with regard to lawful industry and other activities.

In their memorandum published in August the British scientists point once more to the necessity of establishing definite limits for the right of inspection, which should not serve the purpose of organised economic and military intelligence. The memorandum points out that the U.S.A. and other adherents of the Baruch plan should be induced to formulate guarantees ensuring a situation in which no plan for inspection could turn into a thoroughly elaborated system of espionage.

Proceeding from the above-mentioned principles of the organisation of international control, which, I repeat, should be real, strong and effective, the Soviet delegation deems it necessary to set certain limits to the organs of inspection, to restrict their rights to tasks of the actual control of atomic energy and preclude the possibility of the control organs being exploited for arbitrary interference with any branches of the national economy, regardless even of the fact that interference of this kind can only undermine and ruin the national economy of any country.

The American delegation and certain other delegations supporting it especially insist that all plants producing atomic materials in dangerous quantities should be owned and managed by the inter-

national control organ, which thus turns into the owner which will act in the interests of the majority of the members of this organ, of whom the Soviet Union cannot expect an attitude of goodwill.

But it is precisely this situation that delegations grouping themselves around the American delegation and acting under the latter's direction are out to achieve.

The above-quoted memorandum of the British scientists makes no secret of the fact that the American plan for atomic energy control envisages measures which may be interpreted as perpetuating the domination of the United States in the field of atomic energy. The Soviet delegation objects and will object to such a situation and will insist that the international control organ should not be dominated by any single country, but that all its participants should enjoy equality in all activities of this organ.

In this connection it should also be recalled that the representatives of the U.S.A. in the Atomic Commission stubbornly object to the simultaneous establishment of control over atomic production in all stages from extraction of the raw materials to the finished output.

The representatives of the U.S.A. propose to postpone indefinitely the establishment of control over the most dangerous final stages of atomic production, in which the U.S.A. regards itself at the present time as the monopolist. At the same time they insist on immediate introduction of control of the initial stage — that of the extraction of raw materials. It is perfectly clear that the American attitude can only be interpreted as one aimed at preventing the extension of control to the United States, whereas all other countries would be subordinated to international control right now.

Such is the situation with regard to the atomic problem. Naturally one cannot expect the success of an undertaking in which certain delegations display no desire to co-operate for achieving the aims set in the resolution of the General Assembly of December 14 last year.

We cannot tolerate such a situation or reconcile ourselves to the fact that the threat of utilising atomic energy for the mass destruction and extermination of a peaceful population has not yet been eliminated. The conscience of the nations cannot reconcile itself to a situation where, despite UNO's appeal to itself to put an end to the atomic weapon and to the other main weapons of mass destruction and to the other main sources of mass destruction of human beings, the production of the means of mass destruction is not only continued but constantly extended.

THE TRUMAN-MARSHALL PLANS ARE INCOMPATIBLE WITH THE PRINCIPLES OF UNO.

Especially vivid examples of the violation of the principles of the Organisation and of disregard

for it are provided by the so-called Truman doctrine and Marshall plan.

As proved by the experience of recent months, the proclamation of this doctrine signified that the Government of the U.S.A. plainly renounced the principles of international co-operation and agreed actions of the Great Powers and proceeded to try and dictate its will to other independent States, at the same time obviously making use for political pressure of the economic means set aside in aid of certain needy countries.

Striking evidence of this is provided by the measures being carried out by the Government of the U.S.A. in Greece and Turkey, outside of UNO and over its head, as well as by the measures being outlined under the so-called Marshall plan in Europe. This policy is in sharp contradiction to the principle proclaimed by the General Assembly in the resolution of December 11, 1946, that aid to other countries should never be used as a political weapon.

It is now obvious that the Marshall plan is only a version of the Truman doctrine adapted to the conditions of post-war Europe. When advancing this plan, the U.S. Government evidently intended, with the assistance of the Governments of Great Britain and France, to confront the European countries needing aid with the necessity of giving up their inalienable right to dispose of their own economic resources, of planning their national economies at their own discretion, and intended to place all these countries in direct dependence on the interests of the American monopolies, which are striving to avert an imminent crisis by intensifying the export of goods and capital to Europe.

ACTIONS IN CONTRADICTION TO UNO CHARTER.

Similarly, one cannot describe as normal a situation in regard to relations between the members of UNO in which foreign armed forces continue to remain in the territories of member-States of the Organisation as a means of political intervention in their domestic affairs, which creates relations between States marked by inequality and dependence and contradicting the UNO Charter.

British troops are still in Egypt contrary to the latter's will, in Greece in violation of the Constitution of her State, in Transjordan which has applied for admission into the Organisation. American troops still stay in China, which by no means contravenes the establishment of internal peace and tranquillity in that country.

The stay of foreign troops in non-enemy territories should not be allowed unless it is connected with the guarding of communications with former enemy territories during the period of their occupational confidence among nations calls for the earliest and positive solution of the problem of the evacuation of non-enemy States by foreign troops which are not employed for guarding communications with former enemy countries.

It is known that not all the countries of Europe despite want and the difficulties of post-war economic rehabilitation, agreed to such an impairment of their sovereignty, to such intervention into their domestic affairs, while the countries which took part in the well-known negotiations on this subject in Paris realise ever more clearly the true meaning of these offers of aid.

It becomes ever more obvious to everyone that the implementation of the Marshall plan will mean the subordination of the European countries to the economic and political control of the U.S.A. and the latter's direct intervention into the domestic affairs of these countries. At the same time this plan represents an attempt to split up Europe into two camps and to complete, with the help of Great Britain and France, the formation of a bloc of a number of European countries inimical to the interests of the democratic countries of Eastern Europe and, primarily, of the Soviet Union.

An important feature of this plan is the desire to confront the countries of Eastern Europe with a bloc of several West European countries, including Western Germany. This envisages the utilisation of Western Germany and of German heavy industry in the Ruhr as one of the most important economic bases of American expansion in Europe, contrary to the national interests of the countries which were victims of German aggression.

It suffices to recall these facts to establish beyond any dispute the utter incompatibility of such a policy of the U.S.A., and of the British and French Governments supporting it, with the fundamental principles of UNO.

One should note also that certain members of the Organisation have failed to comply with the important decisions of the Assembly on the Spanish Indians in South Africa, on discrimination against the former mandated territory of South-West Africa (the Union of South Africa). The General Assembly cannot overlook such actions of certain members of the Organisation which disrupt the objects set in its decisions and undermine the prestige of UNO.

In this connection, we cannot but dwell on developments in Indonesia. These developments can only be described as an act of aggression against the Indonesian people committed by a State which is a member of the United Nations. The unprovoked armed attack of Holland on the Indonesian Republic has evoked the lawful indignation of all honest people in the world.

Has UNO, however, rendered due protection to the Indonesian people? We all know that this did not happen. As a result of the examination of the Indonesian problem by the Security Council, certain States exerted considerable efforts to belittle the significance of the developments in Indonesia

and to impose on the Security Council a decision on this subject which can by no means be regarded as adequate for protecting the lawful interests of the Indonesian Republic, which has become the victim of an armed attack.

Clearly, such decisions cannot fail to undermine the prestige of UNO, which is called upon to ensure the maintenance of peace among the nations.

Noteworthy is the fact that, while certain influential Powers fail to take a proper interest in the elimination of the unsatisfactory state of affairs with regard to the solution of the Spanish and other problems mentioned above, they display special interest in the Iranian problem, which remains on the Agenda of the Security Council one year and a half after its final settlement, and after Iran herself has requested that this question be withdrawn from the agenda of the Security Council.

Noteworthy also is the stubborn desire of the delegates of the U.S.A. and Great Britain, at any cost and contrary to common sense, to keep the Iranian problem on the agenda of the Security Council, evidently for some specific purposes.

The more noteworthy is the fact that the inordinate stubbornness displayed in this case by the American and British members of the Council could not be shaken even by the perfectly grounded explanation of the General Secretary to the effect that there is no reason for the Council to deal with the so-called Iranian problem.

In regard to the Council for Trusteeship, the Soviet delegation believes it necessary to note the following:

At the meeting of the General Assembly on December 13, 1946, the delegation of the U.S.S.R. criticised the agreements on trusteeship of the former mandated territories presented to the Assembly for confirmation since neither the procedure of preparation itself of these agreements nor some of their articles met the demands of the UNO Charter.

The fact that these agreements, with the above-mentioned shortcomings, were made the basis for the organisation of the Trusteeship Council certainly could not but influence the attitude of the U.S.S.R. delegation regarding the election of mem-

bers of the Council set up on the basis of these agreements.

The Soviet delegation still adheres to the view expressed on this subject at the Assembly meeting on December 13, 1946. The delegation of the Soviet Union as a permanent member of the Trusteeship Council would like to hope that the violations of the Charter which have taken place in concluding trusteeship agreements will be rectified, which undoubtedly would help the Trusteeship Council to accomplish the tasks it faces. It is self-evident that this would meet the interests of UNO as a whole and those of the population of the territories in trust.

The unsatisfactory conditions in the work of UNO are not accidental, but the result of the attitude towards UNO of a number of member countries and primarily of the U.S.A. and Great Britain. This attitude does not help to strengthen the Organisation or to promote the cause of international co-operation. On the contrary, it weakens and undermines UNO, which undoubtedly conforms to the plans and intentions of reactionary circles in those countries under whose influence such a policy is pursued.

As to the Soviet Union, its policy in regard to UNO is a policy of strengthening this Organisation, a policy of extending and consolidating international co-operation, a policy of unwaveringly and consistently observing the Charter and implementing its principles.

The strengthening of UNO is possible only on the basis of respect for the political and economic independence of States, respect for the sovereign equality of nations, as well as consistent and unreserved observance of one of the most important principles of UNO — that of the agreement and unanimity of the great Powers in passing decisions on the most important problems concerning the maintenance of international peace and security.

This is in full conformity with the special responsibility of these Powers for the preservation of general peace and forms the guarantee of the defence of the interests of all member countries of UNO, great and small. The Soviet Union deems it its duty resolutely to fight any attempt to shake this principle, whatever motives may be employed to cover these attempts.

MR. MARSHALL'S NEW PROPOSALS.

It remains for me to say certain things in connection with the speech of the U.S. Secretary of State, Mr. Marshall. In his speech he dealt with questions which have already more than once served as a subject for discussion. Most of these questions figure as separate items on the agenda of the Assembly and consequently we shall be able to state our views on them in the proper place and at the proper time.

Mr. Marshall also raised in his speech some new problems, on some of which the Soviet delegation believes it necessary to dwell at once.

The first is the question of the threat to the independence and territorial integrity of Greece. Leaving the discussion of this question on the proper scale to the moment when the Assembly will take it up in accordance with the established procedure, the Soviet delegation considers it necessary only to note that the very raising of this question is devoid of any foundations whatever.

The charges against Yugoslavia, Bulgaria and Albania advanced by the American delegation are totally arbitrary and unsupported by any proof. They go much farther than the conclusions of the

majority in the Commission, which did not gain the support of nearly one-half of the members of this Commission, and which do not stand criticism if one considers in the least seriously the data on which these conclusions are based. It will not be difficult to prove that the report of the majority of the Commission on the so-called Greek question is full of contradictions and crude distortions which deprive the conclusions of this majority of all significance.

As to Korea, Mr. Marshall quite arbitrarily and wrongly presented the case in such a light that the futility of the work of the Soviet-American Commission for Korea was charged to the Soviet party and moved a proposal which plainly violates the Moscow agreement of the three Ministers of Foreign Affairs on Korea, achieved in December, 1945. Under this agreement, the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R. undertook jointly to prepare a solution of the problem of the unification of Korea in an independent democratic State.

Mr. Marshall's new proposal is a violation of the undertakings assumed by the United States and therefore wrong and unacceptable. Instead of observing the Moscow agreement on Korea and taking steps to work out the measures envisaged by it and to present them to the Governments of the U.S.A., the U.S.S.R., Great Britain and China for joint discussion, the Government of the United States prefers to violate its undertakings and tries to shield its unilateral and absolutely unjustified actions with the prestige of the General Assembly.

The Soviet Government is unable to agree to such a violation of the above-mentioned agreement on Korea and will insist on rejection of the proposal of Mr. Marshall as running counter to the undertakings assumed under the three-Power agreement on Korea.

AGAINST THE PROPAGANDISTS AND INCENDIARIES OF A NEW WAR.

The Soviet delegation believes it necessary to place before the General Assembly a question of major importance concerning the measures against the propaganda of a new war that is constantly intensifying in a number of countries.

More than two years have passed since the Charter of UNO was signed in San Francisco and subsequently ratified by 52 States. It signified the beginning of the activities of the new international association which set itself the task of ensuring peace and the security of nations and developing and strengthening international co-operation for nations in the economic and social progress of

The creation of UNO dates back to a time when the chief enemy of the democratic countries — Hitler Germany — was routed and when the defeat of Japan was near at hand. The attempt of these enemies of humanity to establish their world supremacy met with utter failure as a result of the historic victory of the democratic countries

Then comes the question of the interim committee for "constant attention to the work of the Assembly" and for deciding on matters of a permanent nature." Mr. Marshall proposes to envisage the establishment of a permanent committee of the General Assembly under the name of the "Interim Committee for Peace and Security."

Despite the reservations contained in the American proposal to the effect that this committee would not touch on questions the main responsibility for which rests with the Security Council and the special commissions, this proposal leaves no doubt that the attempt to create an interim committee is nothing but a poorly disguised attempt to replace and circumvent the Security Council.

The functions of this committee in examining situations and disputes prejudicing friendly relations are nothing but the functions of the Security Council specified, in particular, in Article 34 of the Charter. For this reason alone, these functions cannot be transferred to any other institution, whatever the name this institution may bear, with out obvious and direct violation of the UNO Charter, to which the Soviet delegation certainly can by no means agree and to which it will resolutely object.

I repeat that if the above-mentioned new proposals, as well as the old proposals in a new form, are moved by the American delegation for consideration of the General Assembly, the Soviet delegation reserves its right to give a fuller analysis of these proposals when these questions are discussed in essence, and will insist on the rejection of these proposals as running counter to the principles, objects and tasks of UNO, as being proposals the acceptance of which can only undermine the very foundations of UNO.

headed by the Anglo-Soviet-American coalition. Two traditional hot-beds of war were destroyed.

We wish to be certain that they have been destroyed for ever, that the task of complete disarmament of Germany and Japan will be brought to a consummation and those States will never again threaten the freedom-loving nations with war and aggression.

We wish to be certain that the stern lesson which aggressive States learned during the past Second World War has not proved futile and the fate of the severely punished aggressors in the past war will serve as a frightful warning to those who now war in overtly conduct preparations for a new war in disregard of the undertakings they have assumed to develop friendly relations among nations and to strengthen peace and security throughout the world.

War hysteria, fanned by the efforts of militarist and expansionist circles in certain countries, and primarily of the U.S.A., keeps spreading and

assumes an ever more menacing character. For a long time already the press — mostly the American press — as well as that of countries obediently following the U.S.A., such as Turkey — has been conducting a frenzied campaign aimed at influencing world public opinion in favour of a new war. All means of psychological pressure, such as newspapers, magazines, radio and cinema are being used for this purpose.

This propaganda of a new war is being conducted under the most varied slogans and pretexts. But no matter how diverse these slogans and pretexts are, the essence of the entire propaganda is the same: to justify the furious race of armaments in the U.S.A., including the atomic weapon, to justify the unlimited striving of influential circles in the U.S.A. to carry out the plans of expansion permeated with the same "idea" of world supremacy.

The American press most vigorously preaches a new war and calls on the people to prepare for it as effectively and as early as possible. A great number of newspapers and magazines, mostly American, day in and day out clamour about a new war, systematically bringing this corrupting psychological pressure to bear on the public opinion of their countries.

The warmongers conduct propaganda disguised by a hue and cry about the strengthening of national defence and the need for struggle against the war-danger with which other countries allegedly threaten them.

Propagandists and warmongers resort to every means in their effort to intimidate people who are poorly informed about politics with tales and malicious fabrications concerning the alleged preparations for an attack on America by the Soviet Union.

Certainly, they know perfectly well that they are telling lies, that the Soviet Union by no means contemplates an attack on any country, that the Soviet Union is giving all its strength to the cause of the rehabilitation of the war-torn districts and generally of the territories which suffered from war, to the cause of the rehabilitation and further development of its national economy.

The propagandists and warmongers active in the United States, as well as in Britain, Turkey, Greece and certain other countries, are well aware of the fact that in the Soviet Union the entire people — workers, peasants and intellectuals — unanimously condemn all attempts to kindle a new war. Indeed this would be impossible in the Soviet Union, in a country engaged in peaceful constructive work, absorbed in peaceful labor, of which it has enormous reserves, in the rehabilitation of the war-ravaged districts, in strengthening and developing further its national economy damaged by the heavy blows of the war imposed on the Soviet Union by the Hitlerite bandits.

