

# COMMUNIST REVIEW

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

No. 56.

APRIL, 1946

Price 6d.

## LIST OF CONTENTS

EDITORIAL .....		99
STALIN ADDRESSES HIS CONSTITUENTS .....	J. V. Stalin .....	100
DEVELOPMENTS ON THE INDUSTRIAL FRONT .....	E. J. Rowe .....	105
AMERICAN COMMUNISTS EXPEL BROWDER .....		106
METHOD OF SCIENTIFIC CRITICISM .....	A.C.P. Science Committee .....	108
ON FREEDOM OF THE PRESS .....	N. Baltiisky .....	110
PARTY AND MASS EDUCATION .....	Eric Aarons .....	114
PHILIPPINE PANORAMA .....	Staff-Sergeant A. Keesing .....	116
LENIN AND YOUTH .....	"Youth Worker" .....	118
TURKEY GUESSED WRONG .....	S. Belinkov .....	119
THE PARIS COMMUNE OF 1871 .....	R. Humphreys .....	122
RAISING FUNDS FOR THE FIVE YEAR PLANS .....	Prof. S. Turetsky .....	124
ALEXEI TOLSTOI, GREAT RUSSIAN WRITER .....	Henry Rovich .....	125
BOOK REVIEW .....	R.H. .....	126
MIXED BREEDS AND PROGRESS .....	Prof. J. B. S. Haldane, F.R.S. .....	127

ORGAN OF THEORY AND PRACTICE OF THE AUSTRALIAN  
COMMUNIST PARTY

Editor . . . . L. L. Sharkey

## EDITORIAL

THE campaign of the reaction in all the capitalist countries against the Soviet Union and the growing forces of democracy, national independence and Socialism daily strengthens and becomes shriller and more threatening.

The speech delivered by Churchill in the United States indicated the views of the warmongering, imperialist monopoly-capitalist cliques everywhere. With their imperialist rivals, Germany, Japan and Italy out of the way, these warmongers see in the Soviet Union and the world peoples' movement the barrier to their totalitarian world domination. The dream of the imperialists in Britain and the United States is the same as that of Adolf Hitler and Tojo, namely, world domination and the exploitation of the workers of the world by the trusts and combines.

Churchill put all this in so many words. British imperialism is faced with revolution in India and the colonies. British capitalism also finds itself faced with enormous economic and financial difficulties. Churchill, like Hitler before him, sees the salvation of imperialism in an anti-Soviet war. So, because British imperialism alone cannot match strength with the Soviet Union, Churchill appeals to the more powerful American imperialism to undertake the "task" of war on the Soviet Union. Churchill proposed a union of the two most powerful monopoly capitalist States knowing very well that in such a partnership the British imperialists would play second fiddle. He is prepared to eat this humble pie in order, he calculates, to save imperialism as a whole.

Churchill's policy, if carried into effect, means an imperialist war waged against the Soviet Union. "the dozen or more European States" where a new democracy has been established, against the Indian national revolutionaries and the other revolting colonies. To carry through such a programme, in face of the anti-war sentiments of the masses, would mean, in practice, a monopoly-capitalist dictatorship, suppressing and persecuting the working-class movement and restricting free speech and democratic liberty in order to prevent opposition to the mad warmongering plans of the Churchills, Hoovers and Deweys. It would be a war against the toiling people of the whole world, as reactionary in character as Hitler's war against democracy and progress.

Knowing that opposition would come from the labor movement to such a reactionary war, Churchill and his kind try to brand, in advance, the Communists and other progressives as "Fifth Columnists."

Out of monopoly-capitalism already two world wars and innumerable lesser wars have come in a matter of a few decades. It is clear enough that, while monopoly-capitalism and its Hitlers and Churchills dominate powerful countries, the dreadful spectre of new world conflagrations remains ever a peril to mankind. Churchill made it clear he wants his anti-Soviet, anti-people's war soon, while the secret of the atom bomb remains in the hands of the Anglo-American imperialists and can be used to bring the whole world under their domination.

But the conquest of the world is not as easy as Churchill appears to think. Hitler considered his massed Panzer divisions the "atom bomb" that would win his war for him "in a few weeks." The wrecked remains of the Panzers now rust and rot in the fields outside Moscow and Stalingrad and a hundred other battlefields of Europe and Africa.

The American rulers are wary of the Churchill proposals, in their public statements, although the presence of Truman in the chair when Churchill delivered his warmongering tirade of lies and falsifications was significant. If not openly yet, in its essentials, the policy of the Truman government veers toward that of Churchill.

So, too, does the foreign policy of Bevin. Although rejected by the British people at the elections, it is the imperialist foreign policy of Churchill and the Tories that the Labor Cabinet has been pursuing. That represents great danger to world peace. The working-class movement in the English-speaking countries now has to play the major role in the prevention of a new imperialist war by defeating Churchill and the American warmongers and by forcing a change in the policy of the British Labor Government.

The cause of peace is by no means lost; even Churchill, who had to admit that the Soviet Union wants only peace and security and by no means sought war with Britain and the United States, had to modify his remarks by referring to a "settlement." British-Soviet-American co-operation is needed to preserve peace. All true friends of peace will spurn the vicious propaganda lies circulated against the Soviet Union and will see where the real danger lies, namely in the imperialist ambition of reactionary cliques in Britain and the USA, and, acting accordingly, will voice the hatred of the world's toiling people for war and warmongers of the Churchill kind. And democratic humanity is stronger than panzers and atom bombs, however much damage the reactionaries might wreak with them.

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

## STALIN ADDRESSES HIS CONSTITUENTS

Full text of J. V. Stalin's speech delivered in the evening of February 9th, in the Grand Opera House in Moscow, at an electors' meeting of the Stalin district of Moscow.

### COMRADES!

Eight years have elapsed since the last elections to the Supreme Soviet. This was a period rich in events of a decisive nature.

The first four years passed in the intense work of the Soviet people for carrying out the Third Five-Year Plan. The following four years comprise the events of the war against the German and Japanese aggressors—the events of the Second World War. The war undoubtedly was the principal event of the past period.

It would be wrong to believe that the Second World War broke out accidentally or as a result of the mistakes of some or other statesmen, though mistakes certainly were made. In reality, the war broke out as an inevitable result of the development of world economic and political forces on the basis of modern monopoly capitalism.

Marxists have stated more than once that the capitalist system of world economy conceals in itself the elements of general crisis and military clashes, that in view of this in our time the development of world capitalism takes place not as a smooth and even advance but through crises and war catastrophes. The reason is that the unevenness of the development of capitalist countries usually results, as time passes, in an abrupt disruption of the equilibrium within the world system of capitalism, and that a group of capitalist countries which believes itself to be less supplied with raw materials and markets usually attempts to alter the situation and re-divide the "spheres of influence" in its own favour by means of armed force. This results in the splitting of the capitalist world into two hostile camps and in war between them.

Perhaps the catastrophes of war could be avoided if there existed the possibility of re-distributing periodically raw materials and markets among the countries in accordance with their economic weight—by means of adopting co-ordinated and peaceful decisions. This, however, cannot be accomplished under present capitalist conditions of the development of world economy. Thus the first crisis of the capitalist system of world economy resulted in the First World War, and the second crisis resulted in the Second World War.

This does not mean, of course, that the Second World War was an exact replica of the first. On the contrary, the Second World War substantially differs in its nature from the first.

One should bear in mind that the principal Fascist States—Germany, Japan, Italy—before attacking the Allied countries, had destroyed the last remnants of bourgeois-democratic liberties at home, established a brutal terrorist regime within their countries, trampled underfoot the principle of

the sovereignty and free development of small countries, proclaimed that their policy was one of seizure of foreign lands, and declared, for all to hear, that their aim was world domination and the extension of the Fascist regime to the whole world; while by the seizure of Czechoslovakia and the central provinces of China, the Axis States demonstrated that they were ready to carry out their threat concerning the enslavement of all freedom-loving nations.

In view of this, as distinct from the First World War, the Second World War from the very outset assumed the nature of an anti-Fascist war, a war of liberation, one of the tasks of which was also to re-establish democratic liberties. The entry of the Soviet Union into the war against the Axis States could only strengthen—and actually did strengthen—the anti-Fascist and liberating character of the Second World War. It was on this basis that the anti-Fascist coalition of the Soviet Union, the United States of America, Great Britain and other freedom-loving States took shape, a coalition which later played a decisive part in routing the armed forces of the Axis States. This is how matters stand with regard to the question of the origin and nature of the Second World War.

Now probably everyone agrees that the war indeed was not, and could not have been, an accident in the life of the nations, that it actually turned into a war of the nations for their existence, and that, for this very reason, it could not be a fleeting, lightning war. As to our country, for her the war was the severest and hardest of all the wars our Motherland has ever experienced in her history.

But the war was not only a curse. It was at the same time a great school in which all the forces of the people were tried and tested. The war laid bare all the facts and events in the rear and at the front, it mercilessly tore off all the veils and covers which had concealed the true faces of States, governments, and parties, and placed them on the stage without masks, without embellishments, with all their shortcomings and virtues.

The war set something in the nature of an examination for our Soviet system, our State, our Government, our Communist Party, and summed up the results of their work as if telling us: here they are, your people and organisations, their deeds and days—look at them closely and reward them according to their deserts. This is one of the positive aspects of the war.

For us, for electors, this circumstance is of great significance because it helps us quickly and objectively to assess the work of the Party and of its people and to draw the correct conclusions. At

another time it would have been necessary to study the speeches and reports of the Party's representatives, to analyse them, compare their words with their deeds, sum up results and so forth. This involves complex and difficult work, and there is no guarantee that no errors would be made. Matters are different now that the war is over, when the war itself has checked the work of our organisations and leaders and summed up its results. Now it is much easier for us to get at the truth and to arrive at the correct conclusions.

And so, what are the results of the war?

There is one main result which served as a basis for all other results. This result is that at the end of the war the enemies suffered defeat and we, together with our Allies, emerged as victors. We ended the war in complete victory over the enemy—this is the principal result of the war. But this is too general a result, and we cannot stop at that. Of course, to defeat the enemy in a war such as the Second World War, the like of which had never occurred in the history of mankind, means to attain an epoch-making victory. All this is true. Still, all this is a general result, and we cannot rest content with this. To realise the great historical significance of our victory, we must go into this matter more concretely. And so, how should we understand our victory over the enemies, what can this victory mean from the viewpoint of the condition and development of the internal forces of our country?

Our victory means, in the first place, that our Soviet social system has won, that the Soviet social system successfully withstood the trial in the flames of war and proved its perfect viability.

It is well known that the foreign press more than once asserted that the Soviet social system is a "risky experiment" doomed to failure, that the Soviet system is a "house of cards," without any roots in life, imposed upon the people by the organs of the "Cheka," that a slight push from outside would be enough to blow this "house of cards" to smithereens. Now we can say that the war swept away all these assertions of the foreign press as groundless assertions. The war has shown that the Soviet social system is a truly popular system, which has grown from the people and enjoys its powerful support, that the Soviet social system is a perfectly viable and stable form of organisation of society.

More than that, the point is now not whether the Soviet social system is viable or not, since after the objective lessons of the war no single sceptic now ventures to come out with doubts concerning the viability of the Soviet social system. The point now is that the Soviet social system has proved more viable and stable than a non-Soviet social system, that the Soviet social system is a better form of organisation of society than any non-Soviet social system.

Secondly, our victory means that our Soviet State system has won, that our multi-national Soviet State withstood all the trials of war and proved its viability.

It is well known that prominent foreign journalists more than once made statements to the effect that the Soviet multi-national State is an "artificial and non-viable structure," that in the event of any complications collapse of the Soviet Union would be inevitable, that the Soviet Union would share the fate of Austro-Hungary. Now we can say that the war refuted these statements of the foreign press as being utterly groundless. The war has shown that the Soviet multi-national State system successfully passed the test, grew even stronger during the war, and proved to be a perfectly viable State system. Those gentlemen failed to understand that the comparison with Austro-Hungary is fallacious because our multi-national State has grown not on a bourgeois foundation which stimulates feelings of national distrust and national enmity, but on a Soviet foundation which, on the contrary, cultivates feelings of friendship and fraternal co-operation among the peoples of our State.

However, after the lessons of the war, those gentlemen no longer venture to deny the viability of the Soviet State system. The point now is not whether the Soviet State system is viable, for its viability is not to be doubted. The point now is that the Soviet State system proved to be a model of the multi-national State, that the Soviet State system is such a system of State organisation, in which the national problem and the problem of co-operation among nations have been solved better than in any other multi-national State.

Thirdly, our victory means that the Soviet armed forces have won, that our Red Army has won, that the Red Army heroically withstood all the adversities of war, utterly routed the armies of our enemies and emerged from the war as victor. Now everyone, both friends and enemies, admit that the Red Army was equal to its great tasks. But the situation was different some six years ago, in the pre-war period.

It is well known that prominent representatives of the foreign press—and many recognised military authorities abroad—repeatedly stated that the condition of the Red Army inspired grave doubts, that the Red Army was poorly armed and had no real commanding personnel, that its morale was beneath criticism, that it might perhaps prove useful in defence but was not fit for an offensive, that in the event of a blow by German troops the Red Army must fall apart like a "colossus with feet of clay." Such assertions were made not in Germany alone but also in France, Britain and America.

Now we can say that the war swept away all these assertions as being groundless and laughable. The war has demonstrated that the Red Army is

no "colossus with feet of clay" but a first-rate Army of our times, possessing quite modern armament, a most experienced commanding personnel and high moral and fighting qualities. One should not forget that the Red Army is that very army which utterly routed the German Army that but yesterday struck terror into the armies of European states.

It should be noted that the number of "critics" of the Red Army keeps dwindling. More than that, the foreign press ever more frequently carries reports noting the high qualities of the Red Army, the skill of its commanders and men, its faultless strategy and tactics. This is quite natural. After the Red Army's brilliant victories at Moscow and Stalingrad, at Kursk and Byelgorod, at Kley and Kirovograd, at Jassy and Lvov, on the Leningrad and Tallinn, on the Danube and the Oder, at Vienna and Berlin—after all this one cannot help but admit that the Red Army is a first-rate Army from which one could learn a great deal. This is how we understand concretely the victory of our country over her enemies.

These are the main results of the war.

It would be erroneous to think that such a historic victory could have been achieved without preliminary preparation of the entire country for active defence. It would be no less erroneous to believe that such preparations could have been carried out within a short time, within some three or four years. Still more erroneous would it be to assert that we achieved victory owing solely to the gallantry of our troops. Naturally, without gallantry, it is impossible to achieve victory. But gallantry alone is not sufficient to overpower an enemy possessing a big Army, first-rate armament, a well-trained officer corps and a fairly well-organized supply. To meet the blow of such an enemy, to rebuff him and then utterly to defeat him, it was necessary to have besides the unexampled gallantry of our troops, quite modern armament, and in sufficient quantity at that, and a well-organized supply, also in sufficient quantity. But for this purpose it was necessary to have, and in sufficient quantities at that, such elementary things as metal for the production of armaments, equipment, industrial machinery; fuel for the maintenance of the work of factories and transport; cotton for the production of army clothing; bread to supply the army.

Is it possible to assert that before joining the Second World War our country already had at its disposal the necessary minimum of material possibilities in order to satisfy these needs in the main? I believe that we can assert this.

To prepare this colossal accomplishment it was necessary to carry out the three Five-Year Plans of development of the national economy. It was these three Five-Year Plans that helped us to create these material possibilities. In any case,

the position of our country in this respect before the Second World War in 1940 was several times better than it had been before the First World War in 1913.

What material possibilities were at the disposal of our country before the Second World War? To help you to get at the truth in this matter, I shall have to give here a short account of the activities of the Communist Party in preparing our country for active defence.

If we take the data for 1940—the eve of the Second World War—and compare them with the data for 1913—the eve of the First World War—we get the following picture:—

In 1913 our country produced 4,220,000 tons of pig iron, 4,230,000 tons of steel, 29,000,000 tons of coal, 9,000,000 tons of oil, 21,600,000 tons of marketable grain, 740,000 tons of raw cotton. Such were the material possibilities of our country with which she joined the First World War. This was the economic basis of the old Russia which could be used for waging war.

As to 1940, in that year our country produced:—15,000,000 tons of pig iron, that is, nearly four times as much as in 1913; 18,300,000 tons of steel, that is, four and a half times as much as in 1913; 166,000,000 tons of coal, that is, five and a half times as much as in 1913; 31,000,000 tons of oil, that is, three and a half times as much as in 1913; 38,300,000 tons of marketable grain, that is, 17,000,000 tons more than in 1913; 2,700,000 tons of raw cotton, that is, three and a half times as much as in 1913.

Such were the material possibilities of our country with which she joined the Second World War. Such was the economic basis of the Soviet Union which could be used for waging war.

The difference is tremendous, as you see. Such an unexampled growth of production cannot be regarded as a simple and ordinary development of a country from backwardness to progress. This was a leap by means of which our Motherland turned from a backward into an advanced country, from an agrarian into an industrial country.

This historic transformation was carried out within the three Five Year Plans beginning with 1928—the first year of the First Five-Year Plan. Until that time we had had to engage in the restoration of destroyed industry and in healing the wounds received as a result of the First World War and the Civil War. If we consider, besides, that the First Five-Year Plan was carried out in four years, and that the work on the Third Five-Year Plan was interrupted by the war in the fourth year of its execution, we shall see that it took only about 13 years to convert our country from an agrarian into an industrial country. One cannot help admitting that 13 years is an unbelievably short time for accomplishing such a tremendous task.

It is this that essentially explains why the publication of these figures at the time evoked a storm of contradictory comment in the foreign press. Friends decided that a "miracle" had taken place. As to ill-wishers, they declared that the Five-Year Plans were "Bolshevik propaganda" and "tricks of the Cheka." But since miracles do not happen and the Cheka is not strong enough to abolish the law of the development of society, "public opinion" abroad had to reconcile itself to the facts.

What was the policy which enabled the Communist Party to secure these material possibilities in the country within such a short time?

In the first place, it was the Soviet policy of industrialisation of the country. The Soviet method of industrialisation of the country radically differed from the capitalist method of industrialisation. In capitalist countries, industrialisation usually begins with light industry. Since light industry requires smaller investments, since the turnover of capital is quicker and the profits are made more easily than in heavy industry, it is light industry that becomes there the first object of industrialisation. Only after a long period during which light industry accumulates profits and concentrates them in banks only then comes the turn of heavy industry and there begins a gradual transfer of accumulated profits into heavy industry in order to create the conditions for its development. But this is a lengthy process, requiring a long period of several decades during which it is necessary to wait until light industry develops and to vegetate without heavy industry.

Naturally, the Communist Party could not adopt this path. The Party knew that the war was coming that it was impossible to defend the country with out heavy industry, that it was necessary as quickly as possible to tackle the development of heavy industry, that to be late in this matter meant to lose. The Party remembered Lenin's words that without heavy industry it is impossible to uphold the country's independence, that without it the Soviet system may fall. Therefore, the Communist Party of our country rejected the "usual" way of industrialisation and began the industrialisation of the country with the development of heavy industry. This was very difficult but feasible. Of great help in this matter was the nationalisation of industry and the banks which permitted the quick gathering and transfer of funds into heavy industry. It is beyond doubt that with out this it would have been impossible to achieve the transformation of our country into an industrial country within such a short time.

Secondly, it was the policy of collectivisation of Agriculture.

In order to put an end to the backwardness of our agriculture and give the country more marketable products, more cotton, etc., it was necessary to pass from small peasant farming to large-scale farming, because only a large farm is able to use new machinery, to take advantage of all the achievements

of agronomic science and to yield more marketable produce.

There are, however, two kinds of large farm—capitalist and collective. The Communist Party could not adopt the capitalist path of development of agriculture, and not as a matter of principle alone but also because it implies too prolonged a development and involves preliminary ruination of the peasants and their transformation into farm hands. Therefore, the Communist Party took the path of the collectivisation of agriculture, the path of creating large-scale farming by uniting peasant farms into collective farms. The method of collectivisation proved a highly progressive method not only because it did not involve the ruination of the peasants but especially because it permitted, within a few years, the covering of the entire country with large collective farms which are able to use new machinery to take advantage of all the achievements of agronomic science and give the country greater quantities of marketable produce. There is no doubt that without the policy of collectivisation we would not have been able to put an end to the age-old backwardness of our agriculture within such a short time.

One cannot say that the Party's policy did not encounter resistance. Not only backward people who always shun everything new, but also many prominent Party members systematically pulled the Party back and in every way tried to drag it on to the "usual" capitalist path of development. All the anti-Party machinations of Trotskyites and the Right all their "work" in sabotaging the measures of our Government, pursued a single aim—to thwart the Party's policy and to retard the cause of industrialisation and collectivisation. But the Party did not succumb either to the threats of some or to the howling of others, and confidently marched forward despite everything. It is to the Party's credit that it did not adapt itself to the backward elements, was not afraid of swimming against the stream and always preserved its position of the leading force. There can be no doubt that without this staunchness and perseverance the Communist Party would not have been able to uphold the policy of the industrialisation of the country and the collectivisation of agriculture.

Did the Communist Party succeed in utilizing correctly the material possibilities thus created in order to develop war production and supply the Red Army with the necessary armament? I believe that it succeeded in accomplishing that, and accomplished it with the utmost success.

Leaving out of account the first year of the war, when the evacuation of industry to the East retarded the development of war production, in the remaining three years of the war the Party succeeded in rising to such achievements as enabled it not only to supply the front with sufficient quantities of ordnance, machine-guns, rifles, aircraft, tanks, ammunition, but also to build up reserves. And it is known that our armaments, far from being inferior to German

arms, even surpassed them in quality. It is known that during the last three years of the war our tank-building industry annually built on an average more than 30,000 tanks, self-propelled guns and armored cars. It is also known that our aircraft industry in the same period produced annually up to 40,000 planes. It is also known that in the same period our ordnance industry built annually up to 120,000 guns of all calibres, up to 450,000 light and heavy machine-guns, more than 3,000,000 rifles and nearly 2,000,000 tommy-guns. Lastly, it is known that in the period 1942-44 our mortar industry manufactured annually on an average up to 100,000 mortars. Naturally, corresponding quantities of artillery shells, mines of various kinds, aviation bombs, rifle and machine-gun cartridges were produced simultaneously. It is known, for instance, that in 1944 alone more than 240,000,000 shells, bombs, and mines, and 7,400,000,000 cartridges were manufactured.

Such is the general picture of the supply of the Red Army with arms and ammunition. As you see, it does not resemble the picture of the supply of our Army during the First World War when the front experienced a chronic shortage of ordnance and shells, when the Army fought without tanks or aviation, when one rifle was issued for every three soldiers. As to the supply of the Red Army with provisions and clothing, it is universally known that, far from suffering any shortages in this respect, the front even had the necessary reserves on the spot.

This is how matters stand as regards the work of the Communist Party of our country in the period before the war and during the war.

Now a few words concerning the plans for the work of the Communist Party in the near future. As is well known, these plans are set forth in the new Five-Year Plan, which is to be approved shortly. The main tasks of the new Five-Year Plan are to restore the afflicted districts of the country, to restore industry and agriculture to their pre-war level and then to exceed this level to a more or less considerable degree. Not to mention the fact that the ration card system will be abolished in the near future, special attention will be given to the extension of production of consumer goods, to raising the standard of living of the working people by means of the steady reduction of the prices of all commodities and to extensive construction of scientific research institutes of all kinds which will enable science to deploy its forces. I do not doubt that if we render proper assistance to our scientists they will be able not only to come level with, but even to surpass, in the near future, the achievements of science beyond the boundaries of our country.

As to plans for a longer period, our Party intends to organise a new powerful upsurge of the national economy which would enable us, for instance, to raise the level of our industry threefold as compared with the pre-war level. We must achieve

a situation wherein our industry is able to produce annually up to 50,000,000 tons of pig iron, up to 60,000,000 tons of steel, up to 500,000,000 tons of coal, up to 60,000,000 tons of oil. Only under such conditions can we regard our country as guaranteed against any accidents. This will require perhaps three new Five-Year Plans, if not more. But this task can be accomplished, and we must accomplish it.

Such is my brief account of the activities of the Communist Party in the recent past and of its plans for work in the future. It is for you to judge how correctly the Party worked, and is working now, and whether it could not have worked better.

They say that victors may not be judged, that they should not be criticised or controlled. This is wrong. Victors may and must be judged, they may and must be criticised and controlled. This is useful not only for the work but for the victors themselves: there will be less presumption, there will be more modesty.

I believe that the election campaign is the judgment of the Communist Party as the ruling Party by the electors. And the result of the elections will signify the verdict returned by the electors. The Communist Party of our country would be worth little were it afraid of criticism, of a check-up. The Communist Party is ready to accept the electors' verdict.

The Communist Party does not march alone in the election struggle. It goes to the elections in a bloc with the non-Party people. In past times the Communists treated non-Party people and being non-Party with a certain distrust. This was due to the fact that the non-Party banner not infrequently was used as a cover by various bourgeois groups which found it to their disadvantage to appear before the electors without a mask.

Thus it was in the past. But now we are living in different times. Non-Party people are now separated from the bourgeoisie by a barrier called the Soviet social system. The same barrier has united non-Party people with Communists in one common team of Soviet citizens. Living in a common team, they struggled together to enhance the might of our country, they fought and shed blood together at the fronts in the name of the freedom and greatness of our country, they were forging and forged together victory over the enemies of our country. The only difference between them is that some belong to the Party while others do not. But this is a formal difference. What is important is that both are working for the same common cause. Therefore, the bloc of Communists and non-Party people is a natural and vital thing.

In conclusion, allow me to thank you for the trust you have extended to me, by nominating me a candidate to the Supreme Soviet. You need not doubt that I shall try to justify your trust.

(All rise. Prolonged, unabating applause turning into an ovation. From all parts of the

hall come cheers: "Long live our great Stalin Hurrah!" "Hurrah for the great leader of the peoples!" "Glory to the great Stalin!" "Long live Comrade Stalin, the candidate of the entire nation!" "Glory to Comrade Stalin, the creator of all our victories!"