In the Soviet Union, in the country of Socialist democracy, in a country engaged in the peaceful

building of a new life, there is not now can there be anything bearing even a remote resemblance to that which is taking place in certain countries believing themselves democratic and progressive while admitting such shameful actions as the propaganda of war and the poisoning of the public mind with the venom of man-hating and hostility to other nations.

If anyone in the Soviet Union permitted himself an utterance even remotely resembling those mentioned above and permeated with criminal craving for another manslaughter, such an utterance would meet with a stern rebuff and public condemnation as an action gravely endangering society.

Nevertheless, gentlemen who have made it their profession to bait the Soviet Union and other democratic countries of Eastern Europe, as well as consistent democrats and opponents of a new war in other countries, are not sparing in false and slanderous allegations which these provocateurs and warmongers fabricate and spread all over the world along numerous channels.

They insistently preach the inevitability and even the necessity of a new war on the pretext of the alleged need for forestalling the aggressive policy . . . of the Soviet Union and other countries of Eastern Europe. This is indeed shifting the blame. Truly, as the Russian proverb says, the bear is mauling the cow and it is yelling for help.

The preparations for a new war are being conducted literally before the eyes of the whole world. The propagandists and warmongers do not even attempt to hide it. They openly threaten the peace-loving nations with war while at the same time trying to shift on them the responsibility for unleashing a new slaughter.

As seen from a number of indications, the preparations for a new war have already emerged from the stage of mere propaganda, psychological pressure and a war of nerves. Numerous facts prove what I especially refers to the that in certain States — this especially fanned by practical measures of a military strategic nature combined with such organisational and technical measures as the construction and organisation of new military bases, redistribution of the armed forces in conformity with plans for future military operations, intensification of the manufacture of new armaments and feverish work for perfecting armaments.

Simultaneously, military blocs are being formed, military agreements on so-called mutual defence are being concluded, measures are being taken for the standardisation of armaments and plans for a new war being worked out by the General Staffs. . . .

It was not without reason that the well-known American radio commentator Leon Pearson found himself compelled to admit in his recent broadcast that American officers are slowly and thoroughly preparing for the next world war, in which Russia will be the adversary.

This is how the propagandists and incendiaries of a new world war are acting. Fearing a new crisis they are kindling a new war, thus hoping to

eliminate the imminent threat of a crash and loss of their profits.

The instigators of a new war nurture the insane plan of subjugating by force of arms those countries which are fighting for their independence and are rejecting the right of other Powers to interfere in their internal affairs. The warmongers are trying to impose upon them their own standards in external and domestic policy.

While kindling a new war and inciting their followers to a struggle against certain States, those who wish to start another war conflagration expect to achieve their object by means of a localised war. Evidently they disregard the experience of the past wars which teaches that in the present epoch every new war will inevitably turn into a new world war. They forget that a new world war with its senseless destruction, devastation of a great many towns, annihilation of millions of people and of immense material values accumulated through human labor will mean another supreme disaster for humanity and will hurl it many decades back.

The most active part in this propaganda for a new war has been assumed by the representatives of the American capitalist monopolies, the representatives of the biggest enterprises and leading American industries, banking and exchange circles.

These are the circles which made big profits out of the Second World War and amassed enormous fortunes as a result of this war, as was also the case some time ago in connection with the First World War.

If we compare the figures for the five pre-war years, from 1935 to 1939, with those of the five years of the Second World War, from 1940 to 1944 inclusive, we shall find that the profits of all American corporations in the five pre-war years, after deduction of taxes, totalled 15,300 million dollars, whereas during the five years of the Second World War the profits of these corporations, after deduction of taxes, amounted to 42,300 million dollars. According to data of the Department of Trade, the net profits of these corporations during the six years of war, from 1940 to 1945, amounted to 52,000 million dollars.

The magazine *Economic Review*, published by the Congress of Industrial Organisations, cites in its issue No. 11 for 1946 interesting figures showing the growth of the profits (after deduction of taxes) of 50 companies in 1945 and 1946. These figures show that some monopolies made exorbitant profits out of the war, amounting to 200 and 300 per cent. and more, while on some occasions these profits reached even 500 and nearly 800 per cent. as, for instance, in the case of the Atlantic Sugar Company. According to this magazine, these profits exceeded four times the average profits during the period 1936—1939.

As to the profits from trade, according to John Steelman, Director of the Economic Stabilisation Board, in October, 1946, they reached an all time record. This war proves not so very hateful for

those groups of society in certain countries which take advantage of war calamities for the sake of enrichment.

It is not accidental, therefore, that James Allen, in his book *International Monopolies and Peace*, notes the loss of equilibrium and fundamental location observed in the economic life of capitalist countries and quotes from the report of the Government organisation studying this problem an assertion which provides grounds for the conclusion that only in conditions of war is the modern economic system capable of ensuring approximately full employment. This frank admission hardly requires any comment; it speaks for itself.

It should be noted that the capitalist monopolies, which secured a decisive influence during the war, preserved this influence even after the war, skillfully taking advantage of Government subsidies running into thousands of millions of dollars, and of the protection which they invariably enjoyed and continue to enjoy on the part of various Government organs and institutions. This is facilitated by the close connections the monopolies maintain with Senators and members of the Government, who themselves more often than not belong to the circle of directors of or participants in monopolies.

These conditions have placed their imprint also on industrial scientific research, concentrated in the laboratories of various big factories, joint stock companies, trusts and concerns. This should be said about research into the utilisation of atomic energy as well.

Such capitalist monopolies as the du Pont Chemical Trust, the Monsanto Chemical Company, the Westinghouse Company, the General Electric, Standard Oil and others, are mostly intimately connected with this work and are complete masters in this field. Before the war they maintained the most intimate connections with the German trusts through cartels, and many cartel agreements specified that after the war the exchange of information was to be resumed.

All these facts provide an adequate explanation of the exceptional interest taken by various capitalist monopolies in the production of the atomic weapon. These facts can provide the explanation of the stubborn resistance to the just demand for the prohibition of the atomic weapon and for the destruction of the stock of atomic bombs, the production of which cost enormous sums of money.

The capitalist monopolies' hunt for profits and their efforts to preserve at any cost and further to develop those war industries which ensure high profits, cannot fail to influence the line of foreign policy, by accentuating militarist, expansionist and aggressive tendencies in this policy in order to satisfy the constantly growing appetites of influential monopoly circles.

This is the ground which feeds the propaganda of a new war in the United States, where the instigators of this propaganda are not only prominent rep-

representatives of influential American industrial and military circles, influential publications and import-

ant politicians, but also official representatives of the American Government.

THE WARMONGERS NAMED

It is not fortuitous that among the especially vehement instigators of a new war are those closely connected with trade, industrial and financial trusts, concerns and monopolies. I see no need of naming many of them. It is enough to dwell on a few, dealing, of course, with their personalities, personal views, personal qualities, and so on, but chiefly with those social groups, institutions, industrial, technical and scientific Associations whose views and interests those persons represent.

1. The member of the House of Representatives, Dorn, on May 7 while the House of Representatives was discussing the proposal on appropriations for "aid" to the Greek and Turkish Governments, made a cynical statement, worthy of the in-yet-eterate warmonger, to the effect that the Soviet Union cannot be checked with 400 million dollars, but that this can be done with the help of a big air force and the bombardment of the potential industrial centres of the U.S.S.R., the industrial district of the Ural mountains and other vital areas.

2. The President of the National Industrial Conference Board, Jordan, slandered the Soviet Union. According to this insolent person the U.S.A. should produce many atomic bombs and release them quickly, regardless of whether there is any ground to believe that a given country is producing armaments.

3. The former U.S.A. Minister to Bulgaria, Earle, made a provocative statement before the House of Representatives Committee for Un-American Activities, to the effect that the U.S.A. must immediately resort to atomic bombs against a country which refuses to accept the American project of inspection. Intimidating his audience with Soviet "jet bombs released from submarines," he insisted on secret development of the most frightful weapons and on informing the Russians that when the first atomic bomb is dropped on the U.S.A. the Americans will destroy every village in Russia. He insisted on the use of atomic bombs against the Soviet Union.

4. Eaton, Chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives, published an article in the "American Magazine" saying "we can still block Russia psychologically, if we achieve no success we should smash her by force of arms."

5. Senator McMahon, former Chairman of the Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy, stated in Congress that the U.S.A. must be the first to drop atomic bombs if an atomic war is inevitable. In another speech he said that if agreement on the international control of atomic energy could not be achieved, the U.S.A. had four possibilities left to it: firstly, to accumulate a tremendous stock of atomic bombs; secondly, to launch war immedi-

ately; thirdly, to set up an international control organ without the Soviet Union; fourthly, to fix the date for international control coming into force and to proclaim any country refusing to submit to it to be guilty of aggression.

6. Senator Brooks, of Illinois, in his speech in the Senate on March 12 this year, was not ashamed to declare cynically that if the United States had heeded the advice tendered by the Republican Party before the war and had permitted the Germans to destroy Russia, Truman's present programme would not be necessary. He added that during the war the U.S.A. helped the Soviet Union, while now the U.S.A. may be compelled to fight the Soviet Union.

7. General Deane, former Chief of the U.S. Military Mission in the U.S.S.R., stated in his book that the U.S.A. war programme should be calculated to cope with the special situation that may result from a war with Russia.

8. Harwood, Vice-President of the industrial company Cutler Hamper Inc., stated according to the newspaper "Journal" that the atomic bomb is an ineffective weapon because it destroys excessive quantities of property instead of destroying only human beings. This same Harwood cynically stated at a conference of the American Professional Institute in Milwaukee the following: Although this may seem cruel, the type of arms which we must possess if we have to fight, is a weapon which will kill only human beings. Such a weapon will eliminate the necessity during a future war of rehabilitating countries and property on such a wide and expensive scale.

9. John Foster Dulles, in his speech delivered in Chicago on February 10 this year, called for a rigid course of foreign policy in regard to the Soviet Union, asserting that if the United States resolutely announced this course and compromise with the Soviet Union, war would prove inevitable. In the same speech he boasted that since the fall of the Roman Empire no country ever disposed of such an enormous material superiority as the United States, and he called upon the U.S.A. to take advantage of this might upon for achieving its aims.

The meaning of these utterances is clear. It is sometimes overt and sometimes purely disguised instigation of a war against the U.S.S.R. It is the provocative attempt to divert attention from the true warmongers, to shield their incendiary activities with demagogic slander about "social revolution throughout the world" and similar ravings, calculating on the credulity of simpleton listeners.

Such are these instigators of a new war from the ranks of American politicians who do not hesitate to resort to deliberately slanderous outbursts against the Soviet Union and to fan hatred for the

U.S.S.R., nor to inculcate systematically the idea that a new war is unavoidable and necessary, and who systematically appear in the role of propagators and incendiaries of a new war.

Their statements found an echo in the organized utterances of the inveterate reactionaries of the notorious American Legion, some of the participants at the recent congress of which, intoxicated with the war craze, shouted that "nobody should have illusions that America would not take the sword if circumstances so required."

Numerous organs of the American reactionary press, in the hands of such magnates as Morgan, Rockefeller, Ford, Hearst, McCormick and others, do not fall far behind the reactionary politicians engaged in instigating a war. Morgan controls the magazines *Time*, *Life* and *Fortune*, published by the well-known publishing house Times Incorporated, one of the biggest shareholders of which is the firm Brown Brothers, Harriman and Co. It is known that the biggest capitalists of America own big publications and keep them under their control—magazines, newspapers, bulletins—and have their own publishing houses which invade the book market with appropriate literary products.

All these publications, at the bidding of their bosses, conduct a fierce propaganda for unleashing a new war, resorting to all possible insinuations and falsehoods, fabricated in the appropriate spirit, with the aim of arousing hatred against the Soviet Union and the other Eastern European countries of a new democracy.

Day in, day out, the pages of these newspapers and magazines are filled with provocative appeals calling for attacks on other countries which allegedly endanger the security of the U.S.A., although these organs of the press, as well as their masters, know very well that nobody is planning to attack the U.S.A. and that the U.S.A. faces no danger in this respect.

One cannot avoid mentioning as an example such publications as the *New York Herald-Tribune* and a number of other similar organs, mainly of the Hearst press, which systematically publish all possible provocative articles, imbuing the minds of their readers with the idea that "military action" will be necessary "if Europe collapses or if it falls under the control of the Soviet Union."

Utterances of this sort are not few in number. But the main thing which should be pointed out is not the fact that such utterances are made, but the fact that they do not meet with a due rebuff, which merely encourages ever new provocations on their part.

This press is completely in the hands of the owners of various newspaper enterprises and is doing what it is told to do, presenting its literary exercises as an expression of public opinion and pretending to be the mouthpiece for the feelings, desires and aspirations of the American people.

It can be safely stated, however, that the American people, as well as the peoples of other democratic countries, is against a new war, the wounds and scars of the last one not having healed yet on their bodies. In the majority of cases, however, the people has no possibility to speak of its needs and desires in the books, magazines and newspapers published in millions of copies. This is naturally to the advantage of the propagators and instigators of a new war, who utilise their advantageous position to the detriment of the interests of the peace-loving peoples.

What I have stated above should be amplified with a few words regarding the propaganda for a new war which is being conducted by various scientific institutions and universities.

Mention should be made in this connection of the symposium entitled "Absolute Weapon," recently published by Yale University, in which a group of learned authors, speaking of the atomic weapon and of control over the application of atomic energy, could not do better than come to the conclusion that "the most effective existing method of preventing war is the ability to start an atomic war literally at a moment's notice."

Under the mask of scientific objectivity, this book describes diverse variants of an atomic war and says that if the American air forces "succeed in making use of bases in Northern Canada, then the towns of the Soviet Union will be at a considerably shorter distance," and that "it will be possible, using our bases, to demolish the majority of large cities of any other Power."

In this book, devoted to the so-called "absolute weapon" (the atom bomb) the group of American authors indulges in dubious speculations to the effect that "if we (that is, the Americans), are not able to deal the first blow and thus to eliminate a threat before it materialises, that is, to undertake something which our Constitution definitely forbids us to do, then we are doomed to perish as a result of atomic attack . . ."

This book, under the guise of "scientific" discussion, speaks of the danger of "unilateral actions on the part of this or that great Power," and says that if any "unilateral actions" are taken in future, they are most likely to come from the Soviet Union. This argument leads to the provocative conclusion that "a serious danger for the U.S.A. lies in the fact that, without due warning on our part (that is, on the part of the U.S.A.), the Soviet Union one fine day may begin a war against us."

The above extracts from this book are sufficient to make it clear how variegated are the forms and methods of propaganda in the United States for a new war directed first of all against the Soviet Union.

How far the propaganda for a new war goes, accompanied by demands for manufacturing the most homicidal kinds of weapons, may be judged by a report published in the *Chemical Engineering News*, where, in a section entitled "Science and

Civilisation," all the murderous advantages of bacteriological warfare are openly propagated. The same end is served by an article in the magazine *Army Ordnance* about a new toxin, in the research of which, according to the magazine, 50 million dollars have been spent, expenses which, to use the author's phrase, "are fully justified," since one ounce of this toxin suffices to kill 180 million human beings.

While reading all this so-called scientific literature, one realises what devilish activity is being developed by the instigators and propagators of a new war with a view to creating a certain atmosphere, dazing the minds of the people with a war craze.

The frame of mind created in public circles by propaganda of this sort, disseminated by reactionaries all over the world, and particularly clearly felt in the spheres of American influence, may be judged by an article by the English journalist Vernon Bartlett, published early in August this year in the *London News Chronicle*. This article contains the following significant lines:—

"The moment a man arriving in the zone under General MacArthur's Command finds himself in Okinawa on his way to Japan, he is shocked by the tone of the American newspapers' references to the Soviet Union. The American soldier certainly cannot be blamed if, after reading these newspapers, he comes to the conclusion that war

against Russia is apparently a matter of a few months. The Japanese would be fools if they did not take notice of this frame of mind verging on hysteria."

This report tallies with a report of the magazine *News Week* which published an article by the foreign editor of this magazine, Kern, who recently returned from Japan.

Kern says that in Japan the American generals are systematically influencing Japanese military men, convincing them of the imminence and necessity of a war against the Soviet Union. Kern reports that a considerable number of Japanese "suicide" pilots, who came to American aerodromes, have declared their readiness to take part on a new war against the Soviet Union which they had heard had already begun. Kern points out that the Japanese would probably welcome the possibility of fighting against Russians and that the Japanese Army maintained by the United States would probably be able to "seize Russian Asia" to the east of Lake Baikal.