## DEVELOPMENTS ON THE INDUSTRIAL FRONT

E. J. ROWE.

[It is now more than six months from V.P. Day, and February 15, "dead-line" date for the Labor Government to do something positive about the demands of the Trade Unions for the 40-hour week and higher wages, has been passed.

In the weeks immediately preceding this date some feverish activity was displayed by the Government, not towards granting the 40-hour week, but rather towards convincing the Trade Union Movement that its demand for legislation for this desirable reform under its External Affairs powers was neither practicable nor legally tenable. Discussion took place between the A.C.T.U., the Minister for Labor, and the Attorney-General, at which this viewpoint, plus a number of opinions from legal luminaries, was impressed upon the Unions, all with the aim of having the matter referred to and decided by the Arbitration Court with the "favourable intervention" of the Government. The Unions, mindful of the A.C.T.U. Congress decision that the 40 hours could and should be implemented by legislation, still pressed for this.

The Government, in order to manoeuvre the Unions towards the Court, moved in and intervened in the case for the 40-hour week then before it from the Printing Trades Unions. The Court then obligingly adjourned the case to allow "any other interested parties" to intervene and the employers immediately announced their intention to do so. The Labor Government had faced the Unions with a fait accompli. Finally the A.C.T.U. full Executive, after a further discussion with the Prime Minister on February 21, decided to accept the Government proposals that the Unions should submit the matter to the Court and this decision has now been endorsed by the necessary State Labor Councils.

The Communist Party sharply criticises this capitulation to legalism by the Government. We point out that if the Chifley Government had acted courageously and legislated for the 40-hour week both the Government and its decision would have been defended so vigorously by the workers as to make it most difficult for any legal jugglers to deprive us of such a gain. Reaction could have been driven back.

However, the matter is now in court and the task of the Communist Party and the workers generally is to see that the case is not buried under

[We would draw readers' attention to Stalin's remarks about the anti-fascist and liberation character of the Second World War and the period to which he refers. The Soviet leader defines it in the sentence: "If we take the data for 1940—the eve of the Second World War—and compare them with the data for 1913..." (P. 102).—Editor.]

legal argument and "drawn out" in the time-honoured way the Court has of evading the demands of the workers. Secondly, we must see that there is no "piece-meal" decision, allowing some industries that can "afford" it the shorter week and denying it to others. It must have immediate and national application. The first 44 hours decision was given in 1926 and even today, twenty years later, some Unions are still battling to have their week reduced from 48 to 44 hours.

But the A.C.T.U. Executive resolution contains some positive starting points that must be taken up by us and the workers mobilised around them. These are:—

- (1) "That the Commonwealth Government be requested to introduce a 40-hour week for all its employes by Administrative Act."
- (2) "That each State Trades and Labor Council approach their respective State Governments that they intervene in the Commonwealth Arbitration Court proceedings intimating their desire that the Court should grant a 40-hour week and will apply a 40-hour week by Administrative Act to all their employes."

We must organise the utmost pressure upon the Federal and State Labor Governments to ensure that this decision is implemented immediately and must refuse to accept any arguments from State Governments about "penalising one State," or about "waiting for the Court." If it is implemented, and there is no barrier to it, we would have gaps in the "hours front" through which the workers would pour and materially "assist" the Court to arrive at a rapid and favourable decision.

The A.C.T.U. Executive also decided that on the Sunday before the Court hearing mass demonstrations must be held throughout Australia, organised by the Labor Councils. These demonstrations must be made a success, but if certain gentry then expect the workers to sit down and await the Court's decision following them they must be disillusioned. We must organise a mass campaign of job meetings, Union rallies, short stop-work meetings and, if necessary, sharp strike action. The employers and the Press will endeavour to prove to the Court "the inability of industry to afford 40 hours—must have increased production,

etc." The workers must not depend on statistical replies from Union advocates but, from the mass campaign outside, intervene and penetrate the legal arguments with their insistence on the 40-hour week. And remember, the workers do not need any long legal argument or statistical calculation to convince them a 40-hour week is necessary.

But there has emerged from these A.C.T.U. discussions a dangerously negative development. For the Communist Party and the workers the shorter working week has an even more important corollary. Alongside it must go an increase in the pay envelopes of the workers. Up to date both the Court and the employers have side-stepped the demand for increased wages by pointing to the Economic Organisation (wage-pegging) Regulations. It is significant that in his discussions with the A.C.T.U. Executive, the Prime Minister gave them an assurance that these Regulations would be amended to allow the Court to grant the 40-hour week. This means that the Government intends to maintain the pegging of wages and therefore intends to resist the demands of the Unions for £1 per week increase in the basic wage. This is in direct contradiction to the demands of the workers.

With the abolition of overtime and a return to "normal" wage envelopes, the drop in real wages that has taken place due to rising prices during the war is painfully obvious to the workers and they want something done about it now. It is the job of the Communist Party, in its role of organising and mobilising the workers, to see that the £1 increase in the basic wage is brought sharply to the front. After all, every worker knows that the £1 increase would in reality constitute a very small increase, but would in fact be merely restoring to him purchasing power that rising prices have

deprived him of. It is an immediate demand and by no means the last word on wages. And because it is immediate, we must raise it insistently and organise the workers around it. We must endorse also the A.C.T.U. decision to incorporate in the basic wage the war and prosperity loadings and make them subject to adjustment to the cost of living. To do this therefore the Government must abolish those sections of the Regulations which are today being used to prevent wage increases.

So we must link the question of wage increases very closely to the campaign for the 40-hour week and impress upon the Government and the Court the determination of the workers to achieve both.

Powerful strike movements of the workers everywhere in the capitalist world are basing themselves on the demand for higher wages, shorter hours, and better conditions in the factories. And already they have registered great victories which have strengthened the Unions and the workers generally. Australia must prove no exception to this.

The right wing in the Labor Movement, sensing the movement of the workers, and afraid of it, is launching vicious attacks upon our Party and progressive Trade Union leaders. Clearly the struggle to win such demands as increased wages and the shorter working week has the support of the huge majority of the workers and in the campaign around them we can give real application to the slogan put forth by our Central Committee—"To the Masses." But we can do it too upon the basis of the widest united front of the workers and in the process deal powerful blows at the small group of reformist right wing gangsters who today are "sparring for time" in order to prevent the workers from developing a struggle that will ensure the rapid success of the drive for higher wages and shorter hours.

## AMERICAN COMMUNISTS EXPEL BROWDER

(Statement of the National Board on Earl Browder, adopted February 5, 1946.)

THE National Board, by unanimous action, has decided to recommend to the National Committee the expulsion of Earl Browder from the ranks of the Communist Party.

In the six months since the National Convention, which repudiated Browder's revisionism and reconstituted our Party on Marxist-Leninist foundations, Earl Browder has continuously resisted the programme and decisions of the Convention and has steadily turned from obstructive passivity to active opposition to the political line and leadership of the Party. He has violated his pledge to the National Convention to place himself at the disposal of the Party and, by refusing to accept any assignment from the Party, has violated Party discipline and deserted Communist duties and responsibilities. He has carried on factional activity and a campaign of unprincipled attacks against the leadership of our

Party and of our brother French Party. Finally, in violation of elementary discipline and responsibility consonant with membership in the Party, he has established a journal of "economic analyses" which serves him as a political organ to expound his revisionist policy and to combat the general line of the Party.

The decision of the National Board to recommend the expulsion of Browder is based on the following considerations:

(1) Earl Browder's conduct from the time of the Convention to the National Committee meeting of November. At that meeting, in the report of the National Board submitted by Comrade Eugene Dennis, Browder's conduct was thus characterised:

"Unfortunately, after the Convention, Comrade Browder repudiated his pledge to the National Convention; he did not and does not

accept the programme or decisions of the Convention; he remains aloof from all or any Party responsibility; and, further, at the hearings of the House un-American Committee, Browder adopted an equivocal attitude, assumed the role of a 'private citizen' and failed to utilize various opportunities actively to defend the policies and the line of the Party. Browder's position compromises the Party; it acts as a millstone on the Party; it has fostered passivity, has confused and demobilized certain comrades and has impaired the unity of our Party. It is clear that Browder's persistence in this position will be incompatible with his further membership in our party."

(2) Browder's anti-Party conduct from the National Committee meeting to date. In the space of these three months Browder refused to heed the repeated warnings of the National Board and National Committee. Instead he has passed over from being a passive oppositionist to an active opponent of the Party. This is evident, among other things, by the following facts:

(a) After the National Committee meeting in November, 1945, and without the Party's approval, Browder embarked on a "business" undertaking, the publication of *Distributors Guide, Inc.* This is an organ of expression in which he acts as an advisor to Big Business, along a political line that coincides with the interests of the employers and of American imperialism. In this publication, Browder presents a political platform in which he has developed his revisionism of Marxism to an open defence of American imperialism and unreserved support for the entire policy of the Truman Administration, including its imperialist course in foreign affairs. Through this publication, which is a weapon of struggle with which he opposes and attacks the political line of the Party, Browder is working to establish contact, not only with various members in the Party and with trade union leaders in this country, but also with leaders of brother Parties in this hemisphere.

(b) During the past two weeks it has been called to the attention of the National Board that Browder has further violated Party principles and discipline. He has endeavored to broaden his contacts with individual members and sympathizers of the Party; and in these conversations Browder arrogantly defends his anti-Marxist position and views, attacks the political line and decisions of the Party, slanders Comrade Foster and the entire national leadership, and attempts to involve certain comrades in his anti-Party conspiracy.

(c) Browder refused to meet with the National Secretariat on January 29 to answer questions of fact relevant to the above. However, he did meet subsequently with the executive committee of the Yonkers Communist Club and submitted a letter addressed to all members of the Communist Party. In this letter he again slanders and misrepresents

the line and actions of the Party and advances a new document as a basis for waging a factional struggle within the Party.

(d) Further, at the meeting of the National Board on February 5, where Browder was given a hearing to reply to the specific charges preferred against him for his expulsion — Browder cynically refused to reply to the charges or to answer any questions. He challenged the authority of the Board to ask him oral questions. Indifferent to his membership in the Party, and confronted with concrete evidence of his disloyalty to the Party, of his violation of Party principles and discipline — Browder resorted to the cheap trick of a pettifogging lawyer. He tried to stall for time and stated that he would only reply to questions which were submitted to him in writing and after he had extended time to prepare a written document that obviously would be used to serve his factional and anti-Party purposes. Browder did not have the forthrightness and honesty to answer the questions concerning irrefutable and damaging facts which were directed to him.

For these and related acts detrimental to the interests and welfare of the Party, Browder has placed himself outside the ranks of the Communist Party and the working class movement. He has forsaken the right to belong to the Party and must be expelled forthwith.

All members of our Party will understand that the struggle against Browder and Browderism has entered a new stage. It is no longer a struggle against a member of, or a trend in the Party and in the labor movement. It is now a struggle against an active opponent of the Party, against an enemy-class ideology and platform. Browder's desertion and his political warfare against our Party, against Marxism-Leninism, will be answered by the unity of the entire Party and of all advanced workers to drive his ideology and influence out of the working class movement.

Our Party and its leadership have resolutely and honestly worked to rectify our previous mistakes and our former erroneous political line. Our Party has been reorganized and strengthened by the action of the National Convention and by the subsequent development of the Party's political line in the November meeting of the National Committee. It is today in the process of consolidation after passing through the great crisis precipitated under the leadership of Browder. In breaking with Browder's revisionist and liquidationist policies which were destroying the moral-political fibre of our Communist organization, the Party, revitalized with the principles of Marxism-Leninism, is today increasingly coming forward with deepened power and clarity to bring the principles of Marxism-Leninism to guide the working class in the course of the epic struggles it is now waging.

By carrying on with strengthened determination an uncompromising fight against Browderism,

against opportunism as well as Left sectarianism, and all traces of enemy class ideology, the Communist Party as well as the entire working class movement will equip itself to meet the great tasks of today and tomorrow.

## METHOD OF SCIENTIFIC CRITICISM

Science Committee, ACP.

SINCE the publication of John O'Donnell's article "Recent Events in Science" in the December "Communist Review," a number of criticisms both of statements made in it, and of the method of treatment of the subject, have come before the Australian Communist Party Science Committee. A careful study of these, and of the article under discussion, reveals considerable weaknesses on both sides.

There is no disagreement with Comrade O'Donnell's conclusions that if the use of science for progress is to be assured, science and the scientist must become an integral part of the labor movement; and that the continued control of science by the capitalist class presents a growing menace to the world. It is also true that recent scientific developments make more urgent the recognition of these facts.

The main grounds on which the article has been criticised are that the content is confused, the presentation anarchic, that jargon and irrelevant quotations replace adequate explanation, and that in consequence the article . . . can only result in Marxism being held in contempt by students and scientists.

We consider that the criticism on the ground of confusion of content is justified. The first portion of the article, which finishes near the end of the second page, deals with one aspect of radioactivity, the atomic bomb; the second part deals with an unrelated aspect of radioactivity, namely its use in biochemical research. There is no apparent reason why these two, and not some quite different aspects of the subject, should have been combined in one article. Secondly, Comrade O'Donnell speaks of certain "critical questions for science and philosophy," but neither formulates these questions clearly nor offers a solution.

In his attempt to discuss subjects which are admittedly difficult of popular presentation, the author has been forced into considerable oversimplification. Thus his account of the development of the atomic bomb involves so arbitrary a selection of data that it is neither accurate nor connected. In a theoretical article of this kind, it is more important that the development of the bomb is seen arising from the general problems of nuclear research, than as the product of the work of a few "great men." Critical advances have indeed been made by the workers cited by Comrade O'Donnell, as well as by other workers not

NATIONAL BOARD: William Z. Foster, Eugene Dennis, John Williamson, Robert Thompson, Benjamin J. Davis Jr., Elizabeth Gurley Flynn, Josh Lawrence, Steve Nelson, Irving Potash, Jack Stachel, Louis Weinstock.

cited. The co-operative nature of the research which resulted in the production of the bomb is not emphasised. Yet it is a striking example of the effectiveness of planned science, and flatly contradicts the reactionary arguments that this branch of human activity cannot be effectively planned.

Furthermore, he has allowed a number of errors to creep in—barium, a product of nuclear disruption, is a powerful poison, and is confused with bismuth as the basis of digestive powders; the processes of nuclear transformation are also inaccurately described; the neutron is dealt with in a mechanical, undialectical manner.

The atomic bomb is certainly one of the greatest scientific achievements of man. However, we consider that the political problems which it raises are far more important than any philosophical ones. The inability of capitalism to use its discoveries for the benefit of mankind becomes in this instance a direct and increasing threat to the lives of a considerable fraction of the earth's population. This crisis can only be resolved by the world victory of socialism. The production of the bomb certainly provides many new and startling illustrations of dialectical processes in nature, adding further evidence for the correctness of Marxist views. It also deals a profound blow at the idealist philosophers, scientific and otherwise, who denied the reality of matter on the ground that sub-atomic particles were mere mathematical conventions.

Ill-defined discussion of the existence of this or that crisis in science, and other branches of culture, is unfortunately too frequent. The day-to-day progress of science is made up of a series of minor crises, which arise whenever a new fact overturns a current hypothesis. Occasionally, unexplained facts accumulate over a long period; the theory with which they conflict is deeply entrenched in a number of branches of science. The conflict then attracts much more attention, and its resolution may have far-reaching consequences. As examples of such nodal points in modern science we might take the theory of relativity, the quantum theory, the development of nuclear physics, and the recognition of the mechanism of biological inheritance.

The prevailing ideology of the epoch, as it affects both scientist and layman, is a powerful factor in the ease with which such revolutions in theory are accepted. On the philosophical level,

Marxism can facilitate the understanding and acceptance of new theories, just as in the struggle for socialism, the Communist Party becomes a "mid-wife for history." A profound "crisis" for bourgeois philosophy may present no difficulties for the Marxist, while Marxism may recognise nodal points in the progress of science which are ignored by bourgeois philosophy. The relationship of any branch of culture to the mode of production of the epoch is a problem which calls for better treatment from Marxists than the mere assertion that "the crisis in science is an aspect of the crisis of capitalism."

In the light of these remarks, we do not consider that the production of the atomic bomb raises critical questions for either Marxist philosophy or for the bourgeois sciences, but that it is the anticipated outcome of the development of theoretical physics over the past two decades.

In his account of the use of radioactive isotopes in biology, Comrade O'Donnell has indulged in considerable exaggeration. It is true that in some cases, these substances enable us to investigate chemical processes in the body more easily than before. But the technique (not really new, by the way) is only one example of the use of "labelled" trace substances, which has gone on for many years. It certainly does not supplant the earlier methods, nor the methods of conventional biochemistry, but is supplementary to them. It is doubtful whether it constitutes any more a "revolution" than many another new technique.

We must also uphold the criticism on the ground of anarchic presentation. There are many places in the article where consecutive sentences have no relationship to one another, and appear as mere notes having some bearing on the general topic under discussion. It is true that the collection of notes appearing in Engels' work *Dialectics of Nature* is in parts equally disjointed, but in this case publication took place after the author's death, and much of the material had never been completed. We suggest to Comrade O'Donnell that while this may be unavoidable in a posthumous work, it is certainly undesirable in an article in the "Communist Review."

Concerning jargon and quotations, we find the author guilty in part, but we cannot agree with some of the views expressed by the critics. There has grown up in the literature of Marxism a terminology which, if properly used, expresses the intended meaning clearly and succinctly. We see no reason for avoiding the use of such words, phrases, or methods of expression. The term "dialectical level" to which the critics object, is an example. It is true that to the Marxist, the term "level" would be sufficient; but to non-Marxists this word may have a variety of different meanings. It is therefore necessary to qualify it to indicate that it is being used in the particular sense required by dialectical materialism. The term refers to the

stages of complexity and organisation which matter undergoes in its transition from the subatomic, through the atomic, molecular, colloidal, living and thinking, to the social condition. The term "integrative level" is used in a similar sense by some scientists.

However, simply to formulate a process in Marxist terminology does not lead us far. It merely provides a further illustration of dialectical processes in nature, which Engels showed long ago to be quite a general law. For dialectics to be the same powerful tool in science that it is in politics, it is necessary to recognise that its laws assume a specific form appropriate to the dialectical level concerned, and are in fact the correctly formulated "scientific" laws. The generalised laws of dialectics can therefore no more replace the specific analysis of a particular branch of science than they can render superfluous Marx's *Capital*.

The author should be criticised not so much for his use of certain expressions and quotations, as for his failure to use them effectively. The fact that to some readers, the quotations appeared "irrelevant" indicates that they were not properly woven into the argument. It is of course true that some phrases, such as changes occurring in a "real" manner, have no place in such an article, as they confuse rather than clarify the meaning.

It is imperative that what is written shall be fully comprehensible to everyone, but we believe in addition that the content is of greater importance than the form.

Finally, despite these criticisms, it is most important not to lose sight of what Comrade O'Donnell has set out to do, nor of his main conclusions. The task of examining the political and philosophical consequences of his own science is one which most Communist scientists have failed to undertake. Perhaps if they devote some attention to problems of this nature, they will be able to assist in preventing the type of errors which have been discussed.

### NOTE ON ENCYCLOPAEDIA BRITANNICA.

Trotsky's article on "Bolshevism," mentioned in the article, "Need to Revise Webster's Dictionary," in last month's issue, appeared in the 12th edition. In the latest edition, the 14th, the article is supplied by Prof. H. Laski, equally implacable, in his own way, in his opposition to the theory and practice of Bolshevism.

## ON FREEDOM OF THE PRESS AND THE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE PRESS

N. BALTIISKY.

(From "New Times," December 15, 1945).

### PART II

CERTAIN extremely prominent public personages in Great Britain and America have lately been stressing the importance of free information for the promotion of international co-operation. Indeed, if information is truthful and free from editorial tendentiousness, it undoubtedly promotes the development of friendly relations between nations. But what if the information is false and tendentious? What if it is deliberately disseminated for the purpose of disrupting international co-operation?

How can one talk seriously about free information and fail to say anything about guarantees against the extremely pernicious practice of falsifying international information? And yet, there are men who by the very positions they occupy cannot but be aware that certain press representatives and news agencies resort to this pernicious practice, but who nevertheless pretend, in their public statements, that all these "informers" are solely engaged in a quest for the pure and unadulterated truth. They say, for example, that the common people in all countries need the independent information of journalists who possess "the necessary training" for this work. Training is, of course, necessary in every profession; but where is the guarantee that a professionally trained correspondent, knowing that his employer is expecting tendentious information from him, and that the actual facts do not warrant such information, will not manufacture the wanted information? Does not experience show that many newspapers and news agencies readily disseminate such deliberately false information without ever taking the trouble to verify the facts?

Why is it that to this day the British and American advocates of "international freedom of the press" stubbornly avoid discussing this aspect of the question? Can they count on the glaring instances of misleading and downright false information escaping public attention? Many such cases have occurred in recent times. We have already quoted concrete instances of fabrications published in the foreign press, all of a character that can be explained by no other motive than that of desiring to disrupt peaceful, harmonious co-operation among the United Nations. In view of the exceptional importance of this question, we deem it necessary to quote a number of other examples of the same type.

To begin: The New York Daily Mirror published the false assertion that the Franco-Soviet

pact of mutual assistance contains a "secret clause" approving of French freedom of action in the West and of Soviet freedom of action in the East. It is not difficult to understand that the circulation of this falsehood could have had only one purpose: to rouse suspicion in America and Great Britain against the Soviet Union and France.

We may be told that it is no use expecting a truthful statement of facts from a newspaper like the Daily Mirror, one of the Hearst publications, because it is not a serious political organ. Well, then, we shall take another example—an important organ like the New York Herald-Tribune. In its issue of August 15, 1945, that newspaper published a report sent in by Marrow, the London correspondent of the Columbia Broadcasting Company, to the effect that Soviet official circles believe that a representative of the Red Army should be the Supreme Commander-in-Chief of the Allied Forces of Occupation in Japan, and that the Soviet government had submitted a demand to this effect to the United States government. This was a sheer fabrication. Did not that correspondent understand that his fabrication was detrimental to friendly relations between the American and the Soviet people? Of course he did. He understood that perfectly well; does he not possess "the necessary training"? But how explain the fact that an important newspaper failed to understand it, or, if it did understand, deemed it necessary to release this poisoned arrow?

Take the next example. Recently, certain exceptionally astute crooks operating under the name of Agence d'Edition et de Presse, a French news agency, concocted sensational news about instructions alleged to have been received by A. A. Gromyko, the Soviet ambassador who is taking part in the work of the Preparatory Commission of the United Nations Organisation in London. These "instructions" were said to require the following: to oppose the proposal for a meeting of the Big Three; to propose that the occupation of Germany be terminated no later than January 1, 1949; to insist on the setting up of a Control Commission for the Far East, similar to the Control Council operating in Germany. In all, there were eight points, all pure invention. It must be clear to everyone that the object of the news agency referred to in fabricating and distributing this forgery was to poison the international atmosphere and, in particular, to cause a rift between the Three Great Powers. But some French newspapers (Paris

Matin, and others) are so enamoured of this sordid tendency that they published the obviously slanderous statement on November 13, 1945, without the slightest qualms of conscience.

On the Polish question the reactionary newspapers had already circulated such a multitude of fabrications during the war that they now find it difficult to think up anything new. But necessity is the mother of invention for the slanderer, too, and so, on October 17, 1945, Larry Allen, Warsaw Correspondent of the Associated Press, reported a "second occupation of Poland by the Red Army." Mr. Cooper's agency circulated this malicious lie all over the world. It was caught up with particular zest and inflated by certain Paris newspapers. In L'Aurore of October 18, Dominique Prado wrote:

"Yesterday, Poland, which has been a fictitious state up to now, actually became a Soviet Socialist Republic. Yesterday, the Red Flag was hoisted over Warsaw, Cracow and fifteen other cities. . . ."

He was seconded by Charles Dumas in the central organ of the Socialist Party of France with the statement that "it is a matter of the occupation by the Red Army of all the principal cities of Poland. . . ."

Several days later the slanderers tacitly dropped this whopper about a "second occupation of Poland" and went back to their routine petty fabrications, such as that the Soviet Union is confiscating UNRRA goods in Poland, plundering her farmers, driving off her cattle, and so forth. Brant, the Chicago Sun's correspondent in Poland, got so fed up with this ceaseless mendacity that on November 17 he openly confessed:—

"These accusations are heard solely outside of Poland. Even the Soviet Union's bitterest critics in Poland do not indulge in such accusations. This falsehood is particularly cruel and dangerous because it will cause the Poles to starve to death if UNRRA supplies to Poland cease, or are reduced."

The apprehensions Brant here expresses are quite legitimate, particularly in the light of the well-known decision of the United States House of Representatives to prohibit the use of UNRRA funds in countries where representatives of the American press do not enjoy unlimited freedom of action.

Our readers will probably remember that Mr. Cooper, Associate Executive Director of the Associated Press, is fond of talking about the specifically American conception of freedom of the press as distinct from the Soviet conception. It is difficult to believe, however, that the American conception allows freedom to slander; and we absolutely refuse to believe that Americans really advocate such an abuse of freedom of the press. Probably only Mr. Cooper and those who think like him adopt such an attitude. It was they who

demanding uncontrolled freedom of action in Poland; and when their representatives arrived there we got the following specimen of journalism:—

On October 22nd, 1945, the Associated Press circulated a false report from its Sofia correspondent about big Soviet troop manoeuvres, alleged to be taking place along the Bulgarian-Turkish frontier. There were no manoeuvres, of course; but the Associated Press piece of slick trickery was disseminated as "reliable news" among millions of newspaper readers in Europe, America and Australia, and gave numerous newspapers the pretext for expressing alarm at the alleged danger of "Soviet aggression" against Turkey.