"The domination of the United States at sea," Kern adds, "would make a landing in almost any place possible, while Japan itself would enjoy safety under the protection of the superior American air fleet and navy. These menacing strategic facts explain why the absence of Russia at the peace conference for Japan will never be felt."

MAIN DIRECTIONS OF WAR PROPAGANDA

tions now under way in America, and to sober the minds of the people possessed with the war craze. These progressive figures of the U.S.A. and this progressive section of the American press are exposing the war preparations which are being conducted in the U.S.A. on the instigation of military groups and various reactionary organisations.

1. Fear of the Soviet Union as a mighty Power which allegedly aims at world domination and is preparing an attack on the U.S.A. is propagated and inculcated in all possible ways, by shameless use of various slanderous fabrications and provocative outbursts against the U.S.S.R.

2. Open propaganda is being conducted for increase of armaments, for the further improvement of atomic weapons, while no attempt whatsoever is being made to restrict and, even more so, to prohibit the use of atomic weapons.

3. Open appeals are being made calling for an immediate attack on the U.S.S.R., accompanied by provocative attempts to frighten people with the military strength of the Soviet Union on the one hand, and to convince them of the necessity to make use of the present situation when, in the opinion of the instigators of a war, the U.S.S.R. is weak in a military respect, having not yet completely recovered after the Second World War.

4. The war psychosis, incited and fanned by the militarist and expansionist circles of the U.S.A., is being maintained in American society by all possible means.

Progressive people in the U.S.A. are seeing this and are making efforts to expose the war prepara-

Thus the chairman of the organisation of "Progressive Citizens of America," Kingdon, wrote in *New York Times* in this connection that in the centre of all this propaganda are militaristically minded people holding high posts in the War and Navy Departments, members of the House of Representatives and the Senate, leaders of monopolies lending an attentive ear to the call for war, and some representatives of clerical circles. The military party, Kingdon goes on, hopes that it will be possible to engineer some incident and to use it as a pretext for dropping atom bombs.

The magazine *American Mercury*, in its issue of February this year, analysed the plan of the American Army in preparation for a third world war. This article states that "industrial preparedness constitutes at present the key to all Government planning in Washington where the possibility of a third world war is taken into consideration."

Since this conclusion has been drawn by such military authorities as Patterson and Royall and other leaders of the American Army, this article acquired particular significance.

The above-stated facts make it fully evident that the main instigators of the propaganda and the provocation of a new war are American reactionary circles which pursue only their self-seeking interests and are ready for the sake of these interests to plunge humanity into a new, devastating world war.

The American reactionaries are not alone in these efforts. They are supported by their adherents in some other countries who are busy framing military-political or simply political Western, Northern and other blocs.

In this connection mention should be made of some utterances of British political figures who, true enough, do not speak so resolutely as their American counterparts, but act mainly on the quiet, though in the same alarmist spirit.

Everybody will remember Churchill's Fulton speech in which, referring to the "general strategic conception," as he called his main utterances, the British ex-Premier committed "a dangerous act calculated to sow the seeds of discord between the allied States and to hinder their co-operation," as Generalissimo Stalin justly said in this connection, emphasising that "the orientation of Mr. Churchill's line is that of war, a call to war against the U.S.S.R."

We all remember that Churchill opposed to the organisation of the United Nations, as an association of people speaking in different languages, the association of people speaking only English, thus following the example of Hitler who began "unleashing the war by proclaiming a race theory and declaring that only the German-speaking people constituted a superior nation." (Stalin.)

We remember also many other points from this speech in which Churchill resorted to insinuations and slander against the Soviet Union.

Churchill senior is echoed by Churchill junior who, in his statement made in Sydney on September 3, broke the record in warmongering.

The family utterances of the Churchills in themselves would be interesting only to a few, but they are symptoms of the dark work which is being conducted in certain British circles against the cause of peace and which is directed towards the organisation of a new war, either in the form of repeating Churchill's notorious military march on Russia or in any other form, no matter which.

In this connection mention should also be made of the fact that the Anglo-American combined Chiefs of Staff continue functioning in Washington to this day. It is known that on this combined Staff Great Britain is represented by a Military Mission headed by General Morgan and the U.S.A. by a Military Mission headed by Admiral Leahy. This Anglo-American Joint Staff, which was set up for co-ordinating military operations against Germany and Japan, still exists, for nobody knows what purpose, despite the fact that the war ended two years ago.

There is no need to list the numerous facts of the unbridled, slanderous and provocative campaign for instigating a war against the Soviet Union, going beyond all permissible limits, which for a long time has been conducted in Turkey. The Turkish reactionary press strives to keep abreast with the American reactionary press. "The craft with its claw follows the horse with its hoof" says a Russian proverb.

The Turkish press, which day in, day out disseminates abominable slanders against the Soviet Union, which allegedly plans to seize Turkey (the newspaper *Aksam*), indulges in provocative prophecies to the effect that "the United Nations will try to deal a decisive blow to Russia from the Black Sea coast" (*Demokrasi Hsan*). It instigates the Turkish people for preparations for a war and simultaneously extolls the military might of the United States of America, asserting that it inevitably must join the war against the U.S.S.R.

A certain Daver, in an article published in the notorious *Cumhuriyet*, declares with cynical frankness that war is "the only way to set Moscow on the right path." He is seconded by Deputy *Ahi*, editor-in-chief of *Ulus*, who declares that "it is high time for America and Britain to take more decisive measures."

The editor of the newspaper *Tanin*, Yalcin, notorious for his provocative activity, follows suit. In September of last year he wrote that the time had come to "invite the Russians to a sincere talk to a table over which the atom bomb should be suspended." He demanded that an ultimatum be presented to the Russians and declared that "atom bombs would rain on them if they did not agree to establish a new international order." The same Yalcin recently wrote that the language of ultimatums is the only one to be used in talking to Moscow and he demanded: "unite the whole world against Russia."

Similar provocative appeals are voiced by other vernal scribes, as for instance Advzy of the reactionary Turkish paper *Erkenekon*, Professor Nihat Erim, Deputy and Member of the Foreign Committee of the *Mejlis*, and several others.

This provocative clamour is vigorously supported by the Greek reactionary newspapers, in particular by the newspaper *Elinikon Ema* which the other day published an article saying: "Let the Russians not forget that the Russian main oil source in Baku lies within a mere 100 kilometres, as on a platter."

And all this goes on with impunity before the eyes of the whole world.

Such are the intrigues of the enemies of peace, instigating a new war for the sake of their selfish interests, for the sake of making profits out of war which brings new sufferings and disasters to mankind. No doubt this campaign of instigation of a new war is severely and resolutely condemned by millions of people.

The Soviet Government believes that such a situation is intolerable for the conscience of the peoples who bore the entire burden of the recent

SOVIET PROPOSALS FOR MEASURES AGAINST PROPAGANDA FOR A NEW WAR.

On behalf of the Soviet Government, the delegation of the Soviet Union declares that the U.S.S.R. believes it to be the urgent task of the United Nations Organisation to take measures against the propaganda for a new war which is now being conducted in certain countries, and first and foremost in the United States. For this purpose, the Soviet delegation proposes that the following resolution be adopted:—

"1. The United Nations Organisation condemns the criminal propaganda for a new war, conducted by reactionary circles in a number of countries, in particular in the United States of America, Turkey, and Greece by means of dissemination of all kinds of fabrications through the press, radio, films, public speeches containing undisguised appeals for an attack on peace-loving democratic countries.

"2. The United Nations Organisation regards permission of, and the more so support for, such propaganda for a new war, which inevitably will become a third world war, as a violation of the duty assumed by the members of UNO, the Charter of which demands the development of friendly relations among nations based on respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples, and to take other appropriate measures to strengthen universal peace and not to endanger international peace, security and justice". (Article 1, Para. 2; Article 2, Para. 3.)

WARNING ON INFLATION DANGER

E. W. CAMPBELL

(Report to the Central Committee Meeting, 14th September, 1947.)

IN the crisis of 1929, the currency crisis did not break out until the economic crisis as a whole was fairly well advanced. The currency crisis in the 1929-33 period arose out of the crisis of over-production and was mainly caused by the demand for money as a means of payment, both within the countries and between different countries on the world market.

In the boom period preceding the outbreak of the crisis, credit had been used extensively to facilitate the exchange of commodities on both the home and foreign markets. While the demand for commodities continued and while goods continued to circulate, credit could and did expand. This expansion of credit is a two-sided process, but most of the capitalist economists, and particularly those on whom

Second World War, who paid with their blood, sufferings and with devastation for this war imposed upon the peace-loving peoples.

"3. The United Nations Organisation believes it necessary to urge the Governments of all countries to forbid, under pain of criminal punishment, propaganda for war in any form, and to take measures to prevent and stop propaganda for war as an activity dangerous to the public and threatening the vital interests and well-being of the peace-loving peoples.

"4. The Organisation of the United Nations reaffirms the necessity for the earliest implementation of the decision of the General Assembly of December 14, 1946, on the reduction of armaments, and of the decision of the General Assembly of January 24, 1946, concerning the exclusion from national armaments of atomic weapons and all other basic armaments destined for mass destruction, and believes that the implementation of these decisions meets the interests of all peace-loving peoples and would constitute the strongest blow at the propaganda and instigators of a new war."

Generalissimo Stalin, in his message of greetings to Moscow, said that Moscow is the herald of the struggle for permanent peace and friendship among peoples, the herald of the struggle against the incendiaries of a new war.

These words of the leader of the Soviet peoples found a deep response in the hearts of the Soviet people and, we believe, in the hearts of all common, honest, progressive people the world over. The Soviet Union will spare no efforts for the successful accomplishment of this great task.

the Labor Party seems to rely, see only one side of the process. They believe that credit expansion creates expanding production and expanding markets. There is some truth in this. Credit expansion does facilitate circulation of goods and in that sense brings about an expansion of markets and consequently production.

But those economists whose doctrines are accepted by the Labor Party as gospel fail to see that expanding markets and production are in themselves the pre-requisite for credit expansion. In other words, production is primary, money and credit is secondary.

In the 1929 crisis when production finally outpaced consumption and prices began to fall, the whole credit structure ultimately collapsed. When

bills fell due money had to be found as a means of payment of obligations incurred when credit was free and easy. It had to be real money and not ideal money, not credit money. Goods in stock had to be sacrificed at any price to get hold of real money to meet obligations and the currency crisis of 1929 reacted on the economic crisis as a whole, tending to make it more severe and protracted. Ultimately the currency crisis was solved in the anarchic manner characteristic of the way in which all capitalism's problems are "solved", by a wave of bankruptcies. These bankruptcies cancelled out, or helped to cancel out, the mountain of accumulated debt, just as the physical destruction of commodities helped to cancel out the mountain of goods choking the channels of world trade.

Today the currency crisis is developing at the beginning of the crisis rather than at a stage when the crisis is already fairly well advanced. The currency crisis is taking the form of a world dollar shortage. The present currency crisis is caused not so much by the demand for money as a means of payment, but more by the demand for money as a means of purchase.

Most countries today want to buy goods from the United States of America but have no dollars and little gold with which to buy. They cannot get dollars because the American production machine is so colossal that there are very few goods America needs to purchase abroad.

This dollar crisis also arises from the fundamental contradictions of capitalism. America's gigantic production machine can more than meet the requirements of the home market and still leave a tremendous surplus of commodities for export. Other countries need these goods but lack the means of purchase. Thus, much earlier than in 1929, a currency crisis is developing which threatens to react on the crisis in general with very disastrous effects which will undoubtedly be very severely felt in Australia.

One aftermath of the 1929 crisis was that Australia went off the gold standard. The convertibility of Australian paper money and the legal obligation on the Commonwealth Bank to keep a gold reserve of 25% of the paper money were abolished and no longer exist. The reserve of the bank today, the backing of the Australian note issue today, is kept almost entirely in sterling and not in gold. This was all right and functioned smoothly while sterling was still a world currency, still freely convertible into other currencies including dollars, but sterling is no longer a world currency today, it has dropped to the position of being a bloc currency, a currency in which only the Dominions and other countries closely associated in trade with Britain deal. It looks as though sterling will soon fall into complete disfavor.

If sterling does eventually become valueless Australia will be severely hit, because, as I mentioned, the note reserve today is kept almost entirely in sterling and not gold.

There already exists a serious potential threat of inflation in Australia. This threat does not arise from the meagre wage gains won by the workers in struggle, as alleged by some Labor leaders, but from an entirely different source.

The Australian note issue today is somewhere between £202 and £204 million, of which about £19 million is in the hands of the banks and £183 to £185 million in the hands of the public. Before the war the note issue in Australia was about £33 million, which seems to indicate very clearly that inflation already exists in this country.

The factors which determine the amount of currency required to circulate the goods available are well known.

The required amount of money is determined first by the volume of goods — the volume of commodities to be circulated; secondly by the total prices of all of these goods, and thirdly by the speed at which they circulate.

An increase in the volume of goods available and in the total price, would tend to create the need for more money to circulate these goods. However, if the greater quantity of goods circulated more rapidly, this would have a counteracting effect and would minimise the amount of extra money needed.

There has been an increase in production and prices since 1939.

The national income in 1945-46 was up 55 per cent on the pre-war level. The note issue, however, has increased almost six times. There has been an increase in the volume of goods and prices, but there has also been an increase in the rate of circulation. So there is far more paper money in existence today than is required to circulate commodities already in existence and those coming into existence.

Many times more notes are in the hands of the public than are required to circulate the commodities, clearly indicating the existence of inflation.

There is one factor which is preventing the full effects of this inflation being felt and that is that all the notes in existence are not really in circulation. A big proportion of these notes are hoarded in the hands of profiteers and black marketeers.

This money does not enter into legitimate circulation of commodities. It is being used to finance black market motor deals, real estate deals and so on.

It is quite clear that the dollar shortage and the measures proposed by the Government to drastically reduce imports not only from dollar countries but from Britain, will result in further shortages of a whole range of commodities like cars, films, tobacco, petrol, etc., giving a new lease of life to the black market in Australia. There will be a drastic curtailment of imports from Britain arising from the British Government's choice to send more British goods to dollar countries and less to sterling countries like Australia.

The black market note hoard is not yet entering the market for ordinary consumer goods in a big way (although part of it is being used to divert goods from the legitimate market to the black market). It is held out from the legitimate market by controls like the Treasury control of new capital investment, real estate deals, rationing and so on.

If sterling does collapse (so far Britain has been able to stave off bankruptcy because the British Government is not a private concern) there will not be any backing for the Australian note issue. Inflation will break out in full force and the whole system of controls will soon be destroyed.

If this does happen the savings of the workers and the middle class will be wiped out overnight Australia will experience conditions similar to Germany after the first world war.

I suggest that the Party should demand the recall and cancellation of the present note issue and the re-issuing of new notes. This, more than anything else, will deal a very severe blow to the black marketeers.

Britain's dollar crisis has a bearing on the Australian Government's bank nationalisation programme.

The Australian banking system today is only two-thirds Australian, one-third is British controlled. The same applies to the shareholders. Of 70,000 shareholders in nine private banks, 25,000 do not reside in Australia — a little more than one-third of the total. The same applies to share capital. More than one-third is held outside Australia and one-third of the shareholders of so-called

Australian banks do not reside in Australia. The Australian banking system is a long way from being a purely Australian banking system.

We find that 34 directors of seven banks live outside Australia, as against about 24 who reside in Australia.

So here you can see that the nationalisation of banking among other things will convert the banking system into a completely and thoroughly Australian system.

I do not suggest that this enters into the calculations of the Labor Party. When we say that their objective is to strengthen Australian capitalism we by no means maintain that they are fully conscious of their role. We mean that objectively this is their role and we see that they are fulfilling their role of strengthening Australian capitalism by nationalising the banks.

During the war it is well known that the British capitalists had to dispose of assets to American capitalists, and in the developing crisis it may well be that Britain may have to carry this process still further. It is not improbable that banking capital now in the hands of British capitalists may pass into United States hands.

Therefore, I consider we should bring out more sharply the point that nationalisation of banks would completely free the Australian banking system of all foreign influence and make it a thoroughly Australian system. We must come forward as the champions of the Australian people by stressing this.

DEMOCRACY OF A NEW TYPE

PROFESSOR EUGENE VARGA, Moscow

ONE of the most important political results of the Second World War is the emergence of democratic states of a new type: Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, Poland, Czechoslovakia and, also, Albania. We understand by a "democracy of a new type" a state of affairs in a country where feudal remnants — large-scale landownership — have been eliminated, where the system of private ownership of the means of production still exists but large enterprises in the spheres of industry, transport and credit are in state hands, while the State itself and its apparatus of coercion serve not the interests of a monopolistic bourgeoisie but the interests of the working people in town and countryside.