Is it not obvious that mendacity and calumny of this kind may be more effective and dangerous means of poisoning the international atmosphere than open calls for a "new war"? To-day, the peoples, more opposed to war than they have ever been before, react very sharply against such criminal calls when they appear in the pro-fascist press of American and certain Catholic newspapers in Great Britain. And when a fellow like Yalcin in Turkey calls upon the Anglo-Saxons to drop atomic bombs on the heads of the Balkan peoples, or when that British general-fascist Fuller writes that "war is essential to the health of civilisation" and, therefore, "should an enemy not exist, he will have to be created," the broad public undoubtedly turns away from them as from people possessed by the devil. Consequently, the srewder of those who pursue an imperialist policy now refrain from speaking as openly as that; they try to shatter the unity of the peace-loving nations that was established during the war in round-about ways, and step by step to prepare the ground for unleashing international conflicts.

We must not lose sight of this if we want to understand the hidden political significance of the cunningly fabricated "news" with which the saboteurs of stable peace are operating to-day. They are not attacking the idea of peace. Perish the thought! They are "impartial observers." They do not incite anybody against anybody. They merely provide the public with "News." But a definite part of the "news" they distribute is false; not stupidly false, but impregnated with political calumny, which has a far more potent effect upon the credulous public than any open incitement.

The more adroit of the hawkers of false news always endeavour to link up their calumnies with topics of the day in which the public is displaying a lively interest. Characteristic in this respect is the appearance lately of a species of political calumny which might be called atomic calumny. For example, in the beginning of September the Washington Post published a fabricated statement to the effect that three years ago, by order of the Soviet government, shares were bought in the uranium mines in Canada, as a consequence of which the Canadian government nationalised these

mines. On November 16 the French newspaper *Epoque* published a report to the effect that Joliot-Curie, the celebrated French scientist, who is investigating nuclear energy, "went to Moscow in a Russian aeroplane on the invitation of the Russian government." "This journey," the newspaper went on to say insinuatingly, "is being closely watched in London and in Washington..." The French Ministry of Education was obliged to issue a public statement that, in spite of the information published in *Epoque*, alleged to have been received "from an absolutely reliable source," Joliot-Curie had not gone anywhere.

On the basis of the above-enumerated facts it can be taken as proved that some newspapermen and representatives of large news agencies which supply international information engage in the dissemination of criminal slander directed against the security of states and nations on the one hand, and against world peace on the other. This is precisely the gravamen of the charge against the international political slanders.

If we note the countries which most often come under the fire of the international calumniators we shall observe a significant coincidence; they are the same countries against which the newspaper campaign conducted in the guise of advocacy of "international freedom of the press" is directed. They are not countries with reactionary or fascist regimes, like Spain, Portugal, and others where the activities of foreign correspondents are strictly controlled by the authorities. For some reason the reactionary press in Great Britain and America does not demand official intervention in these countries for the purpose of securing special privileges for British and American newspaper correspondents. The entire campaign of the Anglo-American capitalist newspaper kings is concentrated upon the Soviet Union and those democratic countries which were liberated from the Hitler yoke by the Soviet troops. It is against them that are hurled the bombs of political calumny which are disrupting the joint efforts of the peoples to secure lasting peace and international security.

Is such "freedom of action" for press pirates who have no consideration for the fate of the nations to be tolerated by the democratic public? Is it not high time to demand legislative guarantees that will curb miscreant pressmen who are wielding the poisoned weapon of political calumny against other nations, and against international co-operation among the peace-loving nations?

After all, in this sphere too we must learn the bitter lesson of the recent past, and particularly of the period when the fascist aggressors were intensively engaged in their preparations for launching the Second World War. Did they not, in their political struggle against the formation of a united front of collective security, constantly obtain the assistance of the reactionary press of Great Britain, France, the United States and a number of other

countries? It is not enough to recall the responsibility of the Chamberlain and Daladier governments for conniving at the plans and encouraging the successes of the fascist aggressors. For it is not to be denied that in moulding public opinion in the Great Britain, France, and America in the spirit of the Munich plot, the principal role was played by the reactionary representatives of the press and the big news agencies. They misled the public by reassuring reports, such as: "Hitler says he is in favour of peace." It was they who kept circulating endless versions of the slander about "Russia's aggressive plans." And these calumniators denounced all attempts to resist Hitler Germany's pretensions — for example, the attempt of the People's Front in France — as "fomenting war."

To a considerable degree, this tendentious moulding of public opinion by the professional purveyors of false news paralysed the efforts of the democratic forces in Western Europe to maintain peace. The peoples of Europe have paid too high a price to permit a repetition of this sordid business. Since the evil has become intolerable, effective means must be found to remedy it.

What measures can be taken to scotch the criminal utterances of certain organs of the press and news agencies of certain countries?

Lord Cecil once said at a meeting of the League of Nations that the co-operation of the press was desirable "both positively in support of measures of peace and negatively in the suppression of false and pernicious news"; but he did not say how to secure the co-operation of those newspapers which have no desire whatever to co-operate for such objects. It is not surprising. It is as impossible to secure such co-operation as to tie two bald men together by the hair. Evidently, that is why nobody took Lord Cecil's naive suggestion seriously. What was the use of indulging in self-deception?

Another remedy now being advertised in America is the drawing up of "a code of journalistic ethics." For example, R. Valeur, head of the French Press Service in the United States, suggested during the war that the American Association of Newspaper Publishers draw up such a code. But was he not aware that gentlemen of leisure in the United States have drawn up more than one code of this kind and that all were received with a smile? It is hardly likely that even Hearst or McCormick have ever refused to swear faithfulness to any "code of ethics." And it is this very circumstance that proves that in practice codes of honour are soon transformed from a means of self-deception into a means of deceiving others.

A third possible remedy is censorship. Can this be regarded as a suitable means of combating the criminal attacks of the international misinformers? No. Why? Because it would be impossible to establish a uniform censorship among the diverse types of states. The censorship is an evil

even within the boundaries of single states when those states are under reactionary or conservative regimes.

It would be wrong, however, from the point of view of real democracy, to condemn all censorship. This is done only by pseudo-democrats who wish to obscure the fundamental political difference between the two main forms of censorship. Censorship under a reactionary regime is one thing; it is used against the democratic aspirations of the people and should therefore be condemned. Censorship under a progressive, democratic regime is another thing; it is used against the mendacious propaganda of the fascist enemies of the people. Under certain circumstances it is an essential and useful weapon for the protection of democracy. In condemning "all" government control of the press, the news purveyors take good care to hush up the fact that they themselves — the newspaper publishers and their representatives in editorial offices — exercise over their publications all-round private control, which, as a rule, is no better than the control of reactionary governments.

The best possible form of control over the press in capitalist countries would, undoubtedly, be well-organised control exercised by democratic public organisations. But since the progressive, democratic organisations in the greater part of the world still exert little influence over the press, and since the influential privately-owned newspapers still take the liberty of spreading poisonous slander detrimental to the cause of peace and the co-operation of nations, all progressive and democratic countries, and our Soviet country in particular, have every right and reason to install a censorship filter to protect their drinking water reservoirs from being polluted by such filth.

But since a democratic international censorship cannot be established, is there no other means of suppressing at least the grossest violations by the international misinformers of the interests of world peace and the security of the peace-loving nations? In my opinion, making such violators liable to criminal prosecution would be an effective means. To prevent unnecessary complications, I think it would be best to single out for prosecution a limited class of newspaper crimes which are internationally dangerous — say, only the following two:

- a) systematic fomentation of war;
- b) political slander against any peace-loving state, i.e. knowingly distributing false information about the actions of such a state.

A beginning has already been made, by agreement between the Great Powers, in the prosecution of instigators of the war. This raises some hope that it will be possible to take legal proceedings against the unbribeable organs of the pro-fascist press for systematic incitement to war. Such incitement with the help of the press has always been one of the principal methods employed by

instigators of war in preparing the ground for aggression.

In most countries, as we know, libel and defamation of character of any one person are crimes punishable by law. Is it not a thousand times more important to suppress libel against a peace-loving nation or state? Such suppression is dictated by the honour and security of an entire nation and at the same time by the common interests of all nations, by the desire to bring about and consolidate international peace.

It goes without saying that as for the time being we are discussing this merely as a matter of principle, there is no need to go into an analysis of the legal problems this progressive development of international law and justice may give rise to. At any rate, this would imply that such cases would come under the jurisdiction of an international court functioning on the basis of a special international convention. We must bear in mind the possibility that many states will not find it easy to agree to the compulsory trial of such cases by an international court owing to the powerful opposition the influential press may be expected to put up, and it may therefore be necessary, at first, to limit the jurisdiction of the international court to cases brought against press men who demand the right to operate in other countries uncontrolled.

What can be urged on principle against attaching criminal liability to anyone guilty of gross abuses of international freedom of the press? There is not a hint in this of restricting the freedom of political criticism. Mr. Cummings, who in the *London News Chronicle* vehemently insists on the "right in the press and on the platform to criticise any government" may rest assured about that. Criticise, by all means, gentlemen, but beware of malicious slander, i.e. knowingly spreading false information about other countries and governments. It is only such slander — not criticism — that we wish to subject to legal prosecution. As for Mr. Cummings' proud statement that "in Western democracies we do not permit the government to decide what is mischievous and what is not," we of the Eastern democracies can, with our habitual meekness, answer: Very well, gentlemen, let a most impartial international court decide whether your actions were mischievous or well-meaning.

Mr. Kent Cooper of the Associated Press demanded the conclusion of international agreements to accord foreign correspondents diplomatic privileges and complete freedom of action, the right everywhere to use all means of communication at low rates, etc. Even Mr. Bailey, the Director of the United Press, is opposed to such far-reaching demands and believes that Mr. Cooper has lost his sense of reality. While not desiring to intervene in this American controversy, we would like, however, to ask Mr. Cooper whether he is prepared, in exchange for guarantees of freedom of information in European countries, to submit to the juris-

diction of an international court if a substantiated charge of maliciously slandering any peace-loving country is brought against his agency. Yes or no? If he is, then we hope the court will be just and sufficiently stern.

I am very much afraid, however, that Mr. Cooper will not voluntarily admit the necessity of making the political slanderer liable to prosecution before an international court of law, and that he will describe this proposal as a "menace to freedom of the press." Only very recently he asserted that the United States government, which instituted proceedings against the Associated Press on the charge of unlawfully monopolising the distribution of news, was "threatening the freedom of the press." Evidently Mr. Cooper belongs to the category of businessmen who want to pocket all the profits of business, but refuse to shoulder any responsibility.

This is a wrong attitude to take. In the newspaper and news distributing business particularly it is appropriate to insist on the profoundly just principles of no privileges without responsibilities.

## PARTY AND MASS EDUCATION

ERIC AARONS, Secretary, Marx School.

SOME three years ago, the Party began to tackle in a systematic and organised way the problem of educating members in the science of Marxism-Leninism. For this purpose uniform study courses (1, 2, and 3) were prepared for use in the branches, and Marx School established to aid in more advanced education.

Much progress has been made. That is undoubted. However, a great deal more must yet be done. Attendances at Marx School classes are not increasing; we still find many branches without classes, many more that lack permanent, regular, classes, and in which no sustained effort is made to interest new members in Party theory. We need a continued political campaign throughout the whole Party, as well as struggle to overcome the practical difficulties associated with the work.

Many members recruited during the People's War had a rather one-sided view of the Party traditions, tactics, and methods of struggle, springing to a large extent from the nature of that period itself. If the whole of the Party is to be mobilised for the sharp class struggles of to-day and tomorrow, these "old" new members must receive theoretical training.

Workers joining our Party to-day will know they are taking on no easy job. They will come in fighting, and they will come in order to fight, and it is the responsibility of the Party to see that they are provided with the necessary ideological

If you want freedom, then accept responsibility! And, of course, not only the correspondents must answer; the owners and directors of newspapers and newsgencies must be the first to be called to account. Let them have low rates if they are willing to bear high responsibility for political slander and systematic incitement to war.

As for Mr. Chancellor's statement that Reuters, of which he is the General Manager, "are not purveyors of British news" but of an "international commodity," we will take the liberty of saying that in our opinion there is no need for him to repudiate his nation in this offhand way. It would be far better if Mr. Chancellor came out openly as the well-known purveyor of a British commodity, only let it not be of the quality of the sensational report about "expulsion of a million Germans from the Soviet zone of occupation." After all, a man can be a good Englishman and at the same time respect other people's noble striving for what the Declaration of the Crimea Conference so correctly described as "the highest aspiration of humanity," namely, for lasting and durable peace.

weapons to wage the struggle, to supplement and sharpen their enthusiasm for fighting monopoly capitalism.

Our Party will continue to advance, will win new and bigger victories than in the past. But it would be foolish to think that developments will be along an evenly ascending line, without temporary checks and setbacks. For those firmly grounded in theory, such occasions serve only to sharpen the determination to struggle still more intensively and effectively. Those "without theory," however, tend to waver, or even to drop out of the struggle.

We cannot take it for granted, either, that circumstances will at all times in the future permit the Party to provide the present quite extensive facilities to assist comrades to acquire a sound theoretical knowledge.

So we must improve and extend our education in the Party. But at the same time we must push out our circle, we have to begin the education of the masses in revolutionary theory. In one or two instances a start has already been made, but by and large mass education, for us, is virgin soil. Well, it must be upturned.