The social structure of these States differs from all those hitherto known to us; it is something totally new in the history of mankind. It is neither a bourgeois dictatorship nor a proletarian dictatorship. The old State apparatus has not been smashed, as in the Soviet Union, but reorganised by means of a continuous inclusion in it of the supporters of the new regime. They are not capitalist States in the ordinary sense of the word. Neither, however, are they Socialist states. The

basis for their transition to Socialism is given by the nationalisation of the most important means of production and by the essential character of the State. They may, with the maintenance of the present State apparatus, gradually pass over to Socialism, developing to an ever-increasing extent the socialist sector which already exists side by side with the simple commodity sector (peasant and artisan) and the capitalist sector, which has lost its dominant position.

The general historical prerequisite, applying in all cases, for the emergence of these states of democracy of a new type is the general crisis of capitalism, which has very considerably intensified in consequence of the Second World War.

The historical conditions specific to these countries are—

1. The discrediting of the ruling classes and their political parties in the eyes of the broad masses of the people, as a result of their policy of collaboration with Hitler fascism before and during the war, which led to the occupation of these countries by German troops and the fierce suppression and impoverishment of the working masses.

2. The leading role of the Communist parties in the resistance movement, as a result of which unity of the working class was achieved and a people's front formed for struggle against fascism. large-scale landownership and big capital — the economic basis of fascism.

3. The moral, diplomatic and economic support which these countries find in the Soviet Union. Without this support the states of democracy of a new type would be hard put to it to withstand the attacks of reaction, both external and internal. Very edifying in this respect is the fate of Greece.

The following features are characteristic of the economy of the states of a democracy of a new type:

Private ownership of the means of production continues to exist; the peasant is the owner of his land, the artisan of his workshop, the trader of his shop, the small capitalist of his factory. Big enterprises, however, in mining, industry, transport and banking are nationalised and are under state management. There still exists the appropriation of surplus value, but it is restricted to a relatively narrow sphere* — not only because there is considerably less privately-owned capital but also because the trade unions and the State successfully protect the workers against the capitalists.

We would like, here, to stress the decisive significance of the special character of the State for the development of the economies of these countries. Where the State is controlled by monopoly capital and serves its interests it can own a very considerable part of the means of production without in the slightest degree altering the character of the social system. In Hitler Germany the railways, Imperial Bank, Discount Bank, Prussian State Bank, large industrial enterprises (e.g. Hermann Goering-Werke), power stations, agricultural and forest areas, etc., were the property of the Reich, individual lands or municipalities. The existence of such considerable public property, however, did not at all alter the fact that the economy of Hitler Germany remained a monopolistic economy and the social order a bourgeois one. The change in the character of the State — its transformation from a weapon of domination in the hands of the propertied classes into the state of the working people — this is what determines the real significance of the transfer of a decisive part of the means of production into the hands of the State in the countries of a democracy of a new type.

The change in the character of the State explains also why the influence of nationalisation of the distribution of the national revenue is totally different in the democratic States of a new type from that in the bourgeois-democratic countries such as Great Britain.

* The bourgeoisie nevertheless, which still almost entirely dominates in the sphere of trade, receives large profits, thanks to the sale of the commodities of the socialised enterprises; it frequently enjoys the support of former officials who have remained in the State apparatus.

Nationalisation in the new democratic States signifies a special sort of economic revolution. The property of traitors to the country, of fascist capitalists, was confiscated without compensation. Other big capitalists received compensation, but their income after compensation was only a small part of the surplus value which they previously appropriated.*

The contradictions between the social character of production and the private character of appropriation have sharpened to such a degree as the result of the deepening of the general crisis of capitalism that in the post-war period the wave of nationalisation has embraced almost all countries with fully-developed capitalist relations, with the exception of the U.S.A. Nationalisation in these countries is an attempt to solve the contradictions between the social character of production and the private character of appropriation within the framework of the bourgeois social system. It is precisely this which explains the introduction of nationalisation with full compensation for the capitalists. Thus in Britain, for example, the share-holders of electricity companies were given compensation to the amount of £450,000,000 sterling. This sum was calculated on the basis of the Stock Exchange value of the shares before nationalisation. Similarly, compensation amounting to £1,035,000,000 was fixed for owners of transport enterprises due to be nationalised. This means that the share-holders were not harmed. The distribution of the national income remains almost unchanged.†

These various methods of carrying out nationalisation show the difference between a bourgeois democracy and a democracy of the new type.

The economic importance of the nationalisation of big industrial enterprises naturally differs very greatly in various countries of democracy of a new type. In countries where agriculture predominates and where industrial development is inconsiderable — Bulgaria and Yugoslavia — its importance is relatively less. In Poland, which has a big coal mining and heavy industry, the importance of nationalisation is far greater, the more so as it extends also to industrial enterprises of medium size. In Czechoslovakia, which is much more highly developed industrially, and where industry was expanded by the Germans during the war, nationalisation plays the greatest role, despite the fact that in this country it embraces a smaller number of medium enterprises than in Poland. While industry in Yugoslavia and pre-war Poland was almost completely destroyed during the war, the industry of Czechoslovakia suffered extremely little from military operations. The fact that in Bul-

* Difficulties arose in connection with the fact that British and American capitalists were partners in numerous enterprises taken over by the State. Many capitalists, who had fled abroad, are rapidly becoming American citizens and new "motherland," full compensation or the return of their enterprises.

† Nevertheless, bourgeois nationalisation also signifies progress in the direction of the new type of democracy.

garia and Yugoslavia it was not necessary to nationalise so many individual plants does not detract from the importance of this measure for the future economic development of these countries, which are being transformed from agrarian appendages of Germany, as they were before the war, into independent agrarian-industrial countries.

The second important feature of the economies of the countries of democracy of a new type is the complete and final elimination of large-scale landlordism, of this feudal survival inside the capitalist system of economy. The social and political power of the big landowners, dating back a thousand years, has been destroyed. The big landed properties were confiscated by the State and distributed among peasants having little land and landless agricultural laborers. The number of peasant households (i.e. private owners of land) increased very considerably in these countries.

The division of the lands among many hundreds of thousands of peasants who had little or no land has converted the overwhelming majority of these peasants into loyal supporters of the new regime. The mistake made by the Hungarian Communists in 1919, when they wanted to leap over an essential historical stage of converting the confiscated large landed properties into state farms, instead of dividing them up among the peasants and so satisfying the land hunger, has nowhere been repeated.

The cultivation of land by the peasants using their own resources and giving them the opportunity of selling their produce on the market (in some countries only after fulfilling tax payments and deliveries to the State) make possible the preservation or re-emergence of commodity capitalist relations in the economy of the country. As Lenin pointed out "small-scale production engenders capitalism and the bourgeoisie continuously, daily, hourly, spontaneously and on a mass scale."

Thus, the social order in the States of democracy of a new type is not a socialist order, but a peculiar, new, transitional form. The contradiction between the productive forces and relations of production becomes mitigated in proportion as the relative weight of the socialist sector increases.

The nationalisation of the land of big landowners and its distribution among the peasants had a different significance in different countries. In peasant countries like Bulgaria and old Serbia there existed no large-scale land ownership in the proper sense of the word. Only a relatively small amount of land could be distributed among the peasants there. In other parts of Yugoslavia, previously belonging to Hungary, e.g. in Croatia and the Banat, considerably more land could be distributed.

In Czechoslovakia an agrarian reform was carried out already after the first World War; here the estates, first and foremost of expelled Germans, were distributed among the peasants.

In Poland the agrarian reform is of decisive importance for the political development of the country. Here the position of the peasantry was at its worst. "Polonia infernum rusticorum" — "Poland is the peasant's hell" — was said of it already some hundreds of years ago. Here landownership of the feudal type was retained in its entirety, both on the territory of pre-war Poland and in the Western districts which were previously under German domination. The elimination of landlordism opens up a new era in the economic and political life of Poland.

It is quite clear that the class of big landowners by no means intends to accept these changes peacefully but is resisting the new regime in every way. Nationalisation of the land does not mean that the big landowners immediately lose their political influence. True, some of them fled abroad, but many remained inside the country. A considerable part of their property was in the form of valuables, works of art, furniture, houses, which remained in their hands. In many cases the former big landowners, e.g. in Poland, succeeded in penetrating into the State apparatus, above all into the agricultural administration, and in sabotaging the carrying out of the agrarian reform. More important still is the fact that there remained in the country a stratum of people enjoying some influence, whose existence wholly or partially depended on the big landowners. Among these are the rural clergy, notaries, judges and teachers, who regularly received money, food, firewood, etc., from the landowners; various estate employees, agronomists and other persons who were in the service of the landlord; State officials, judges, officers, who obtained their posts through the influence of the landlord; deputies elected by the population at his behest. In short, the elimination of the economic basis of the power of the agrarians does not signify simultaneous destruction of their political influence inside the country.

The same can be said of the big bourgeoisie. Although their enterprises were nationalised, in the majority of cases considerable personal property still remained in their hands. A large part of the former managers, leading engineers and other persons in the service of this bourgeoisie remained in the nationalised enterprises.

To this day, persons sponsored by the big bourgeoisie are to be found in the State apparatus and the various economic organisations — Chambers of Commerce and so forth — which continue to exist. The representatives of the big bourgeoisie have close contacts with the middle bourgeoisie, whose enterprises have not been expropriated. Since the nationalisation of their enterprises they have not yet completely lost their influence.

Here, too, the general rule that changes in the economic basis do not immediately evoke corresponding changes in politics continues to operate. Deprived of their economic power, the landlords together with the expropriated and unexpropriated

capitalists and their adherents, fight with every means at their disposal against the new democratic regime, organise oppositional political parties and through priests, teachers and notaries already debauched by them, conduct agitation among the new peasants (who often lack the necessary means of production) for giving back land to the landlords. They frighten the peasants by telling them they will be hanged in the event of the old system being restored, because they "stole" the land. They organise plots against the government, arm bandits, etc. They seek and find active support in reactionary circles abroad.

The big bourgeoisie, still to a degree playing a dominant part in home and foreign trade,* struggles against the new regime in the economic sphere as well, attempting to plunder the State and discredit the social system. With the help of accomplices bribed by them in the State enterprises and the State apparatus, they often obtain commodities at less than cost price, hide them, send them to foreign countries or sell them inside the country exclusively in exchange for gold or foreign currency. The representatives of the big bourgeoisie try to cause inflation or increase the existing inflation, thereby to provoke dissatisfaction among the working people and turn them against the new regime.

In a word, it is by no means a peaceful idyll that reigns in the countries of new democracy but, on the contrary, a sharp, extremely fierce class struggle that is in progress, just as in the old capitalist countries.

As regards the class struggle, however, there exists a difference in principle between the State of democracy of a new type and the old bourgeois countries. In the old bourgeois countries the State is a weapon of domination in the hands of the propertied classes. The entire State apparatus — officials, judges, police, and, as a last resort, the standing army — is on the side of the propertied classes.†

The opposite is to be seen in the countries of new democracy. Here the State protects the interests of the working people against those who live by appropriating surplus value.‡ When conflicts arise the armed forces of the State are to be found, not on the side of the capitalists, but on the side of the workers. It is wholly inconceivable that the armies of these States should be used against the working people. State officials and judges serve the interests of the working people.

* The co-operative bodies are still not sufficiently strong to squeeze out private capital in the circulation of commodities, and in many cases they are tied still to the capitalists.

† This does not, of course, prevent the organs of the bourgeois State in certain cases settling wage disputes between capitalists and workers in favor of the latter. This, however, never happens should it threaten the foundations of the bourgeois social system—private ownership of the means of production. The passage of social legislation—the shorter working day, health insurance, unemployment benefits—can be explained by the well-understood interests of the bourgeoisie.

This distinction vividly demonstrates the fact that power is in the hands of the people — the new character of the States in the countries indicated. The State influences the economic life of the country far more and in a different direction than in the old bourgeois countries, though there too the economic functions of the State have greatly extended as compared with the pre-war period. In the countries of democracy of a new type, however, the trend of economic policy is different in principle. In the capitalist countries the economic policy of the State serves the interests of monopoly capital in particular.

In the States of democracy of a new type economic policy is directed to strengthening and developing the socialised sector of economy, accelerating economic development, improving the position of the working people, establishing a fair distribution of income in accordance with services rendered to society. To raise the standard of life of the whole people requires an increased output of production. The economic policy, therefore, aims at the utmost development of the productive forces and the elimination of restrictions on their development caused under capitalism by the scramble for profits.

To realise these aims, the States of democracy of a new type seek to influence the development of economy in a planned way. Economic plans calculated over several years have been drawn up.

It is obvious that there can be no planned economy, as understood in the U.S.S.R., in these countries. It is impossible owing to the presence of private ownership of the means of production.

Genuine planned economy is possible only under Socialism, when all the means of production are nationalised.

However, nationalisation of the decisive enterprises in mining, industry, transport and credit gives the States of new democracy far greater possibility, than in the case of the States of monopoly capital, to influence by means of planning the economic activity of individual small private producers, the more so because the planned influence of the State is in the interests of the overwhelming majority of these small private producers, primarily the peasantry, and is not against their interest. Undoubtedly, this influence will increase as the countries of new democracy become more industrialised. All these facts show that the planned influence of the State on the economy of the countries of new democracy is sufficiently effective not only to be an obstacle to their reconversion into capitalist social systems of the old type, but also to encourage the development of these countries in the direction of Socialism. Not only does the general line of historical development push them along this road, but also concrete practical needs.

Thus, for example, many former agricultural workers have been given land but do not possess the means of production, tractive power and implements, with which to cultivate it. The means

of production of the big estates—tractors, steam-ploughs, etc.—distributed among the peasants are unsuitable for cultivating small peasant plots. The new rural proprietors, lacking the means of production, are threatened by the danger of becoming economically dependent on the prosperous peasants who, for money, or part of the harvest or labor, will cultivate their lands.

The practical needs of the peasants who possess land but not the means of production, urge them, therefore, towards joint cultivation of the land, in order to make use of the existing means of production which can only be used to advantage on a big farm. Various forms of arrels have arisen. In a number of arrels the peasants jointly plough and cultivate the land. After this the boundaries of the individual plots are re-established and each peasant gathers the harvest on his own field.

In Bulgaria, where old traditions of cultivating land on a co-operative basis exist, co-operatives of joint cultivation of the land have been formed

on a voluntary basis. All the land of the members of the co-operative (which often includes all the peasants of a village) is cultivated jointly and the harvesting is also done jointly. But the harvest is distributed not according to the purely Socialist principle of the number of days worked; besides the number of days worked, account is also taken of the size of the land which the peasant put at the disposal of the co-operative and also the amount of the means of production put in. Hence, this is a compromise between the Socialist principle and one based on private ownership of the means of production. It is a solution of the problem which corresponds to the transitional character of the social system.

By giving support to this new type of agriculture co-operative in the form of credits, tractors and seed, etc., the Government encourages its development and extension and influences the development of economy in a progressive direction.

(To be continued)

YOUTH AND THE COMING CRISIS

"YOUTH ACTIVIST"

THE report on the coming economic crisis by Cde. Dixon to the last C.C. Plenum and the subsequent discussion and decisions are of vital importance to the labor movement in the task of winning the youth.

Under the present-day mode of capitalist production, young workers are playing an increasingly important role. With the development of large-scale industry and its accompanying improvements in production technique, machinery tends more and more to replace the skilled tradesman. This means a greater and greater demand for process workers and for the replacement of the "dear" labor of adults by the "cheaper" labor of youth. Whilst it is true that the present "boom" hides this to a large degree, the tragic slogan of "too fat at 21" will, unless the crisis can be successfully combated, shortly be as prevalent (at least) as in the years 1929 to 1933.

In view of the nearness of the crisis (already being evidenced in America) and the indications of its being more prolonged and much deeper than previously, it would be well to examine some experiences and effects of the last crisis on the youth.

Figures obtained from Commonwealth Year Books of 1929 to 1934, although incomplete, indicate a big drop in the employment of youth as soon as they attain the age when they are no longer considered a paying proposition, i.e. when they cease to be a cheap means of exploitation—the age at which they are sacked depending on the different industries and on the level of wages for such industries. The number of young people affected by the "cuts in economy" and the effect on them cannot be measured in mere figures. From

the point of view of developing Australia as a nation alone, the effects are tremendous. Many thousands of young people wishing to get married could not do so. Many thousands who did were faced with the prospect of starting life in bag humpies and "love on the dole," faced with the prospect of bringing children into a world which could not adequately feed and clothe them because there was "too much" food and clothing. The stories of the frustration of living in a society which could not "afford" to employ them and the degenerating effect of pool rooms and street corner gangs needs no repetition.