Undoubtedly many practical problems will arise in endeavouring to put any program of mass education into effect. But experience shows that if the Party as a whole is convinced politically, if trade union and other forms of narrowness are

eradicated, and the task seen as an essential part of the fight for socialism, the difficulties will be tackled with enthusiasm and determination, and will be overcome.

Comrade Sharkey has clearly outlined our task.

"Our Party today has a similar task, to raise the political understanding of the masses to the level of a Communist understanding of society and the consequent tasks of the labor movement. Marx and Engels, Lenin and Stalin, have given us an understanding of the historical tasks of the working class in regard to the revolutionary change-over from Capitalism to Socialism. The advance guard of the proletariat have been able to grasp these theories, to master Marxism-Leninism; it has to be taken to the masses who, unaided, are unable to raise themselves to the level of a theoretical understanding, are unable to advance beyond the immediate practical tasks of wages, conditions, strikes." (The Trade Unions, p. 9).

We must, therefore, on a wide scale, introduce the workers, and first of all the organised workers, to the revolutionary theory of our Party. This does not mean that the Party should be a purely educational, a propaganda, institution; that propaganda alone will win the workers to the side of Communism.

"... in order that actually the whole class, that actually the broad masses of toilers and those oppressed by capital may take up such a proposition, (i.e., of direct support of, or benevolent neutrality to, the vanguard—E.A.) propaganda and agitation alone are not sufficient. For this the masses must have their own political experience. Such is the fundamental law of all great revolutions. . . ." (Left Wing Communism, p. 72.)

These fundamental teachings are expressed in another form in a slogan which was once current in the Party, to the effect that "the basis of Communist education is struggle."

However, the basis is not the building. The masses have had extremely rich experiences in the past fifteen years and will undergo many more in the future. Under the leadership of the Party the masses have, and will acquire these experiences most quickly, in the sharpest form, and with the least loss and suffering. It will help them to draw lessons and become politically active, if their experiences are pinpointed in theoretical form—in the shape of ideas.

On every ideological front, from art to political economy, from the family to bourgeoisie, a struggle must be waged against the bourgeoisie. We must

not underestimate the revolutionary role of revolutionary ideas.

"Arising out of the new tasks set by the development of the material life of society, the new social ideas and theories force their way through, become the possession of the masses, mobilize and organize them against the moribund forces of society, and thus facilitate the overthrow of these forces which hamper the development of the material life of society." (History of the C.P.S.U., p. 117.)

It is our task—for there is no-one else to perform it—to bring these mobilising, organising theories to the masses as part of the preparation for the defeat of capitalism.

Mao Tse-Tung, that great Marxist, has this to say in his *China's New Democracy* (p. 55):

"Revolutionary culture is a powerful revolutionary weapon of the people. Before the outbreak of the revolution, culture paves the way for it by spreading revolutionary thoughts. During the revolution, it is a necessary and important front in the general revolutionary front, and revolutionary cultural workers are commanders of various grades on this cultural front."

This should be enough to convince us of the great importance of the tasks we are confronted with in the sphere of mass education. We should also recall Engels' estimate of the great advantage the German working class of his day had because of its "sense of theory," over that of Britain, with its indifference to theoretical questions.

In the same writing Engels has something to say about Party education—

"It is the specific duty of the leaders (i.e., all members of the vanguard Party—E.A.) to gain an ever-clearer insight into all theoretical questions, to free themselves more and more from the influence of traditional phrases inherited from the old conception of the world, and constantly to keep in mind that Socialism, having become a science, must be pursued as a science, i.e., it must be studied. The task will be to spread with increased enthusiasm, among the masses of the workers, the ever-clearer insight thus acquired. . . ." (Quoted in What is to be Done, p. 50.) (My emphasis—E.A.)

So one side of the struggle for education is to improve our own understanding. The other is to take practical steps to bring theory to the workers. With ideology it is either . . . or—either bourgeois ideology or socialist ideology; and the latter will not be victorious spontaneously, either in the Party or among the masses. It must be fought for.

## PHILIPPINE PANORAMA

STAFF-SERGEANT A. KEESING.

Part II

THESE three men, Soriano, Roxas and MacArthur form the spearhead of the most reactionary section of American finance capital, which is interested in maintaining the Philippines as a source of raw materials for American industry, as a market for commodities, as a suitable area for the investment of surplus finance capital, and as a base for the economic invasion and penetration of the islands and countries of the Pacific.

Why do these interests prefer Roxas to Osmena, who has a good record as a flunkey of capital? Osmena has been at some pains in recent months to establish himself as a comforter of collaborators, whom he has appointed judges of the Supreme Court, governors of the provinces, and town mayors. Nor, in the light of his unconcern for the sufferings of the people, his inattention to the problems of relief, housing, jobs, food rations, etc., has he recommended himself as a tribune of the people.

However, it is no longer possible for the reactionaries to manoeuvre rejection of independence owing to the pressure of the democratic forces both in the United States and in the Philippines. Their problem now is: how to maintain the dominance of finance capital. To achieve this they are endeavouring to capture every key position in the government and they are determined to get tried and dependable tools. That is why Roxas has been selected to lead the spearhead of reaction. He has proved his loyalty to imperialism under both Japanese and American masters. Osmena is regarded as unsuitable. He is vacillating and not aggressive enough to suit their requirements. In the past he has carried out their wishes but with plenty of reservations. And he is not a member of the innermost financial circles, being a relatively poor man.

Against this concentration of forces directed towards the maintenance of the colonial status of the Philippines, a progressive movement of the people is maturing, strengthened and steeled in the struggles and guerrilla warfare against the Japanese invaders. When Bataan was about to surrender a group of patriots, led by Luis Taruc and Caste Alejandro, began to organise people from all strata of society for a guerrilla war against the Japs. They set up an organisation called Hukbong Bayan Labag sa Hapon (The People's anti-Japanese Army) a name which in its abbreviated form of Hukbalahap or the Huk has become famous as one of the fighting guerrilla movements which played such a big part in the defeat of fascism.

The Huk's programme was simple and acceptable to all honest patriots, calling for struggle on two issues: to eliminate the Japanese military fascists and work for independence; and to improve living

standards. Organising and arming themselves on the same principles as China's Red Armies (Snow's Red Star Over China was an important textbook), they rapidly gained the support of peasants, landlords, and townspeople in all of the central provinces of Luzon, recruiting on the widest possible basis. As a people's movement, the Huk outlawed pillage and forcible seizure, organised assistance to the people and imposed a rigid discipline on themselves. To make their aims clear and increase their military efficiency regular lectures and classes were organised on all political and military topics.

Gradually, as they eased the Japs out of one provincial town after another, local and municipal governments were set up on the basis of a popular adult franchise from which only the collaborators and sympathisers of the Japanese were excluded. Although designated by Roxas as a bandit organisation attempting to bring the Soviet Union into the Philippines, leading American officers acknowledged that the rapid pace of the advance of U.S. troops from Lingayen to Manila, well ahead of schedule, was entirely due to the work of the Hukbalahap in eliminating Jap strength in the provinces. Major-General Doherty, Chief of Staff of the 6th Army, said: "The Hukbalahap is one of the best fighting units I have ever known."

Other guerrilla organisations also made their appearance, mostly on a small scale, but these were either U.S. Army espionage groups or bodies formed to protect their own immediate interests, controlled by the landowners. Often they were rival organisations, formed to combat the influence of the Huk, which they feared as a revolutionary movement. Consequently the Huk was forced to launch a campaign attacking the "awaitism" policy of these units, a policy which would have effectively ended all active opposition to the Japs. There were also "phony" organisations whose sole purpose was to gain victory bonuses from the U.S. Army. Some of these groups proved useful to MacArthur when he was engaged in attacking the Huk and putting forward Roxas as the spiritual leader.

But facts are difficult things. The Hukbalahap had a fighting strength of more than 40,000 and is estimated to have killed more than 25,000 Japs. Attempts by reaction to smear the Huk were only partly successful, because the Huk was able to produce rescued American airmen who had fought with them for a period of many months. Nevertheless, MacArthur had both Taruc and Alejandro jailed and their release was not accomplished until late in September, when popular demonstrations and deputations forced the hand of the Government. It is believed that approximately 500 Huk leaders are still held incommunicado.

April, 1946

April, 1946

117

In March of this year the leaders of six progressive organisations, including the Hukbalahap and the National Confederation of Peasants, met together and formed the Democratic Alliance, a body which, while permitting each participating group to retain its organisation and platform, united them all on a generally acceptable programme. Membership is individual and the Alliance is today the strongest single grouping numerically in the Philippines.

Early in July a manifesto setting out in some detail its programme and demands was widely distributed. The main points were:

1. Speedy victory over Japanese fascism.
2. Immediate relief for the needy.
3. Strengthened national unity against fascism; for the preservation and extension of democracy and for the assurance of national independence; arrest, removal from public office, trial and punishment of all collaborators.
4. Rehabilitation and improvement of national economy.
5. Guaranteed social and economic security.
6. Improved education and sanitation.
7. Development of friendly relations with the United Nations.

This programme was published over the signatures of the delegates representing the six participating organisations. The Alliance, recognising that there was no section of the Nacionalista Party able or willing to champion the needs of the mass of the people, immediately put itself forward as an alternative party. "In common with liberated and free peoples all over the world, Filipinos are no longer contented to live under the domination of the fascist or reactionary landlords and finance capitalists. More than three years of suffering under Japanese fascist rule have taught us the meaning of fascism in action, they exposed to us the naked truth about our former national leaders who, almost to a man, preferred to collaborate with the enemy rather than to fight for our national liberation. They also exposed to us the reactionary big landlords and vested interests which dominated the Nacionalista Party, who either trafficked with the enemy or profiteered at the people's expense."

There followed a declaration of principles calling for national independence, national unity against fascism and reaction, the defence and extension of democracy, and a clean, progressive government.

It is already evident that this new Alliance is exactly what the people needed. It has grown with amazing rapidity and has carried out several mass demonstrations, including the one mentioned above, 35,000 strong, which secured the release of the guerrilla leaders and an undertaking from Osmena to investigate their accusations against collaborators. This procession carried placards naming the collaborators and demanding their

removal. The Alliance has already become a powerful factor in political life and is seriously threatening the positions of the representatives of vested interests.

The immediate task of the progressive movement in the Philippines today is to secure not merely political independence, but also economic independence as its indispensable corollary.

The pre-war economy was predominantly agricultural, yet insufficient rice was produced for the people's needs because the production of commercial crops was far more profitable. Thus, although the islands contain some of the best rice country in the world, it was still necessary to import two million bushels a year. One-third of the cultivated area was — and still is — devoted to raising money crops for export to the U.S.A. Further, the accumulation of lands in the hands of the sugar barons meant a rapid increase in the use of agricultural labor, which, because of the absence of industrialisation, meant extremely low wages and living standards. At the same time a very large proportion of lands immediately cultivable or suitable for cultivation under irrigation, remain idle and unproductive.

The mining industry expanded rapidly during the decade 1930-40, with practically the whole product exported in the form of raw material. The chief emphasis was on gold production, but the output of iron and non-ferrous metals also increased substantially:—

	1934	1940
	Tons	Tons
Iron . . . . .	7,000	1,200,000 (to Japan)
Chromite . . . .	1,300	194,000
Manganese . . .	500	48,000
Copper Concentrates . . . . .	5	8,000

There are also deposits of asbestos, molybdenum, lead, zinc and platinum practically untouched, and some oil in Cebu, but little high quality coal.

It will be seen that the Filipino economy has the one-sided character of all colonial regimes, depending on the large scale export of a few agricultural and mineral products to pay for imports of food and manufactured commodities. Most of this trade was dependent on the U.S.A., which took 80% of the products and supplied 70% of the imports. Yet the principal exports were competitive with, not supplementary to, American production, a fact which has resulted in widespread support by influential sections of U.S. interests for the demand for independence, with a rider that tariff barriers should be erected to exclude Philippine imports.

The popular progressive movement in the Philippines is fully aware of these facts and understands that the only real prospect of economic as well as political independence lies with the development of natural resources in the islands to the fullest possible extent, establishment of modern

industries based on domestic resources, the modernisation of the backward and oppressive systems of agrarian relations, and the establishment of a well-rounded and self-sufficient economy. Private capital refuses to take the risks involved in such development, i.e., the almost certain absence of profits for some years. Consequently the Democratic Alliance and all its affiliated organisations are campaigning for the government to establish publicly owned industries and services, for a planned economy which will enable the Philippines to take their rightful place among modern nations.

## LENIN AND YOUTH

### "YOUTH WORKER."

[I]t is no accident that the greatest figures in the modern struggle for the emancipation of mankind, Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin, all commenced their revolutionary activity as youths. Lenin understood the reason for this: "When people see how their fathers and mothers live under the yoke of the landlords and capitalists, when they themselves experience the sufferings that befall those who start the struggle against the exploiters, when they see what sacrifices the continuation of this struggle entails in order to defend what has been won, and when they see what frenzied foes the landlords and capitalists are—they are trained in this environment to become Communists." (Lenin and Stalin on Youth, p. 30).

Lenin grew with the movement and very early became known as "the Old Man" but he never forgot or lost interest in the youth. Throughout his life he gave the greatest attention to youth, for he realised better than any that the future belongs to the youth and it is the duty of the elders to train and fit youth for its high obligations.

Lenin's attention to youth is shown in the fact that while in Switzerland, he found time to deliver a special lecture to the Swiss revolutionary youth organisations on the 1905 Russian revolution, explaining in simple language its world significance and bringing home the importance of youth by showing the particular part that was played by the Polish student youth in the tremendous National movement directed against Tsardom. Lenin realised very well the significance of the youth movement in the general revolutionary movement. For example, in estimating the development of the 1905 October political strike, Lenin analysed the cause and effect of the student movement, and three years after the defeat of the revolution, during the period of blackest reaction, he gave a report to Party organisations on "The Student Movement and the Present Political Situation."

Lenin was an uncompromising opponent of reformist theories and the opportunism of the Second International and made clear that if reactionary theory and practice is to be defeated,

However, the economic development of the Philippines will not take place in a vacuum — it must necessarily be affected by conditions prevailing in the neighbouring countries of Indonesia and Asia. If South-East Asia as a whole remains backward and impoverished it will be extremely difficult for the Philippines to achieve economic prosperity, or protect their infant industries against the products of low wage labor. Therefore Filipino democrats are no less interested in the struggles of the peoples of Indonesia, India, Indo-China, and China than in their own problems.

then youth has an important role to play. Criticising the Chauvinism and opportunism of the Social Democratic and Labor Parties of Europe, he wrote, in the "Review of the Youth International": " . . . In the circumstances thus prevailing in Europe, on the League of Socialist Youth organisations falls the tremendous, grateful, but difficult task of fighting for revolutionary internationalism, for true socialism and against the prevailing opportunism which has deserted to the side of the imperialist bourgeoisie."

Understanding the importance of youth, what then did Lenin teach the youth? Lenin taught the youth first, the importance of theory, the need to learn; second, the need for organisation; and third, the need for character based on Communist morality.

Lenin's teachings of the youth are models of simplicity in language and exposition, e.g., his speech "Task of the Youth Leagues" made to the 3rd All Russian Congress of the Young Communist League in 1920. Although presented simply, Lenin's speech was based on the fundamental principles of Marxism—explaining the nature of class society and the nature of capitalist exploitation so that the only correct political conclusions can be drawn by the youth.

Lenin not only showed youth the need to understand the science of Socialism, but the need for organisation and the kind of organisation needed by the youth: " . . . The Y.C.L. should be a shock group, helping in every job and displaying initiative and enterprise. The League should be such that any worker may see that it consists of people whose doctrines he may not understand, whose doctrines, he, perhaps, may not immediately believe, but whose practical work and activity prove to him that they are really the people who are showing him the right road." (Lenin and Stalin on Youth, p. 33). Lenin emphasised that the youth leagues must not be pocket editions of the Communist Party, but broad Socialist youth organisations.

Having tremendous faith in the creative initiative of the masses and particularly of the youth,

Lenin pointed to Socialist competition as the means for harnessing this latent energy to the cause of the working class and of Socialism:

" . . . To the extent that the youth prove that they can unite their labour, to that extent will the success of Communist construction be assured." (Lenin and Stalin on Youth, p. 33). He shows the difference between Socialist competition and Capitalist competition: " . . . Sometimes Socialist competition is confused with Capitalist competition. This is a great mistake. Socialist competition and Capitalist competition represent two entirely different principles. The principle of capitalist competition spells defeat and death for the one, victory and domination for the other. The principle of Socialist competition is that those who are more advanced should render comradely assistance to the backward in order to achieve general progress." ("Basis of Shock Brigades," from "Lenin on Socialist Competition.")

Lenin recognised the special difficulties which beset youth—that not having the background of experience of adults they fall prey to the reactionary influence of bourgeois ideas—hence he directed special attention to the question of character building, showing the difference between Capitalist and Communist morality. He teaches the youth that morality has an economic foundation—bourgeois economy gives rise to bourgeois morality, for example, the traders proverb: "If you don't cheat you don't sell." Private property gives rise to selfishness, individualism, cheating and treachery. Communist morality is based on training to fight exploitation and the profit system. "Morality serves the purpose of helping human society to rise to a higher level and to get rid of the exploitation of labour." (Lenin and Stalin on Youth, p.

30). In this lies the sublime heroism and sacrifice of the people of Stalingrad, who knew what they fought for and how to die for it. History has shown that if youth is deceived and won by fascist reaction, it is converted into ravaging wild beasts, but if it is given a high ideal and something to fight for, if it is won by the Socialist and anti-fascist forces, then it gives us the heroes of the Russian Civil War; the heroes of Labor who built Dneprestri, Kuznetsk and the Siberian city of Young Communists, Komsomolek; the heroes of the 8th Route Army of China and the Republican Army of Spain, the Armenians of Britain and the "Rats of Tobruk" and the uncrowned heroes of the mighty Red Army.

Lenin pointed out that the main task in winning the youth to Socialism is: " . . . criticism of the bourgeoisie and arouse hatred of the bourgeoisie among the masses, develop class consciousness and ability to unite their forces." (Lenin and Stalin on Youth, p. 25). Applied in the conditions of the People's War against Fascism, this meant: (1) Exposing the real character and class nature of fascism and arousing the hatred of youth against its mortal enemy; (2) making the youth class-conscious and the custodian of the great traditions of struggle of the Australian people for democracy and a better life—imbuing youth with the spirit of Australian Trade Unionism and militant struggle; and (3) Developing that knowledge and experience of tactics which can make possible the achievement of youth unity.

The care, attention and comradely assistance given by Lenin to the youth movement must be an example to all Communists. We must heed Lenin's advice, the youth are a store of energy and initiative, but we must be tolerant of the weaknesses associated with youthfulness. We must help them to learn, organise, unite and struggle for Socialism.

## TURKEY GUESSED WRONG

S. BELINKOV.

(From "New Masses," January 8, 1946.)

TURKEY'S position in World War II was a continual subject of world comment. In contradistinction to World War I when Turkey was an avowed ally of German imperialism, in the recent war Turkish policy was very ambiguous. While Ankara maintained allied relations with Great Britain, it did everything to demonstrate its friendship for Hitler Germany. Aside from Germany's direct vassals, Turkey was the country which, more than any other, overrated the strength of Nazi Germany and her chances of victory.

In the autumn of 1939 Turkey proclaimed herself a "non-belligerent." Then she adopted a policy of neutrality which from the very start was favorable to Germany, inasmuch as it protected Germany's Balkan front. However, in the early period of the war, when Hitler seized western Europe and launched

his African adventure, Turkey's neutrality was of some positive value to the Allies as well, since it prevented a swift advance of Hitler's hordes to the Suez and the Nile valley.

After Hitler Germany attacked the Soviet Union and concentrated the bulk of her armed forces on the Eastern Front, the value of Turkish neutrality to the Germans was considerably enhanced. It favored the Germans inasmuch as it protected their south-eastern flank and made it unnecessary for Hitler to split his reserves. The Dardanelles were open only to Axis navies. Turkey permitted German and Italian warships free access to the Black Sea, which facilitated the military operations of the invaders in the southern regions of the U.S.S.R. The flattering compliments the Germans paid

Ankara spoke eloquently of the value they attached to Turkey's services to Germany.

As the military and political situation in Germany deteriorated, Turkish neutrality became increasingly important to the Nazis. It is obvious that if Turkey had entered the war even at the end of 1943, the military collapse of Hitler Germany would have been expedited. But even after the Teheran Conference Turkey ignored her treaty of alliance with Great Britain and deferred renouncing her neutrality on one pretext or another.

Far from assisting the Allies, Turkey continued to render substantial aid to the Germans. Turkey, Spain, Switzerland and Sweden were the chief suppliers of scarce strategic raw materials to Germany's war industry. According to the well-informed Turkish publication, *L'Economiste d'Orient* (Jan. 10, 1944), ninety per cent of Turkey's total exports went to Germany. Public opinion in Allied countries was incensed by the fact that Turkey was supplying Germany with chromium ore. British and American newspapers repeatedly declared that without Turkish chromium a large part of Germany's high-grade steel industry would have been brought to a standstill. Economic assistance rendered by Turkey, as by other "neutrals," made it possible for the Nazis to continue their resistance to the Allies.

Right down to the final stage of the war the Turkish press spoke approvingly of the assistance the Turks were rendering to Germany and of their friendliness toward German aggression. "We have demonstrated our friendship for the Germans all through this war and have done so in their moment of greatest need," *Anadolu* wrote on May 7th, 1944. "We shall remain friends of Germany to the last," *Son Posta* frankly admitted on April 22, 1944.

On the other hand, Turkey lost no opportunity in manifesting her unfriendliness toward the Soviet Union. We have only to recall the trial of the absolutely innocent Soviet citizens, Pavlov and Kornilov, staged by Turkish authorities at the instigation of Hitler's ambassador, Von Papen; the repeated crossing of Soviet frontiers by German aircraft from the Turkish side; attempts of Nazi spies to enter the Soviet Union through Turkey and the like. An Englishman who returned from Ankara in 1943, writing in the *Asiatic Review*, described his impression of Turkey's attitude toward the U.S.S.R. as follows: "The Turks are displeased not that Russia is at war, but that in spite of her losses she is still a formidable power."

As late as the summer of 1944, many of Von Papen's directives were carried out by Turkey as punctiliously as in 1942, when Hitler considered himself master of Europe. From the very first day of the war, large sections of the Turkish press, official quarters, adopted a violently hostile attitude towards the Soviet Union.

The Red Army's victories in the summer of 1944 and the opening of the second front in Europe could not but have a sobering effect upon Ankara. But while it realized that its expectations of German victory proved groundless, it now just as erroneously banked upon a split in the camp of the Allies.

Turkey's formal rupture of diplomatic relations with Germany was so belated that it evoked caustic comment all over the world. But even after that it was six months before Ankara could make up its mind to declare even symbolic war on Germany. It only did so when Hitler's hordes had been driven way back by the Red Army from Turkey's borders. Turkey could then, of course, commit herself without any risk. It was the unanimous opinion of the world press that Ankara's underlying motive was the fear of forfeiting the right to representation at the San Francisco Conference.

Turkey hoped to make a good thing out of the war by trading with Germany and her satellites. "It cannot be denied that the Germans did pay good prices for our goods," the Turkish newspaper, *Ulus*, recalled regretfully on September 21, 1944, after the break in Turko-German relations. Having plundered nearly all of Europe, the Nazis, interested as they were both in obtaining strategic raw materials and in the continuation of Turkish neutrality, could afford to pay five or six times above world prices for certain kinds of goods.

But this one-sided policy of serving Germany and her satellites was fraught with the most disastrous consequences to Turkey's economy. She began to experience increasing shortage of raw materials as well as foodstuffs and consumer goods. Scarcity and high prices of coal and oil caused acute transport difficulties. Turkey's national income has always been one of the lowest in the world. "Profitable" trade with the Nazis enriched only a handful of speculators. Treasury receipts declined. Paper currency became generally inflated. Today, the cost of living has risen severalfold. Agriculture, unable to stand the strain of "neutrality" so favorable to the Germans, has fallen into decline. Strong relics of feudalism have made themselves acutely felt. Although an agrarian country, Turkey is unable to supply even her minimum food requirements. At the end of last year, the newspaper *Yeni Sabah* lifted the curtain which conceals the state of affairs in the Turkish countryside. It bitterly complained that the farming methods of the Turkish peasant go back to the time of Adam and Noah.

"We are told," wrote the journalist Uluney, that Turkish peasants no longer plough holding the ox by the tail and that they have tractors, reapers, threshing machines and so on. But I must frankly confess that I have never seen a tractor even in the environs of Istanbul. In our district of Cartal you won't find a single agricultural machine." Large numbers of the rural population are hopelessly enmeshed in the toils of the usurer Etaga (a

large landowner) and lead a most wretched existence.

Adaptation of Turkish economy to the needs of the German war machine reacted disastrously on foreign trade, which is the important item in the country's economy. Encouragement was given to the cultivation of crops which the Germans needed. Industries which produced goods the Germans required were expanded. No thought was given to the cost of production. The result was an artificial and widening gap between prices in Turkey and prices in the world market, with the consequent curtailment of export possibilities and loss of customers. During the war, Turkey's imports came chiefly from Germany and German-occupied countries. Turkey gets nothing from these countries now and in order to purchase elsewhere she needs foreign currency which she doesn't have.

The dislocation of agriculture, the stagnation of industry and the backwardness of foreign trade, resulted in still further impoverishment of the masses. The cost of maintaining an army of over a million men is obviously too heavy a burden on the country. A Reuter's commentator recently (Sept. 14, 1945) expressed the opinion that if the Turkish Government failed to cope with economic difficulties, domestic political changes which might gravely affect Turkey's position in foreign affairs were bound to occur.