The youth of today have not yet experienced an economic crisis. They find it difficult to conceive of unemployment and the sack at 18 or 19. The effects of capitalist education, of "office boy to managing director" and "equal opportunity for all" ideas, still have a great deal of influence. Nevertheless, the objective reality of working for a boss for low wages and under mostly rotten conditions, does go a long way to overcoming this influence and strips them of many of their illusions. This process will be more than accentuated in the crisis about to break.

As from next year, industry will also be faced with the problem of finding jobs for more young people than before, because of the influx of greater numbers of youth who were born in those years from 1933 onwards, when the worst of the crisis had passed, and the population again began to increase. This influx will, in all probability, coincide with the developing crisis, and even more acute problems of finding employment for them will arise.

Besides these effects of mass unemployment among the youth, there is yet another aspect to be considered.

At the historic Seventh Congress of the Communist International (1935) Kuusinen, in his youth report, made the following points:

"... During the last few years the condition of the youth has changed. We refer not only to protracted and chronic unemployment. LACK OF OCCUPATION has already become a mass phenomenon among the youth.

"... Formerly a certain — even if slight — number of the working class youth had the opportunity of rising out of their class to something 'higher,' to the ranks of the petty bourgeoisie, or to the petty bourgeois intelligentsia; in exceptional cases a young worker could become a doctor, architect or teacher. These exceptional cases were sufficient to foster reformist illusions among the greater part of the working class youth.

"Today, on the contrary, entire sections of the working class youth are becoming DECLASSÉD, that is to say, they no longer have the opportunity of rising into the class of their fathers; they have no chance at all of finding work, or of learning a trade. These young people are sinking to the level of the LUMPEN PROLETARIAT, are falling a prey to hunger, poverty, crime, prostitution, etc."

How well may these words apply again, in the very near future, in this country.

Communists are often accused of desiring the introduction of a society which will "break up the family." There can be no more glaring indictment of capitalism (and the hypocrisy of its defenders) than the fact that during the last depression large numbers of young Australian women were forced to prostitution in order to exist, or that, because of the iniquitous means test, which prevented more than one member of the family being employed, young people were forced to leave home and seek jobs in the country. And yet when the Communist Party lays the blame for these things on the society which breeds hunger, poverty, crime and prostitution, and when Communists claim that a Socialist society will rid the world of such degradation, we are accused of wishing to "break up the family."

Especially in view of what took place in Germany, it would be well for us to again heed Kuusinen's words on the DECLASSING of the youth. It was precisely this declassed section of the population which formed the core of the bestial Hitlerite S.S. Guards and Stormtroopers. It was these youth who, educated by capitalism and filled with bourgeois ideology, gained no experience in working class struggle, had never come in contact with the trade unions or other organisations of the labor movement, and who were taught to believe that their enemy was not the capitalist class but the labor movement, with results that the whole world knows only too well.

The coming crisis will create similar problems for the working class movement.

Kuusinen added:

"Fascism has been commissioned by the bourgeoisie to infect the neglected youth with its demagogy, and especially with chauvinism. In fact, this situation creates objective conditions for fascism to carry on its noxious work among the youth. But Communism also has far greater opportunities for work among the youth than formerly. The only question is whether we are capable of utilising these opportunities."

This is still the question facing us today. We MUST utilise these opportunities.

What are our tasks?

Part of the statement of the C.C. Plenum demands the raising of living standards by increasing wages and preventing of further price increases.

With relation to youth — "a radical alteration in the method of computing wages of young workers to allow substantial wage increases is needed."

What does this mean?

The wages of apprenticed youth, for example, are computed as a percentage of the needs basic wage plus a small part of the war and constant loadings. So that despite the fact that the apprentice is (supposedly under present methods of training and tech. college curriculum) learning to become skilled, the margin for skill paid to the adult tradesman is not passed on to the youth — not even the whole of the loadings! So that up to the age of 21 (in most cases) the apprentices are supposed to live on a PART of the NEEDS BASIC WAGE. Similar conditions (with only minor differences) apply to the computing of wage rates of male and female unskilled junior workers. The unapprenticed youth does not receive any margin for skill until such time as the adult wage is paid (again in most cases about 21). Despite these facts the production of young workers at 18 or 19 is equal to that of adults.

The demand of the trade unions, the Communist Party and labor youth organisations is that there must be a radical alteration to this method of computing wages. In the case of apprentices to be paid a percentage of the tradesman's rate, and for unapprenticed youth a percentage of the adult rate, and for payment of full wages at 18 or 19, or before, if adult work is being done.

Another question which could well demand much more of our attention is the extension of the school leaving age to 16 — thereby relieving, to some extent, the labor pool, as well as ensuring better education and an extension of child endowment.

The present offensive being conducted by the capitalist press and by some sections of the right wing for an extension of the system of incentive payments, and the corresponding opposition from the labor movement, is in many ways bound up with youth problems. Those industries which already have incentive payment such as textiles,

clothing, food preserving, electrical trades, etc., employ large numbers of young people, and the resulting effect of bonus and piecework, etc., can be seen in their lack of unity and poor union organisation. Much greater attention by the progressive forces to these young people will go a long way toward strengthening the trade union movement and will win these youth to a progressive policy.

The recent period has seen some improvements in attention to youth problems by the labor movement. Some good results have been obtained (such as recent metal trades increases), but all too often has this been the result of work done by the youth themselves, which, whilst a good development, still indicates that insufficient attention is being paid to the youth by the trade unions and progressive forces generally. The trade unions in particular must pay considerably more attention to winning wage increases for young workers.

Recent organisational developments among the youth should also demand our attention and should

be studied by all Communists in order to assist such movements to grow and extend their influence among the masses of working class youth.

The winning of the above demands not only concerns the youth themselves from the point of view of raising living standards, so as to be better able to combat the crisis, but also vitally concerns adult workers. As was the case before, the tendency will be to replace the adult worker with the younger and consequently "cheaper" labor of the youth. The raising of the level of youth wages will help mitigate this to a large degree.

The problems of the youth are part of the general problems facing the labor movement. In the struggle to combat the coming economic crisis, youth will play an important role. They, too, must be mobilised to struggle against the aims of monopoly capital to force the workers to carry the burden of the crisis and they will be mobilised if we take up their problems, swing them to us and away from reaction.

SELF-GOVERNMENT FOR SCOTLAND

W. LAUCLAN

(From the "Communist Review," London.)

A CLASSIC Marxist definition of a Nation is given by Stalin in *Marxism and the National Question*. "A nation," he says, "is an historically-evolved, stable community of language, territory, economic life and psychological make-up in a community of culture."

It is clear from the above definition that Scotland is a nation. It is an historically-evolved, stable community. From the sixth century onwards there has always been a Scottish people, and from the end of the tenth century the territory of Scotland has been practically the same as today.

The Scottish people have a common language and a common economic life. In Scotland the social and economic developments differ from those of England. Scotland remained practically untouched by Roman influences; and its Celtic customs, though influenced by Irish, remained free from Mediterranean influences. The beginning of the eleventh century marks the emergence of Scotland as a nation by the amalgamation of territories, regions and principalities into a single whole.

Until James VI of Scotland became James I of England in 1603, Scotland was a completely independent nation. Scotland had developed her own constitutional system of Parliament, of King, Barons and Burgesses, and legal jurisprudence. For over five centuries in bitter warfare against a more powerful opponent she held her own and won independence and liberty at Bannockburn in 1314. The "drift south" began when James VI went to London in 1603, and continued with the Treaty of Union in 1707.

The majority of the Scottish people were opposed to the Treaty of Union. The Convention of Royal Burghs voted against it, and popular demonstrations of opposition took place in the principal towns and cities. While the Treaty set out that in all time coming there would be neither Scotland nor England but Great Britain, it could not break down the historical past of nearly a thousand years' struggle between the two nations. The drift south continued, and, despite the growth of entanglements, the two countries remained apart.

As capitalism developed into imperialism, the decline of British industry as a whole was especially marked in Scotland, where, owing to the predominance of heavy industry, all the features and aspects of decline were accentuated. The struggle between the dominating English monopoly capitalism and the Scottish people sharpened. The growth of the demand for Scottish control of Scottish affairs resulted in 1885 in the passing of the Bill providing for a Secretary of State and a separate Scottish Department and a day in Parliament to discuss Scottish estimates. The Scottish national question again became an integral part of Scottish politics.

Previous to the First World War the Labor Party in Scotland, the L.L.P. and the Scottish Trades Union Congress passed periodical resolutions, and a Nationalist movement, of varying proportions, always existed. But it is in the period of post-war decline of monopoly capitalism that the Nationalist movement grows more and more as the national problem remains unsolved.

In 1914 a Convention representing M.P.'s, town councils, county councils, parish councils, education authorities, some trade unions and the Scottish Home Rule Association, the Scottish National Movement, and other national bodies met in Glasgow and set up a committee to draft a Bill. After two years the Convention met again and endorsed the terms of a Bill which was brought before the House in the spring of 1927. It was talked out in its second reading. This was the ninth occasion in eight years on which the question came before the House—the twenty-first since 1889.

Today there is widespread and growing interest in the affairs of Scotland. It is most sharply expressed around the issues of Scotland's economic and social future, its pressing problems of housing and health—so much worse than England— anxiety about the future of the heavy industries, the demand for new, light, alternative industries, the plans and demands of the various local authorities.

Because of these, Scotland's national question arises afresh. The total inadequacy of existing Government machinery to deal with the huge and pressing problems becomes more apparent. The very act of the British Parliament in giving a Scottish Secretary, Scottish Office and Administrative Department is in itself an admission that Scotland requires separate treatment.

Scotland's problems cannot be dealt with fundamentally without a Scottish Planning Commission and a Scottish Government. The resolution adopted by the Scottish District Congress of the Communist Party in September, 1943, stated clearly:

"We require not only a National Planning Committee for Scotland to plan our post-war reconstruction, but complete self-government for Scotland. We demand the establishment of a Parliament for Scotland on the basis of equal borough and rural areas, which would have the administration of all Scottish affairs and deal with Scottish aspects of social and industrial legislation."

Whilst taking our stand on this basic position we believe that the movement for self-government can be rallied and consolidated if it sees before it not only the objective of a Scottish Parliament, but certain immediate, clear and practical steps that could set the country firmly and speedily on the road to complete self-government.

Four such proposals are being worked out by the Communist Party in Scotland at the present time. They were explained for the first time at the Scottish Assembly held in Glasgow on March 22 of this year to advance the cause of self-government, and created a very deep and favorable impression. It is our belief that Scotland's ability to deal with her problems could be increased by:

(1) The creation of an Under-Secretary of State for Industry and a Scottish Department for Industry which would take over all functions of the Board

of Trade in Scotland; be fully responsible for the development, location, and control of Scotland's industry; prepare an annual finance, raw materials (production and consumption) and output budget; encourage Scotland's trade. It would be independent of the Board of Trade, but would work in close liaison with it.

(2) An Under-Secretary for Labor and a Scottish Labor Department which would take over all existing functions of the Ministry of Labor in Scotland; be responsible for the control, training and allocation of Scottish labor, and administer National Service arrangements on behalf of the Ministry of Labor.

(3) A Scottish "Cabinet" to be created, responsible for Scottish administration, and consisting of the Secretary of State, the two new Under-Secretaries, the two existing Under-Secretaries who are responsible for housing, agriculture and fisheries, and the Scottish representatives of the Ministry of Supply; fuel and power; transport; admiralty, etc.

(4) The Physical Planning Committee should be transformed into a Scottish National Planning Commission responsible for developing a long-term as well as short-term plans for Scotland, co-ordinating all existing regional plans, making its proposals to the Scottish "Cabinet" for endorsement. Besides representatives from the Scottish and British Government Departments, the Planning Commission should include representatives of the employers, trade unions, major local authorities, North of Scotland Hydro-electric Board and the like.

At the same time as we put forward these interim measures for legislative and administrative devolution, we recognise the need for attention and speedy action to deal with Scotland's economic problems if a repetition of pre-war conditions is to be avoided.

The changeover in Scottish industry following the conclusion of the war witnessed a decline in the numbers employed in the basic industries, and an increase in the number employed in the consumption-goods industries. The aircraft industry, virtually disappeared from Scotland, and today we have almost 90,000 registered unemployed in the country.

This colossal waste of manpower and exceedingly rich resources is due to negligence of the past and its continuance into the present stage. In face of the acute economic difficulties confronting Britain today the demand, proper and urgent, is being made for an overall economic plan. No British plan can secure full utilisation of Scotland's exceedingly rich resources unless there is a national plan for Scotland which takes full account of its special problems. Big and quick decisions are needed, but there is as yet no sign of a Scottish national plan. Rapid action is necessary if this is to be avoided.

It is imperative that industry be directed to Scotland. Speedy development of the nationalised coal resources is essential. Scottish steel capacity

must be expanded, and a long-term programme announced for shipbuilding and engineering. We need to get a planned increase in the number of trading estates and new factories to employ at least 150,000 people by the end of next year at the latest. For balanced industrial development rapid decisions are needed on the Forth Road Bridge, Mid-Scotland Ship Canal, the Clyde Estuary, Resort, and the main road and rail developments.

THE OBSCURITY OF PICASSO'S ART

LEN FOX

JOHN OLDHAM in his article on Picasso in the September *Communist Review* makes some excellent points; in particular he stresses correctly the fact that painting need not be representational or photographic—and that therefore we should not criticise a Picasso painting because it does not look like a photograph.

In fairness, however, to Derek Kartun, whose criticism of Picasso is attacked by Oldham, it must be pointed out that Oldham has completely ignored his main point made by Kartun—that Picasso's later work is obscure, that it is not understood by ordinary people, does not (with a few exceptions) inspire them in their forward march, and that Picasso is "out of touch with any considerable body of the people to an extent quite unprecedented in the history of great artists and their public."

Kartun's criticism is a friendly, constructive one—the exact opposite of the type of criticism of modern art which is given in such books as Sir Lionel Lindsay's *Addled Art*. For this latter type of criticism, of course, progressives will have no time.

It is true that Kartun referred to "forty years of barren experimentation with form in which the most talented (modern) artists have indulged in their despair with the world in which they found themselves," and that this phrase is open to criticism—depending largely on the exact meaning we give it.

By taking it out of its context, Oldham gives the impression that Kartun was criticising Picasso because Picasso had been experimenting in form, that Kartun is completely against modern art. But anyone who reads Kartun's criticism in the *Tribune* of August 6, 1946, will see that this is not so. Kartun is not attacking modern artists because they experiment, but because many of them have let a gap grow between themselves and ordinary people.

The phrase of Kartun's about "barren experimentation" implies, if taken in its context, that the cubist, surrealist and other experiments of the last forty years have not given birth to a popular art movement because modern artists like Picasso have been out of touch with ordinary people.

Their experimentation has largely been a negative one based on despair with the old world. Kartun wants to see, I suggest, a constructive ex-

perimentation based on belief in the new world that is being born.

To operate successfully and carry through such a programme, to ensure that Scotland will not become a distressed area once again, we need the right to run our own affairs.

permentation based on belief in the new world that is being born.

John Oldham tries to cover the gap between Picasso's art and the ordinary people by writing that "Picasso all his life has had a great love of humanity." But the fact is that for most of his life this "great love of humanity" did not show itself in Picasso's paintings. When he was a struggling artist, in his early "blue period," he painted pictures of outcasts like "The Old Jew" and "Absinthe-Drinker." But then followed a long period when Picasso became absorbed in experimentation with form—not for the sake of finding a way to express his "great love of humanity," but for the sake of form.

(Apart from some early paintings of picturesque circus folk, I cannot recall seeing one Picasso painting of an ordinary working man or woman.)

The Spanish War had a deep effect of Picasso and brought him back closer to the ordinary people. The Second World War had a similar effect on him. He joined the Communist Party.

Are not Communists like Kartun justified in asking that Picasso, who has passed through so many phases out of touch with ordinary people, should now strive to achieve a new phase in which he will regain his early contact with the people?

In effect, John Oldham says no. For his article implies that Communists aren't allowed to ask for intelligibility, that Kartun is wrong in writing:

"Picasso's painting gives little or no direct inspiration to this forward march (of the common people). . . . The tremendous force that Picasso could be for the working class movement of today is, as yet at any rate, potential and not real. . . . There is barely a line of his work which comments with joy or hope on the future. . . . It cannot be said that the painting of Picasso is singing the glories of the new France that is being born in the same unmistakable voice as that of Aragon in his poems of the Resistance. . . ."

"The sense of being in tune with society, of expressing the great earth-shaking movements of men, of representing the vigor of the nation against what is decaying and dying—this sense which lies at the bottom of the flowering of Renaissance Italy and 19th Century France is almost totally absent."

Surely, if Communist critics do not say this (in a friendly way, of course, avoiding any suggestion of dictating), they are neglecting their duty to the artist. Oldham admits that "Picasso has spent the whole of his creative life in an environment of decaying capitalism." No artist, not even Picasso, can help being harmfully influenced by such an environment. The critic should help the artist to rise above his environment.

THE THOUGHT OF MAO TSE-TUNG

ANNA LOUISE TRONG

MAO TSE-TUNG is one of Asia's most notable leaders and thinkers. He is Chairman of the Chinese Communist Party and for nearly twenty years has lived blockaded, shut off from the world by the battle fronts of foreign and civil wars. From this seeming isolation, the thought of Mao Tse-tung shapes the Chinese Revolution and is expressed in regional governments representing 140 million people in North China and Manchuria.

From his distant Yen-an cave, Mao Tse-tung even became a world figure. His thesis on "Protracted war" predicted the course of the Chinese people's resistance to Japan so accurately that it became an accepted formula in other lands among military experts who never knew whence it came. His theories on "new democracy" have probably affected new government forms in post-war Europe. His analysis of the path to national independence, people's democracy, and people's livelihood charts a way, not only for the Chinese people, but for the billion folk that live in the colonial countries of South-East Asia.

The thought of Mao Tse-tung, despite its wide influence, has never been clearly and fully summarised abroad. It has reached the outside world spasmodically, with long intermissions, due to the blockade of war. In America, people still raise the childish antithesis: "Are the Chinese Communists followers of Moscow, or are they what the West calls 'democrats'?" The answer is that they are neither, though to some extent they are a little of both. They are Chinese trying to solve the bitter problems of China, using their own ideas and also any valid ideas they find in the West. Specifically, they use the method of social analysis known as Marxism. Because they are Chinese, applying their thought to Chinese problems, their policies and even their concepts of Marxism have increasingly diverged from the European pattern. Their thought is not dependent, but creative. Its creative quality comes, first of all, from Mao Tse-tung.

The Chinese Communist Party, like other Communist Parties, regards itself as the advance group of the "proletariat." In China, it considers itself the spokesman and leader for other classes as well, notably the peasants, the petty bourgeoisie, and the middle class of the cities and towns.

China's revolution is a peasant revolution. Its basic characteristic is that the peasants (not the

One question in conclusion. When John Oldham, in his article, quoted without comment an opinion that Picasso is "above classification" and is "the spirit and moving force of our epoch," did he imply that he agrees with this opinion? I hope not, for surely Picasso is not a god, but a man. Surely, for all his greatness, he is not above criticism.

workers) form the principal mass that resists the oppression of foreign capital and of the left-over medieval elements in the Chinese countryside. In the past, Marxist analysis has not been applied to guide such a revolution. Peasant revolts in past history lacked discipline and cohesion—and failed. Mao Tse-tung develops the theoretical basis of the peasant revolution. As one example, he says the "democracy" must be a "peasants' democracy," with voting forms adapted to the vast numbers of illiterate peasants, who vote by dropping a bean in a candidate's bowl. He overcomes the traditional weakness of peasant revolutions by the cohesion, discipline, and devotion of highly-developed organisation.

The "united front" between classes is a point over which Communist Parties in all lands have struggled. "You must unite with them on certain points and struggle against them on others," explained Liu Hsiao-chi, whom the Chinese Communists consider their second greatest Marxist thinker, and to whom I went for an estimate of Mao's thought. "Our mistake in 1927 was that we only united with the bourgeoisie, but did not struggle against it; so that the bourgeoisie gained its aims and rejected ours. In the years immediately following, we made the opposite mistake; we only struggled against the bourgeoisie, but found no way to unite even with the small town merchants. To know when and on what points to unite and when and on what points to struggle needs careful and constant analysis. We united with Chinese capitalists against the Japanese invasion, against foreign imperialism and feudalism. We have, in other words, a policy of uniting with the capitalists and struggling against them at the same time."

The Communist military strategy, which enabled them to start with an army of 3,000 men, and attain, after twenty years of fighting, an army of 1,500,000 men, all the time drawing military supplies and even manpower from the enemy, is also based on Mao Tse-tung's analysis.

The "labor exchange brigades," which increased the productivity of farming in the Communist areas during the hardest years of the anti-Japanese war, was another invention by Mao, based upon a study of the forms of peasant labor—including a type of mutual help that went back more than a thousand years, known as the "squads of the Tang Dynasty

Generals." Usually there are two ways to improve the productivity of primitive peasant farming: the capitalist way of Europe and America, or the collective farming of the U.S.S.R. The Chinese Communists cannot use either now. Their labor exchange brigade employs co-operative methods of farm production on a foundation of individual ownership.

The supply system that enabled the Yen-an Border Region to survive both a Japanese war and a Kuomintang blockade, and that made it possible for the many anti-Japanese bases scattered behind the Japanese lines in North China to live and grow into the mighty "Liberated Areas," was worked out through Mao Tse-tung's analysis of conditions in the rural areas. It is a system by which the personnel of army and government is not paid in money, but draws part of its food from taxation and part from joint productive work. "By this method," said Liu, "we can support an army and government staff of two or three million without too seriously burdening the people's livelihood. With this system we have been able to carry on war for twenty years and carry it on till final victory."

The Communists expect Chiang Kai-shek to go bankrupt from war inflation, and to face revolts from his over-burdened peasants. They are confident that this will not happen with them.

Mao Tse-tung's book on *Protracted War* (July, 1938) was his first work that influenced thinking outside the Communist ranks. It was military and political analysis of high quality, the most important book of its kind to appear in China during the war. The ideas later became current among Chinese and American military experts. The book was studied by the Japanese high command in China. "We know from captured documents," Liu Hsiao-chi told me, "that the Japanese, after reading it, considered Mao Tse-tung the greatest Far Eastern strategist."

At the time the book was written, most people in China despaired of final victory. A few people had of swift victory, to be won by a desperate gamble, a tremendous counter-offensive, which, if it failed, would mean complete defeat for China. Chiang's view was obscure. At times he talked of a quick counter-offensive, at other times he clearly awaited the entrance of America, Britain, and U.S.S.R. into the war. Mao Tse-tung proclaimed that the Chinese people, if sufficiently united, could drive out the invader. The war, he said would be in three stages: (1) Japanese penetration, during which the regular Chinese armies would retreat, but guerrilla warfare would be carried on in the Japanese rear; (2) a long stage of "stalemate," whose length and severity would depend on the extent of unity among the Chinese forces, but in which Chinese resistance would eventually wear down the Japanese; (3) a victorious counter-offensive. The book charted so accurately the path that the war actually followed that today it reads less like prediction than history.

The *New Stage*, published in October, 1938, continued the analysis of the *Protracted War*, with special reference to the beginning of the "stalemate stage." Its primary purpose was to make detailed proposals to the Kuomintang for co-operation against the Japanese. Three forms of co-operation were suggested; that the Communists might join the Kuomintang; that, if this was not allowed, there might be joint committees; failing this, there might be frequent conferences on emergencies. The proposals came to nothing, for the Kuomintang was growing increasingly reactionary, passing regulations against all non-Kuomintang parties and people's organisations.

Pessimism grew in China in 1939. Since the Kuomintang, now centred in Chungking, did almost nothing against the Japanese, the Japanese left Chiang alone in the interior, and concentrated on mopping up North China and the coastal areas. The Kuomintang grew more oppressive; elements in the Kuomintang collaborated with the enemy. Was China then a lost nation?

In such a situation, Mao Tse-tung wrote his *New Democracy* in 1940. It was a clarion call. China, he said, was not lost. There were great reserves of strength in the Chinese people. Even if the Kuomintang turned reactionary, even if it turned traitor, the Chinese people would win victory, both in their war of resistance and in their revolution. The book then analysed the road to victory, the methods by which victory might be hastened; it set forth the form of government that could best lead the people to victory and to prosperity after the war. Not the Kuomintang dictatorship nor the Socialist government by the Communists, not the old forms of democracy from the developed capitalist lands, but a "New Democracy," a coalition government of all revolutionary classes.

The *New Democracy* bases itself on an analysis of the character of the Chinese Revolution, and its place in the present stage of the "world revolution," which has, in the U.S.S.R., reached the Socialist stage. China has not the conditions for Socialism; its revolution is the democratic revolution, which in European countries in the past was led by the bourgeoisie in their struggle to establish capitalism. The democratic revolution must also establish capitalism in China, but, because the world is in a new stage, and because China is a semi-colonial country, and because of the existence of an energetic Communist Party, this capitalism will not be the old form of capitalism, controlled in the bourgeoisie, but "new capitalism," controlled in the interests of the vast majority of the people. The democracy also will not be of the old type, in which the capitalists are in control—nor will it be a workers' dictatorship establishing Socialism, as in the U.S.S.R. It will be a "New Democracy," jointly administered by "all revolutionary classes"—workers, peasantry, petty-bourgeois, and even such capitalists as oppose feudalism and foreign imperialism.

New Democracy marked a turning-point in China's revolutionary thinking and influenced the revolutionary thought of the world. For the Chinese Communists, it became the basis for all future policies, from 1940 till now. On it was based the form of government in the Liberated Areas, including the famous "three-three" system by which the Communists, even in areas that they might easily dominate, confine themselves to one third of the government positions. After five years of testing, the thesis of New Democracy was expanded in Mao's report to the Seventh Party Congress in April, 1945, in the work, *On Coalition Government*, which may be regarded as a sequel to New Democracy applied to a later period.

By this time Mao Tse-tung felt able to state with confidence: "In the entire period of the bourgeois-democratic revolution, in a period of several dozens of years, our general programme of new democracy will remain unchanged." The Chinese form of Marxism was established; it had its theoretical base, its practical experience, its programme for the years to come.

New Democracy was also published in Moscow, both in Russian and in English. The Soviet reviewers recognised it as a new "Marxist classic," applicable not only to China, but to similar semi-feudal, semi-colonial lands. It seems highly likely that the theories of Mao Tse-tung's New Democracy influenced the forms of government that have arisen in parts of post-war Europe.

In the five years that followed the writing of New Democracy, great changes took place in the world. The war widened to involve the Soviet Union and then the United States. The entrance of America into the war with Japan did not lighten the difficulties of the Chinese Communists. It did not compel Japan to move any troops out of North China. Chiang Kai-shek meantime got American weapons, and became more aggressive toward the Chinese Communists. The years 1941-42, after America entered the war, were for the Communists their most difficult period, in which the Yenan Border Region itself was attacked from the north by the Japanese and from the south by Chiang Kai-shek.

The thought of Mao Tse-tung, during this period, turned towards many inventions. Under his leadership the Communists of China learned to "disperse even more completely," and so to penetrate into the enemy's secured regions. They devised a very wide organisation of the peasant militia, unpaid, fighting with very primitive weapons, but co-operating with the regular armies of the Communists towards effective victory. The "production movement" arose, to make the army and government as self-sustaining as possible. "Labor exchange brigades" were promoted to increase the output of the farms.

Two books by Mao Tse-tung appeared during this period: *Problems of Economy and Finance*, which outlined the policies that enabled the Yenan Border Region to survive both the blockade and the

war; and a book usually called *Remaking of Ideology* but which might better be called: *Rectification of the Three Styles*, which deals with methods of study, methods of party work and methods of literature. This was part of a campaign within the party to get away from the dogmatic, pedantic, narrow approach, and to base policies and methods on concrete knowledge.

One or two quotations from the latter book indicate what Mao was driving at and give a flavor of his style:

"Marxism-Leninism has neither good looks nor magic; it is only very useful. There seem to be a lot of people that think it is a sort of charmed medicine with which one can easily cure any disease. Those that take it as dogma are that kind of people. We ought to tell them that their dogmas are more useless than cow-dung. For dung can be used as fertiliser, while dogmas cannot. Comrades, you will know that my purpose in talking like this is to give the dogmatists a great shock and awaken them."

"What then is the condition of those students that graduate from schools that are completely severed from practical activities in society? Such a one is considered a man of knowledge. But first of all, he does not know how to till the soil; secondly, he does not know how to work in a factory; thirdly, he does not know how to fight in battle; fourthly, he has no knowledge of office work. . . . All he has is knowledge from books. Can such a person be considered an all-round intellectual? I think not. He can at most be considered a semi-intellectual. . . .

"Books have no legs; they can be opened and shut at will. To read books is the easiest job in the world. It is much easier than cooking a meal or slaughtering a pig, for when you want to catch hold of the pig, he will run, when you slaughter him, he will squeal, while the book on the table can neither run nor squeal, but lets you handle it as you like. . . . What an easy job! So I wish those that have only book knowledge and no practical experience would understand their own shortcomings and be more humble."

"On the other hand, if comrades who have done practical work misuse their experience, this is also harmful. Their rich experience is very valuable but should they rest content with it, it is quite dangerous. They should understand that their knowledge belongs to the perceptive sphere, and that they lack rational or generalised knowledge. . . . Their knowledge has no theoretical foundation and is therefore incomplete. . . .

"Thus we see that there are two kinds of incomplete knowledge. It is only by the blending of the two that comparatively complete knowledge can be created."

In the same essay, Mao Tse-tung has this to say on criticism:

"We must bear in mind two principles: 'to make an example of the past so that we shall be more careful in the future'; and 'to cure the disease and

save the patient.' We must expose all errors committed in the past, analysing and criticising scientifically and showing no favors to friends, so that each one will be more careful in the future and so do his work better. . . . but the exposure and criticism is done as a doctor treats his patients, with the purpose of curing the disease and not of killing the patient. . . . To attempt to cure him at one stroke or by beating him all over is no way to solve the problem."

This bit from *On Coalition Government* is recommended to all organisations:

"A room should be constantly dusted or it will be covered with dust. Our race should be regularly washed or it will be dirty. This is also true of the ideology of our comrades and the work of the party, which should also be constantly cleaned. A running stream does not smell and a door-hinge will not be moth-eaten means that germs and worms are dispersed by continuous movement."

These examples show the clear, pungent style, close to the Chinese peasant, in which the thought of Mao Tse-tung finds expression.

After reading what I have so far written, Lu Ting-yi, Chief of the Information Department of the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party, summed up for me Mao Tse-tung's thought on the Chinese Revolution under four heads:

1. China is at present a semi-colonial and semi-feudal country. Her bourgeois-democratic revolution began after the First World War, when the Socialist Soviet Union already existed and the Chinese proletariat was already politically awake. This conditions the present stage of the Chinese Revolution, as an anti-imperialist and anti-feudal revolution, led by the proletariat with the peasantry as the main force and with participation of other broad social strata.

The revolution establishes a "new democracy," and not the old forms of democracy nor yet Socialism. Therefore one should have no illusions of a quick transition to Socialism, but should wholeheartedly promote the democratic revolution. Without the leadership of the working class, the peasants' struggles must fail, but there is no fear of such a struggle developing beyond the power of the workers. While the peasants form the "main revolutionary masses" there are also very broad social strata—the petty bourgeoisie, the liberal bourgeoisie, forward-looking landlords and other patriotic people—who demand democracy and who are especially willing to struggle against imperialism. There must be a correct approach to all of these.

Since China is a vast country, semi-colonial, semi-feudal, under domination by several powerful, rival imperialist countries and by native feudal forces as well, it follows that her economic and political development is marked by disunity and unevenness. This makes the development of China's democratic revolution very uneven, and its nation-wide victory requires a protracted and tor-

tuous struggle. However, bases of armed revolution may first be established and maintained in vast regions where the enemy's rule is comparatively weak. Such a base can be established in a secluded section even during periods of revolutionary ebb. With this as a starting point, the nation-wide triumph of the democratic revolution can come about through a tortuous process of struggle.

2. Military struggle constitutes the main form of the political struggle. Its two basic problems are: army-building and strategy and tactics.

The army must be a people's army of a new type, fundamentally different from armies of warlords, fighting for the people's interests in all its aspects. It never fights for the personal interest of a warlord or a petty clique. It has the triple task of combat, mass work, and production. Its relation to the people is expressed by the phrase "support the government and love the people." Within the army there must be a democratic life, good relations between officers and men, and a voluntary yet authoritative discipline. It must have a correct policy to disintegrate enemy forces and win over war prisoners.

Strategy and tactics must admit the enemy's superiority in strength, the enemy being large and we being small. It is under such conditions that ways to defeat the enemy must be sought. Hence the enemy's defects and our own strong points must be thoroughly exploited, and there must be full reliance on the power of the masses of the people for our success, survival, and growth. When our armed forces are small, and the enemy's superiority is unequivocal, we must use guerrilla warfare. When regular forces have been established, there must be simultaneously the organisation of regional and local forces. Armed struggles should go hand in hand with non-military struggles. . . . In military operations we are for quick, decisive battles and against protracted battles. . . . In battles we oppose "beating the many with the few"; we are for "beating the few with the many."

3. "From the people and to the people" is the all-inclusive political directive. To guarantee this there must be close organisational ties between the Party and the non-party people, and intimate connections within the Party between leadership and rank and file.

The Party must carry on an ideological struggle against erroneous tendencies. Mean while, a system of strict democratic centralism must be maintained. Special attention must be given with due regard to the vast extent of the Chinese Revolution in space, in time, and in variety of social strata—in defining and securing correct relations between old and new members, local people and outsiders, military and civilians, one area and other, one demilitarised and other. By such principles the Chinese Communist Party of two million members, isolated from each other by long periods of war, has been able to achieve unprecedented solidarity, both

within the Party and between the Party and the broad masses of the people.

4. Marxist-Leninist dialectical materialism is the method of thinking used. None of Mao Tse-tung's policies are either copied from a book or based on piecemeal experience. Mao's method of thinking opposes both dogmatism and empiricism. He emphatically advocates the study of theory, but also holds "there is no right to speak without fact-finding." His policies are based on analysis of both the domestic and the international situation, and of the experiences of the Chinese Revolution, especially those of the Great Revolution of 1925-27, as interpreted by dialectical materialism.

Since the Second World War ended, Mao Tse-tung has been developing his thesis on the post-war relations in the world. These views have not yet appeared in book form, but have been expressed in several interviews—two were given to me last August—and in an official statement on the "Post-War International Situation" put out by the Communist Party's chief of information, Lu Ting-yi, on New Year's Day, 1947.

Mao Tse-tung takes issue with the widely current idea that antagonism between Soviet Union and an Anglo-American bloc is leading to war. "This idea is only a smoke-screen which American reactionaries blow up to hide the more immediate antagonisms," he said to me last summer. "These are between the American imperialists and the rest of the capitalist world." He analysed these conflicts in some detail and said: "Very soon the British people will begin to ask themselves: 'Who is it that oppresses us? Is it the U.S.S.R. or is it the United States?'" In the months since then, the thought of important groups in Britain has moved steadily in the direction Mao foresaw.

The official analysis of the international situation, issued by the Chinese Communist Party on New Year's Day, 1947, sees a world-wide struggle developing between the forces of "anti-democracy," and the growing "world democratic might." The victory in the anti-fascist war has stimulated the growth of the people's democratic forces everywhere, but they are now being attacked on a world scale by the anti-democratic forces, whose "central fortress" is the imperialism of the United States. In the other capitalist and colonial countries, the reactionaries "turn traitor," and sell out the interests of their respective peoples to American imperialism, becoming "running-dogs of American imperialism." Chiang Kai-shek is given as an example.

"The American reactionaries have a heavy burden," said Mao to me with a smile last autumn. "They must sustain the reactionaries of the whole world. And if they cannot sustain them, the house will fall down. It is a house with one pillar. There are many patients with one doctor. And the disease of these patients is incurable. Even penicillin will do nothing for them."

All over the world, therefore, the democratic forces, in resisting the reactionaries of their respective nations, find themselves also in conflict with American imperialism. A united front against American imperialism begins to form on a world scale. It consists of the democratic people of America, the people of other capitalist countries, and the people of colonial lands. It includes all social classes, "workers, farmers and patriotic elements, and advocates of peace among the bourgeoisie." Its growth is seen in the new democratic regimes in Eastern Europe; in the leftward advance of Great Britain and France; in the leftward trends among peoples in Germany, Italy, Japan; in the growth of wide people's struggles in colonial and semi-colonial countries with China at the head; in the development of democratic forces in Latin America; in American strike movements and the "Wallace incident." These are the world's immediate struggles, rather than any conflict between the capitalist world and the Soviet Union. The U.S.S.R. is a "main pillar" of the "world democratic might," but is not a direct participant in these immediate struggles.

This new line-up is seen as a "new page in world history," which will last from the end of the Second World War "down to the day when stable and lasting peace of the world is ensured." For the reactionary forces are "outwardly strong, but hollow inside"—"paper tigers," as Mao said to me last summer. The struggle will be long and tortuous, but the victory of the world democratic might is sure.

With such a world view in mind one should read Mao Tse-tung's New Year's greeting, issued over the Yanan radio on January 1, 1947, at a time when the Yanan Border Region was invaded, when Chiang Kai-shek occupied more than 100 Communist cities and 179,000 square miles of their territory, when the world outside China worried over a possible Third World War.

"In 1946 throughout the post-war world, the side of light waged victorious struggle against the side of darkness. And in post-war China also the side of light waged victorious struggle. . . . In the post-war world and in China, a very great people's movement developed for peace and democratic liberties. . . . These movements must of necessity move towards victory. There is no power that can bring them to a halt.

"In the year 1947 the world-wide front of the people of all countries, including China—will develop rapidly. The movement of the Chinese people for democratic liberties will obtain even more important victories than those of 1946. This will cause conditions in China to undergo a change beneficial to the restoration of peace and the independence of the nation. . . .

"At present the Kuomintang authorities have not shown any slightest intention towards peace.

. . . But in the not distant future the light of liberty will surely illumine the vast reaches of our ancestral homeland . . . within the next few years an independent, peaceful, democratic new China

will surely establish a firm foundation."

To many people these words will sound incredibly optimistic. But file them away. Mao Tse-tung's predictions have been right so far.

POLITICAL RESOLUTION OF THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF BURMA

JULY 30, 1947.

NEW FEATURES IN THE SITUATION

TWO momentous events have taken place in our national life within the last ten days.

1. The assassination of Bogoyoke Aung San and his ministerial colleagues.

2. Declaration on the Nu-Atlee agreement of the formation of a Provisional National Government in place of the former Governor's Executive Council.

The British imperialists were compelled to agree to these concessions, because there was no other alternative for them. At the same time, they wanted to nullify them. So the assassination of the national leadership and imperialism's attempt at a rightist coup d'état was its last desperate step.

But this has changed the entire political situation in our country and hence a new orientation has to be given to our policy of final seizure of power.

Why the new situation?

1. (a) The last desperate attack on the national movement by British imperialism has begun with the assassination of Bogoyoke.

(b) Today the people no longer feel the same confidence in the AFPFL leadership and also in the Government as they felt when Aung San was at the head of affairs.

Hence the people want Communist-AFPFL unity at any cost to save the national movement.

It also to lead them forward towards the final goal. Their concrete suggestion for unity is that "Communist Party and AFPFL must modify their respective demands and unite." The people also urges upon the Communists to get into the Government and make the ministry stable.

2. By the Nu-Atlee agreement, formal but serious concessions to the national demands have been won from British Imperialism.

On the one hand, this has brought about a new situation, in which if we play a positive and correct role we can lead the people into a national war supported by the entire nation against the British imperialists. "This kind of war for the fatherland has been taking place in many colonies and semi-colonial countries, i.e., Philippines, Indo-China, Indonesia, India, Iran, Greece, etc. . . . (Political Affairs, March, 1947.)

On the other hand, if we do not change our tactical line and continue in the old sectarian way

(i.e., because of our negative attitude on the government), there is every danger that not only will our Party be completely smashed, but our entire national movement will be shattered, making it possible for the imperialists to rule our country indirectly for ever.

Hence, under the new conditions, it becomes imperative for the Communist Party of Burma to immediately change its tactical line.

'BRITISH IMPERIALIST AIMS TOWARDS OUR NATIONAL MOVEMENT

Today, British imperialism has been compelled to leave off direct rule and resort to indirect rule, by making formal but important concessions to our national demands, and at the same time it is trying to sabotage them from within, in order to continue its rule.

At the same time, we must frankly admit that we had previously minimised the value of the concessions that have been gained by the national movement. If that had not been so, we could have utilised these concessions in certain respects and to a certain extent for the development of our common national movement.

If we divide the period from September to July into three phases and study the British imperialist game with regard to our national movement and also the concessions that have been won by the nationalist movement from the unwilling hands of the British imperialists in each phase, we shall clearly see why this final change has to be made.

FIRST PHASE

The September uprising was the climax of a spontaneous workers, employees, police and peasants' struggle. This upheaval immediately made the imperialists decide to retreat, before the movement could assume the character of a national war against British imperialism. Hence, the imperialists started to negotiate with the national revolutionaries. Since the movement could not lead to a final clash with imperialist rule, thanks to the national bourgeois leadership, and because imperialism had begun to negotiate with the national leaders right from the beginning, the concessions gained by the national movement were very little.

- (a) AFPFL leadership had to share power with the toadies in the Executive Council on a 50-50 basis.
- (b) Promise of more power for the Executive Council was given by Rance, once the leaders entered the Executive Council.

In effect, the powers gained by the national movement in the Executive Council were no greater than those of the Paw Tun Government. At the same time, since the popular leaders were in the Executive Council, the character of the Executive Council had definitely changed from that of the previous one.

But it must be recognised that this upsurge compelled imperialism to forsake its previous method of direct, open, repressive rule over us. It made imperialism assume a popular mask, in order to carry on the assault against the national movement. This was because the gathering momentum of the national revolt would challenge the very existence of imperialism if it continued its open and direct rule.

From September onwards, the imperialists resorted to every kind of repressive measure to check the national revolt. The national leaders also, through compromises and disruptive moves, tried to checkmate the people's movements.

But because the basic contradictions between imperialism and the people remained as serious as before and because the national leaders had not won any serious concessions from the imperialists, the people began to march forward with a firmer tread. The upsurge continued, with increasing strength.

The reflection of the people's upsurge was manifested in Bogoyke's public statements, etc. He categorically declared that his government would resign if a promise of independence within one year was not given by the British. He threatened the British government with armed revolt. In the armed forces and in rural areas, serious preparations for armed actions were made by PVOs and Socialists.

In January, the upsurge assumed a higher form of struggle than even in September, i.e., armed struggles of PVOs and Socialists, etc. Against the background of the armed struggle, a general strike of industrial and other workers broke out in many places and particularly at Rangoon.

SECOND PHASE

Imperialism, faced with a more serious national upsurge than in September, was now prepared to concede more to the national demand. The national bourgeois leadership also, true to their tradition, became prepared for a compromise instead of leading the upsurge to final assault.

The Aung San-Attlee agreement made the following concessions:—

- (a) Elections for the Constituent Assembly as envisaged in the White Paper plan were given up. Direct elections to the Constituent Assembly on a basis of adult suffrage was conceded.

- (b) The Governor's Executive Council was composed of AFPFL members only.
- (c) Financial autonomy was given to the Executive Council.
- (d) No interference by the Governor in the day to day activities of the Executive Council, i.e., promise to function as a "Dominion Government by convention."

After the agreement, the PVOs were allowed to be armed, a concession which had till then been resisted by the imperialists.

Hence, this was the period from which began the last stage of direct rule by imperialism. While making these concessions, imperialism tried to nullify them by other means.

Taking advantage of the national division, imperialism secured more powers from the popular executive council for the bureaucracy. As the mass struggles led by the Communist Party developed more and more, the frightened right wing leadership also began to rely more and more on the bureaucracy. Unprecedented repressive laws were passed, which armed the bureaucracy to terrorise the workers' and peasants' movements everywhere. The British military rained bullets from their machine guns, etc., on our unarmed peasantry under the diabolical plan called the "Operation Flush" in this period.

By means of slave conditions associated with the British loan, imperialism succeeded in maintaining its stranglehold on our national economy.

By encouraging reactionaries among the minorities, British imperialism tried to foster separatist movements in many places. In this way they wanted to further disrupt the national movement.

But in spite of the designs and intrigues of the imperialists, they failed to suppress the national upsurge, which, in fact, began to gather greater momentum day by day. The AFPFL election campaign roused our freedom-loving people. But in particular our campaign for national unity for a final struggle prepared a larger section of our people than before for uncompromising struggle against imperialism. When the people in general began to get disillusioned with the national leaders, they went more and more to turn towards struggle.

The entire working class and the middle-class employees, including police, teachers, etc., were on the verge of general strike. The ABTUC had fixed August 15 as the date to start the general strike, in spite of the Aung San government's disruptive role. Country-wide peasant actions, previously unheard-of, were about to begin. The ABTUC session at Kyaukse had informally fixed August 15 as the day from when an all-Burma campaign against Dominion Status was to begin. A large section of the army was on the point of revolt. A big section of the navy was about to start a mutiny.

Thus, the country was preparing for a much bigger upheaval than in September, 1946, or January, 1947.

The reflection of this uncompromising upsurge was manifested in the sayings and doings of the national leaders themselves:—

- (a) The Constituent Assembly in unequivocal terms demanded complete independence outside the British Empire.
- (b) Bogoyke began more and more to say that he "would lead the country to struggle if independence was not granted by January, 1948."
- (c) For the first time since September, Bogoyke categorically stated in public meetings, as well as in the Constituent Assembly, that "Nobody had the power to go against the decisions of the January, 1946, AFPFL Congress resolutions."

In his last speech on July 13, he once again reiterated what has been said above.

- (d) After the elections, the national leadership had to lessen their anti-Communist crusade, and before his assassination Bogoyke showed definite indications for unity with the Communists.

All these facts gave more courage to the masses of our people and they longed for immediate struggle against imperialism.

THIRD PHASE—PLOT TO STAGE RIGHTIST COUP

Faced with this unprecedented strength of the national liberation movement on the one hand and its own crisis at home on the other, imperialism negotiated with the goodwill mission led by Thakin Nu and reached an agreement.

British imperialism had its own internal troubles. After the second world war it had come out much weaker politically and economically than before. By the terms of loan agreements, America, its imperialist rival, was swallowing up all its imperialist bases. The growing British labor movement also no longer supported the imperialist policy of keeping the colonies in slavery. Among the New Democracies in Europe, imperialism could find no support for its subjugation of the colonies.

Hence, British imperialism, still wanting to retain its Empire, has to resort to desperate means. They can no longer rule the colonies in any of the old ways. It is for this reason that, with the Nu-Attlee agreement, the period of indirect rule of imperialism in our country has begun. This indirect rule they intend to carry on by making serious concessions to the national demands on the one hand, and on the other they want to sabotage it from within through the bureaucracy, military chiefs, vested interests, British monopoly concerns and by means of treaties, etc.

The gains are the following:—

- (a) Admission by imperialism of the sovereign status of the Constituent Assembly despite its limitations.
- (b) Positive promise for transfer of power by a certain date, i.e., towards the end of 1947.

- (c) Formation of a formal Provisional National Government by the AFPFL, functioning as a cabinet and by convention, no longer responsible to the Governor, but only to the working committee of the AFPFL. The Governor is to function as a constitutional head by convention. The status of the Councillors was raised to ministers, with the Prime Minister as the head.

On the other hand, although the Constituent Assembly had declared that Burma will not remain within the British Empire, the Nu-Attlee agreement still says that "Should the final decision of the Constituent Assembly be that Burma is to become an independent State outside the British Commonwealth ... This shows that imperialism will desperately try in the interim period to create such conditions as will compel Burma to remain within the Empire."

The cold-blooded murder of the entire national leadership is a direct and desperate attack of the imperialists on the national movement for the fulfilment of that very design. By means of this coup d'état they intended to put the reactionary Saw-Sein-Maw gang, which would obey their dictation like slaves, into power. In this way, they could check Burma from leaving the Empire. The Fascist coup d'état was definitely engineered by the Tory section of the Imperialists, most probably with the silent consent of the Labor imperialists. It was executed by the Saw-Sein-Maw gang in conjunction with the British military chiefs and bureaucrats in Burma, the British monopolists in Burma and a section of the Burmese bureaucracy (e.g., Tun Hla Aung, etc.).

At the same time, just before the assassination, the growing demand of "AFPFL-CP unity" by the national movement, which was forcing the AFPFL leaders to unite with the Communists, had to be stopped. This is because national unity today would mean liquidation of imperialist rule. Hence imperialism on the one hand attempted the Rightist coup d'état and, on the other, tried to put the blame for this on the Communists so that the national movement could be still more disrupted without any hope of unity in the near future. This is evidenced by the fact that immediately after the assassination of the national leaders, imperialist News Agencies spread the news abroad that the murder was committed by Left Parties in order to stage a coup d'état. Later, UPA reports from London openly stated that it was the Communists who were responsible for the assassination. It is authentically learnt that the British million. It is authentically learnt that the British million. It is authentically learnt that the British million.

Although the prompt initiative of the proletarian party has checked the immediate designs of the imperialists, thereby saving the country from disaster, there is yet every danger that their attack on the national movement will be repeated over and over again in the interim period, through Saw-Sein-Maw rebellion, political assassinations and various kinds of political and military intrigues. It is quite possible

not avail, in view of the present grave shortage of scientific manpower, and since German scientists of doubtful political alignment, even if not actually Nazis, are being brought to work in Australia by the Commonwealth Government, surely it is not

too much to ask that the same privileges be extended to such men as Georgalas, for instance, who in addition to being a brilliant geologist was also a staunch and active anti-Nazi in his own country during its occupation by the Nazis.



BOOK REVIEW

SLAVE SOCIETY IN IMPERIAL ROME

(K. Kautsky)
J. W.



There are a great many reasons put forward for the decline and fall of the Roman Empire. Sooner or later in the course of his argument every political or religious crank will appeal to the history of Rome for support in his contention that godliness, or love of pleasure, or usury, or some other particular curse, was the cause of Rome's downfall. I have not the slightest doubt that we shall shortly be told that Rome collapsed because the Emperors nationalised the banks.

Most of the explanations have some grain of truth in them. But they only touch the surface and mistake the effect for the cause.

There is no simple answer to the question, "Why did Rome collapse?" In order to understand why, it is necessary to make a scientific study of the mode of production of Roman society, of the class struggles which resulted, and of the effect which these struggles had on the forces of production and the way of life.

Such a study is presented in Kautsky's *Slave Society in Imperial Rome*.

This is not just another superficial explanation of the fall of Rome. It is a careful, scientific examination of the development of Roman society, based on an understanding of the fundamental principles of social development first enunciated by Marx and Engels.

"The history of all hitherto existing society," wrote Marx and Engels in the *Communist Manifesto*, "is the history of class struggles. Freeman and slave, patrician and plebeian, lord and serf, guild-master and journeyman—in a word, oppressor and oppressed—stood in constant opposition to one another, carried on an uninterrupted, now hidden, now open fight—a fight that each time ended either in a revolutionary reconstruction of society at large, or in the common ruin of the contending classes."

Kautsky very clearly and accurately analyses the development of the class struggles in Rome and shows how these led to "the common ruin of the contending classes."

The growth of new ideas, the luxury of the rich, the influence of usury, and most other 'factors' which are variously put forward as being of decisive influence, are examined and shown to be part of an interconnected whole—the peculiar products of the particular organisation of society.

"Those who would understand the opinions which are characteristic of a particular epoch and which distinguish them from other epochs," writes Kautsky, "must first of all study the needs and problems peculiar to the period. These are at bottom the outgrowth of the particular mode of production in the period, of the manner in which the society of the time maintained its life."

The predominant form of production in Roman society was agriculture, and an agriculture organised under a system of slavery. Great estates, owned by wealthy landholders, were worked by numerous slaves. As the rich became richer, free peasants were pushed from the land and free artisans lost their independence. Great numbers trooped to the city of Rome, to become the 'spivs' of their day, the 'lumpenproletariat,' who were bribed with 'bread and circuses' to support the moves of aspirants for political power.

Meanwhile the landowners devoted less and less time to the management of their estates and to constructive government, and more and more time to luxurious enjoyment.

"Boundless wealth was being accumulated in Rome for the sole purpose of serving personal gratification; pleasure-seeking wealthy wasters staggered from banquet to banquet, scattering with lavish hands the abundance which it was impossible for them to consume all for themselves."

Production from the land inevitably declined. Such a mode of production could not develop the productive forces. With cheap slave labor there was no incentive for improved means of production to be introduced. Moreover, the slaves had no interest in their work and could be trusted only with the simplest and most robust tools.

"Unintelligent, sulky, malicious, eager for an occasion to injure the hated tormentor, whenever the opportunity served, the slave labor of the latifundium produced far less than the peasant farm. Pliny, in the First Century of our era, already pointed out how fruitful the fields of Italy had been when the farmer had not yet scorned to till them himself, but how intractable Mother Earth had become when fettered and branded slaves were permitted to maltreat her."

Wealth continued to pour into Rome as tribute and spoil from conquered countries. With the de-

cline of production the economy of the Empire became more and more dependent on war. But the ability to wage war also declined. With the disappearance of the independent peasant cultivator the earlier irresistible Roman armies of free citizens were being replaced by unreliable mercenary armies.

And so the uninterrupted fight between freeman and slave, patrician and plebeian, ended in the disintegration of Roman society and the common ruin of the contending classes.

A comparison between decaying Roman society and modern capitalist society naturally comes to mind. There are many aspects which seem very similar. But Kautsky shows that these similarities are only superficial, that the basic modes of production of the two societies are vastly different and that consequently the development of each society takes a different form. In particular, there was in Rome no inherently revolutionary class capable of overthrowing the oppressing class and of constituting society.

But while we cannot look for parallels between Roman society and our own, for history repeating itself, nevertheless a study of the history of those times does increase our knowledge of the broad social laws of development. This is the value of such books. I am not aware of any other easily available book which gives such a complete, yet concise, analysis of this particular historical period. In addition, it is written in a most clear and absorbing style.

In a brief preface L. Harry Gould quotes Lenin, who wrote, "We know from many of Kautsky's works that he could be a Marxist historian, and that these works of his will remain the permanent treasure of the proletariat in spite of his subsequent renegacy."

"One such treasure is presented in the pages which follow," comments Gould.

Slave Society in Imperial Rome is taken from Kautsky's complete work, *Foundations of Christianity: a Study of Christian Origins*, which is a Marxist analysis of the beginnings of Christianity.

The part now printed, after discussing the political and economic structure and trends of Roman society, shows how Christianity was peculiarly fitted to become the dominant religion of such society at a certain period of its decay. As opposed to idealistic philosophy, which holds that ideas change society, Marxism holds that society moulds ideas. Hence Kautsky shows how Christianity, far from being a new and inspired doctrine which brought light into the world, actually, for the most part, absorbed and reflected ideas which were current and which arose as the result of the disintegration of ancient society.

Current Book Distributors is to be congratulated on its enterprise in publishing this extract from such an important classic. It is indeed a treasure.



Questions & Answers

conducted by
L. H. GOULD

Please explain the terms Socialism, Socialisation, What is the connection between Socialisation and Nationalisation?—J. T. McCarthy.

Socialism is the first phase of Communist society: it is the social order which, through revolutionary action by the working class (the proletariat) and its allies, replaces capitalism. In Socialism the state power is in the hands of the workers. Further, Socialist society is a "classless society"—classless in the sense that there are no exploiting and exploited classes. These are the basic political features of Socialism. The main economic feature of Socialism is the ownership of the means of production by the workers. Production is social, or socialised (just as it is, as we shall see, in capitalism); appropriation of the products of this social labor is also social—in contradistinction to capitalism, where appropriation is private, i.e., by private individuals, the capitalists.

Socialisation is the process of development of social, or socialised, production, the degree of organisation of social labor which first appeared in history in the Middle Ages side by side with the individual labor of the small producers in town and countryside. This small, scattered, individual production was replaced in the end by modern capitalism. From the 15th century onwards the small producers are dispossessed (expropriated) of their means of production, such as the spinning wheel, handloom and blacksmith's hammer. The producers are transformed into wage-laborers, an assembly by the capitalists in great factories. Labor thus ceases to be individual; it becomes social, socialised. The new socialised means of production "are only workable by a collectivity of men" (Engels).

But now note. Earlier, the means of production were owned by the small producers. The handloom, blacksmith's hammer, etc., were "small, dwarfish, circumscribed," but they belonged to the producer

himself. And he himself owned (appropriated) the product of his labor. But under capitalism, when the puny means of production along with their owners become transformed into "actual socialised means of production and socialised producers" (Engels), both the means of production and the commodities produced by this socialised labor are appropriated privately, i.e., by the capitalists. Engels then discusses the contradiction: "socialised production with capitalistic appropriation."

Terms such as "social labor," "socialised production," "socialisation of production," etc., occur not infrequently in basic Marxist writings which deal with the origin and development of capitalism. Thus Lenin, in his *Imperialism*, after discussing the swindles and manipulations of the monopolists, says: "At the basis of these swindles lies socialised production; but the immense progress of humanity, which achieved this socialisation, entirely goes to benefit the speculators."

It is clear, therefore, that socialisation is not the same as Socialism. It becomes Socialism only when the historical process of socialisation is completed, namely, when the means of production and the products of social labor are owned by society as a whole. . . . "the transformation of capitalistic private property, already practically resting on socialised production, into socialised property" (Marx). In Chapter 32 of *Capital*, Socialism is explained as the "further socialisation of labor and further transformation of the land and the other means of production into socially exploited and, therefore, common means of production."

The distinction between socialisation and Socialism may be formulated as follows:—

Socialisation: Usually refers only to the degree of organisation of social labor in capitalism. If so, it means socialised production with private appropriation.

Socialism: Socialised production with socialised appropriation, or, complete socialisation.

What is nationalisation?

Nationalisation is state capitalism, or state monopoly capitalism. It means the control of an industry or industries by the government on behalf of the capitalist class. Nationalisation arises when "the means of production have actually outgrown management by share companies, and therefore their transfer to the State has become inevitable from an economic standpoint." (Engels.) Capitalist relations remain; wage-labor is exploited as before.

But nationalisation represents a further stage in the organisation of capitalist economy. Hence, in answer to the particular question set above, nationalisation expresses a higher degree of socialisation of labor, of socialisation of production. (Note: The main political issues around nationalisation of the private banks are treated fully elsewhere. Here we need only observe that sometimes the capitalists

themselves favor nationalisation — when government intervention in industry guarantees the investments and dividends of the capitalists, e.g., only a tiny fraction of the shareholders of the Bank of England opposed nationalisation; similarly, the bondholders of the N.S.W. Government railways have nothing to complain about. But frequently the further advance of the Labor Movement requires nationalisation of industries, e.g., Lenin's demand prior to the October Revolution; similar demands advocated, and adopted, in a number of countries following the defeat of the Axis powers; and the current A.C.P. policy of nationalisation of the banks and the key industries.)

But two special points must now be made in regard to nationalisation:—

1. The rate of increase of socialisation of labor in history corresponds generally to the rate of development of capitalism from its free competitive stage, through the concentration and centralisation of capital to the emergence of the great monopolies, the domination of the financial oligarchs—in short, imperialism. This is the epoch of the general crisis of capitalism, and means for the toilers extreme exploitation, the resort of the capitalists to greater violence and reaction, to fascism, and the outbreak and recurrence of devastating wars. The Socialist revolution becomes a "practical necessity" (Stalin).

2. The capitalist mode of production creates, in the form of the monopolist trusts and the banks, and in such state enterprises as the post office, the material prerequisites for the advance to Socialism.

Marx said of the banking system that it "presents indeed the form of common bookkeeping and distribution of means of production on a social scale, but only the form." And Lenin: "The imperialist war is the eve of the Socialist revolution. And this is so not only because the war with its horrors is generating a proletarian uprising — no uprising will create Socialism if it has not ripened economically — but because state monopoly capitalism is the fullest material preparation for Socialism, is its threshold, is that rung on the historic ladder between which rung and the one called Socialism there are no intermediate rungs."

Further from Lenin: "Capitalism in its imperialist stage arrives at the threshold of the most complete socialisation of production. In spite of themselves, the capitalists are dragged as it were into a new social order, a transitional social order from complete free competition to complete socialisation" (i.e., to Socialism).

A few words about the Socialist objective of the ALP, as contained in the formula, "Socialisation of production, distribution and exchange." This formula means Socialism, even though clumsily expressed. And the meaning is not affected by the unscrupulous demagoguery of right-wing ALP leaders, and the confusion created among ALP workers by misuse of the terms socialisation and

nationalisation. Note this point in L. Sharkey's letter to the *Sydney Morning Herald* (4/10/47): "Mr. Lang was urging what he called 'socialisation of credit,' by means of bank nationalisation, which he implied was a sovereign remedy against depression and a certain guarantee of prosperity for all. My pamphlet explained that what Mr. Lang and the Labor Party leaders had in mind was not 'socialisation' in the sense of Socialism, but nationalisation, and their claims were exaggerated to a degree that misled the people."

To summarise. Socialisation of labor, of production, begins with the beginnings of capitalism in

the Middle Ages. It achieves a very high degree of development in the imperialist stage of capitalism, which is emphasised all the more under nationalisation (state monopoly capitalism). The very highest historical expression of socialisation occurs after the Socialist revolution, when the last forms of private ownership are abolished.

(References: Engels, *Anti-Dühring*, Section 3, Chapter 2; Lenin, *The Threatening Catastrophe*; Sharkey and Campbell, *Government Enterprise*, pp. 71-80.)

SEARCHING FOR THE BLUE STARS

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

TWO American astronomers, Humason and Zwicky, of Mount Wilson Observatory, in California, have recently reported a hunt for faint blue stars in two areas of the heavens. One was in the neighbourhood of the Hyades in the constellation of the Bull, where stars are very thick. The other was in the constellation Coma Berenices, as far away as possible from the Milky Way.

They photographed the same area of sky, first through a yellow glass and then through a violet one, and picked out the 48 stars, which appeared much brighter through the violet than through the red screen. All these stars were very faint indeed. Even the brightest was 20 times too far away to be visible with the naked eye.

Readers may well ask what can be the point of such a search and, even if it has more point than looking for the bluest postage stamp, what possible practical value it can have.

The answer is quite simple. The bluer a star, the hotter it is as a general rule.

The reason is straightforward. As one heats a black object up it begins to produce invisible infra-red rays which can be felt as heat. Then it becomes red-hot, and later white hot. Still hotter things give blue light. Thus an arc lamp is much hotter than a filament lamp, and much bluer.

Of course, many modern lamps, for example neon, mercury and sodium lights, shine because the atoms in them are electrically excited, not because they are hot, and their colour obeys quite different rules.

But since blue light consists of more rapid oscillations than red, it is quite natural that a hot body, whose atoms are moving quickly, should give bluer light than a moderately hot one. So what Humason and Zwicky were really doing was looking for the hottest bodies in two regions of the universe.

This is a reasonable thing to do, because matter under extreme conditions develops new properties (the change of quantity into quality). For example, some very cold metals become superconductors with practically no resistance at all, so that an electric current induced in a lead ring in a bath of liquid helium will go on circulating for hours on end.

The spectra of these stars were photographed, which made a calculation of their temperatures possible according to a principle first laid down by the Indian astronomer Saha, and worked out in more detail by Milne and Fowler in England.

In a number of cases their so-called proper motions—that is to say, the rate at which their directions in space alter—were already known. This made it possible to pick out those which were near to the sun; near, that is to say, in an astronomical sense. For a near object does not have to be moving very fast to alter its apparent position noticeably in ten years or so. So most stars which change their position quickly are fairly near to us.

In fact, most of the blue stars in the Hyades shared the motion of Aldebaran and the other bright stars of this cluster. So they must be very much dimmer.

It turns out that they belong to the group of stars called white dwarfs, which are extraordinarily dense. The matter in them is so closely packed that a cubic inch of it would weigh a ton. It is, of course, held together by its own gravitation, which is so enormous that even light has a good deal of work to do in getting out of such stars, and gets redder in the process, though not enough so to stop the stars being bluish-white.

Although no such star is bright enough to be seen without a telescope, they are so common near the earth that it is quite possible that there are more of them than of all the other stars put together.

Searches in regions like the Hyades, where there are a lot of stars, will help to decide whether this is so. If so, they probably represent a late stage of the evolution of stars, and perhaps our sun will finally contract into one.

The search for blue stars near the pole of the Milky Way gave quite a different result. A few are dwarfs, but most are very bright and large stars at an enormous distance.

In the direction of the Milky Way, there is so much dust between the stars that one can usually only photograph stars, however bright, a few thousand light years away.

At right angles to the Milky Way one can see out into space beyond it. And some of these large blue stars may be a good way out in the almost empty space between our galaxy and its neighbours which we see as spiral nebulae. So when more is discovered about them they may help us to fix the scale of the universe more closely, as well as telling us more about very hot matter. When I say very hot, I do not mean as hot as the matter in the first millionth of a second of an atom-bomb explosion, or the matter of an exploding star, but the hottest matter which is on permanent display.

I don't know what will come out of such studies, or whether anything will. I know that the study of matter in the sun told us of the existence of one new kind of matter, namely, the gas helium, and taught us much about the behaviour of the commoner kinds.

In particular, in the sun and other stars we study matter in a much simpler state than is common on earth; that is to say, as gas consisting of single atoms, many of which have lost one or more electrons. Their study has been of immense help in laying the foundations of chemistry.

Whether knowledge obtained in this way will be used for good or evil does not depend on the astronomers. Unfortunately so, because they are very internationally minded, much more so than chemists, for example.

Star mapping, and particularly eclipse observation, are international matters, planned for many years ahead by the workers concerned, and workers in other jobs might well learn a lesson from the International Astronomical Union.

In fact when miners, transport workers, or, above all, agricultural workers, have as good, international tie-ups as astronomers, our planet will be a much happier place.

(World Copyright Reserved.)