Democratic processes now at work in a number of European countries are having certain repercussions in Turkey. As in other non-belligerent countries, the political forces in Turkey were divided in their attitude towards the warring camps. Even as late as last year, certain influential circles demanded unreserved adherence to the Axis powers. On the other hand, progressive elements severely criticised Ankara's orientation in foreign policy on the grounds that it ran directly counter to the country's fundamental interests and was highly detrimental to its political and economic relations with the democratic states. The progressive elements were opposed to rendering assistance to Nazi Germany and favored adherence to the United Nations. However, the political regime in Turkey, on which friendship with Nazi Germany left a deep impress, makes it impossible for the progressive forces to exercise effective influence on the country's policy.

A section of the Turkish press has of late been praising the alleged "democratic" character of the regime. But this is intended mainly for foreign consumption. It is noteworthy that while some newspapers are boosting Turkish "democracy," others affirm that even the most elementary principles of political democracy are impracticable in Turkey owing to the peculiarity of her development. The facts compel admission that Turkey is one of the few countries which have so far remained impermeable to the processes of democratisation of social and political life. Turkish workers have

virtually no rights. "In all countries," *Yeni Sabah* wrote, "workers are able to stand up for the right to wages and social security. They have labor arbitration courts, which we have not. Unhappy women have nowhere to turn for redress when their rights are trampled upon. As to men, they can only obtain their wages by force. Here, too, we find no support from law and justice."

Although Turkey was not involved in the war in Europe, the authorities used the war as an excuse to remove practically every restriction on employment of female and child labor, to increase the working day sometimes to as many as fourteen hours. Kemal's labor laws were thus virtually abrogated. As early as 1940, the last remnants of labor organizations—the Kemal trade unions—were suppressed. Even handicraftsmen's associations are being suppressed. On the other hand, various pro-fascist organizations continued to operate openly.

The press presents an equally ugly picture. According to the Turkish newspaper, *Tan*: "The Turkish press is subjected to such tyrannical pressure as to be met with only in Iran. The government carried its interference so far as to dictate to us the kind of type to use for display heads. We have been unable to breathe, let alone talk, discuss and express our opinions." Last year a bill was passed imposing additional restrictions and frankly directed against the progressive newspapers. Its effects were not long in forthcoming. All of the democratic newspapers and periodicals, including *Tan*, were suppressed. Only in the spring of 1945 was a certain let-up to be observed. *Tan* again appeared. But, adhering to their balance of power policy even with regard to the press, authorities simultaneously sanctioned the publication of *Tasvir*, a pro-Axis newspaper.

During the war, the reactionary Turkish newspapers gave every support to Nazi Germany and acted as advocates of Hitler and his gang. These newspapers too usually lead the hue and cry against the progressive elements and against those who call for sincere co-operation with the democratic world. Judges who are involved in the violence of fascists and the intrigues of Pan-Turkish conspirators meet our rigorous punishment to progressive and democratic leaders.

Turkey's prolonged friendship with Germany has affected her foreign policy as well. As early as 1940 Turkey virtually disassociated herself from the Balkans. She renounced her obligations towards her Balkan allies. "Greece, Rumania, Turkey and Yugoslavia mutually guarantee the security of all their Balkan frontiers"—this underlying principle of the Balkan Pact of 1934 proved an empty phrase as far as Turkey was concerned. In defiance of the provisions of the pact, she remained impassive when Yugoslavia and Greece were attacked by Germany. This facilitated the occupation of the entire Balkan peninsula by the Germans. During the period of the German sway in the Balkans Turkey

did not even hint that she was a Balkan country. The Balkan people's struggle for national liberation from the Nazi invaders, which evoked the admiration and gratitude of the progressive men and women all over the world, was characterised by the Turkish reactionary press as "mutiny" and "anarchy." And it was not until the whole Balkan peninsula was liberated from the Nazis, thanks to the victory of the Red Army and the efforts of the Balkan people themselves, that Turkey began to talk of the "solidarity" of the Balkan countries and the "invaluable assistance" she supposedly rendered them.

Certain elements in Turkey claim that it is she that should exercise leadership in the Balkans. Obviously these calculations are built on sand. The situation in the Balkans today is fundamentally different from what it was before the war. Not only have the peoples of the much-suffering peninsula rid themselves of the German invaders; they have irrevocably put an end to their reactionary regimes. They need nobody's tutelage, Turkey's least of all. That is probably the reason for the un concealed animosity which the democratic restoration of Yugoslavia, Rumania, Bulgaria and Albania arouses in Ankara. The democratic govern-

ments of these countries are viciously attacked in the Turkish reactionary press and their social reforms are represented as chaos and anarchy. Veneal journalists openly call for armed intervention with the purpose of restoring pro-fascist regimes in the Balkans. Many Turkish newspapers echo Goebbels' lie that the non-Slav people of the Balkans are menaced by a "Slav pest!"

Turkey's policy during World War II seriously undermined her prestige in international affairs and in Balkan affairs in particular. This evidently is realised in Ankara and attempts are being made to recoup the loss in other directions. In the latter part of September, in connection with a visit of the Regent of Iraq to Ankara, the idea of a new bloc headed by Turkey—this time a Turko-Arab bloc—was loudly advertised. The suggestion made by Nuri Said that Turkey should join the Arab League was hailed with delight by Turkish reactionaries.

When one examines Turkey's foreign policy during the war and in the initial period of peace, one is struck by her studied disregard of profound changes which have taken place in the international arena. To disregard realities in this way can lead to no good.

## THE PARIS COMMUNE OF 1871

R. HUMPHREYS

ON March 18, 1871, the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie was overthrown and replaced with the dictatorship of the proletariat for the first time in history. On that day the masses of Paris, through the Central Committee of their National Guard, assumed control.

Eight months before, France had declared war on Prussia. Napoleon III was endeavouring to save his dynasty from extinction. By military conquest and victories he hoped to show the bourgeoisie of France that he should continue to lead their state machine, despite its obvious degeneration. For France this war was not a war of national liberation but a dynastic war. Corrupt and ill-equipped, an army of 80,000 French soldiers was thrown against Bismarck's well-trained machine which, four years earlier, had defeated Austria in 15 days. Bismarck's treacherous and dynastic policy placed Germany in a position against which she had to defend herself. The war forced the final unification of the Germanic states (excluding German Austria) under the hegemony of Prussia. It was necessary, if the proletarian movement was to develop and grow, that Germany should finally unite and become one nation. It was therefore to the ultimate advantage of the working class that German borders should remain intact.

Bismarck, however, was not content with defence. Quickly he plunged forward over the bodies of the French army, this product of the

Empire's decadence and corruption, and swept on to Paris. For German working men the war was no longer one of national defence but a predatory invasion of France. August Bebel and Wilhelm Liebknecht were imprisoned for refusing to vote for war credits in the North German Reichstag to carry on this war of plunder.

Soon the Prussians had Paris in a state of siege and Paris, the cultural capital of the world, starved. The masses of Paris organised the National Guard whose weapons were purchased by public subscription. In the armed masses of Paris, short of essential commodities and having suffered through the years of Napoleonic oppression, the wealthy sections saw a danger to their continued existence as capitalists. They surrendered France's Paris to the Prussians and then tried to disarm the masses of the arms which they had purchased. They marched their ill-fed provincial troops straight to the working class suburb of Montmartre. The National Guard was called out and resisted this attempt to abscond with their arms. The soldiers fraternised and the cause of Thiers was lost. He then signed an order excommunicating Paris, shifting the government to Versailles. Paris was thus left in the hesitating yet working class hands of the Central Committee of the National Guard.

The hesitation and lack of determination of the Central Committee of the National Guard arose

from the fact that the French proletariat was immature. Many were still historically, socially and ideologically close to the petit bourgeoisie and followed Proudhon. Others showed a petit bourgeois lack of faith in the ability of the proletarian masses to organise together for the revolution and followed Blanqui. There was thus no truly revolutionary party, conscious of the historical role of its class—no party capable of consciously directing the struggle.

It was in this situation that the Central Committee of the National Guard made some of the most fateful errors of the commune. The soldiers who had fraternised with the people were allowed to leave Paris with the reactionary Thiers. This reactionary Thiers government itself, together with the rich, was allowed to go and stay unmolested in Versailles, there to plot, with the help of the Prussians, the bloodthirsty counter-revolution. Fear of being accused of illegally capturing power caused the central committee to waste valuable days organising elections which could have taken place when the situation was more settled. Paris was divided into districts (arrondissements) from which the members of the Commune's assembly were elected. Paris elected workers, intellectuals, and a few leading revolutionaries from other countries to administer their new state. There was a majority of Jacobins-Blanquists and a minority of Proudhonists. A few anti-communards were elected from the richer districts in the first place. However, when they saw their position was hopeless they refused to take their seats.

The commune separated the church from the state, abolished the standing army and replaced it with the armed people, abolished night baking, industrial fines against workers, back rent which had accumulated during the siege, reopened abandoned factories, publicly destroyed the guillotine. All officials were elected and subject to recall. Attempts were made to contact the peasantry but Paris was surrounded by the enemy. In addition not one of the parties of the commune had firm organisational ties with the village. However, appeals were made. One of them was this:

"At last Paris has won—bear this in mind you worker of the land, you who are property-less, wage workers, small property owners, by rich who are being devoured by usurers, by rich who are being devoured by usurers, by rich landlords—all of you who sow, harvest and toil with the sweat of your brow only that best part of the fruits of your labour should fall into the hands of some idlers—in the final analysis Paris wants land for the peasants, the means of production for the workers—work for all."

The strong party leadership of the first International, badly needed by the Communards, was absent because of the isolation of Paris and because of the weakness of the Paris section. However, "Marx was a participant in the mass struggle of the Commune." He did all that was possible to

let the world know the truth about this "storming of the heavens." His defence of the Commune earned for him the bitterest enmity of the bourgeoisie. He became the centre of a vilification campaign in the press after his brilliant report to the general council of the International on this "Civil War in France." Delivered by Marx as the end was approaching, it outlined for the world proletariat those lessons which were the commune's invaluable contribution to the problem of taking power. Without these lessons conjuncture could exert its disruptive influence. With these lessons it was and is quite clear that "the working class cannot simply take hold of the ready-made state machine and wield it for its own purposes." This machine must be smashed and not just captured. It must be purged of its capitalist bureaucracy and institutions. A new proletarian machine must take its place. "The commune showed in what concrete forms the organisation of the proletariat as the ruling class will be expressed and how the organisation will be combined with the most complete and consistent battle for democracy."

While the Commune was feeling its sometimes uncertain steps towards Socialism, the capitalist world was feverishly organising against this threat to their existence. Bismarck forgot his 'national' hatred and offered Thiers his help. He released from captivity the officers and soldiers of the old Imperial army. Degenerate products of the Third Empire, they were willing helpers of Mammon.

Inside the Commune itself differences developed between the Jacobin-Blanquist majority and the Proudhonists. These latter, failing to see the methods which must be used in a state of civil war, protested against the use of 'dictatorship' by the committee of public safety. The masses forced these people to forget their foolish prattling. However, this splitting activity of the minority led to a weakening of the Commune, fighting for its existence in the face of the enemy.

The bourgeoisie used to advantage the weakness displayed in the relationship of the Commune towards the Bank of France. They received 257,000,000 francs from this institution compared with the Communards' 16,000,000, and thus financed their plans to drown the Commune in blood. This weakness flowed from the immature nature of the proletariat of Paris. It was socially, economically and historically close to the petit bourgeoisie. Its fetishism towards money is therefore not altogether unexpected.

The bourgeoisie who remained in Paris opened the gates to the attacking Versailles forces. On May 21 there started one of the bloodiest street battles in history. The streets of Paris flowed with the proletarian blood of the men, women and children of the Commune, defending to the last their freedom—their beloved Commune. Overwhelming masses of arms and men killed and slaughtered all in their path. A callousness and

disregard for life not previously seen in history exterminated the Commune. This white terror herded together thousands of Communards and shot them; 40,000 died in this way in a week. Those who escaped death were exiled to France's tropical colonies. There they died of starvation, fever and overwork. A few escaped through the Prussian lines to other countries. All this because the proletariat of Paris had dared to challenge the authority of the bourgeoisie to rule.

The wheels of history move inevitably forward. The power of the bourgeoisie occasionally swells to stimulated proportions and they manage to momentarily turn the wheels backwards. But the very development of their society strengthens the

already mighty arm of the proletariat so that their edifice crashes in one part of the world after another. In its scarred and chaotic place the symmetry and order of scientific socialism, the proletarian state, is built and mankind goes forward henceforth consciously unfolding and developing the laws of nature and making his own history.

"Workmen's Paris, with its Commune, will be forever celebrated as the glorious harbinger of the new society; its martyrs are enshrined in the great heart of the working class. History has already nailed its exterminators to that eternal pillory from which all the prayers of their priests will not redeem them."

## RAISING FUNDS FOR THE FIVE-YEAR PLANS

PROFESSOR S. TURETSKY (Moscow)

THE devastating effects on Russia of the First World War and of succeeding foreign armed intervention and the Civil War were such that in 1920 industrial output dropped to only 14 per cent. of the 1913 level.

Rehabilitation demanded enormous funds. When this task had eventually been accomplished and the 1913 level of industrial output recovered, the Soviet Government set out to build up a heavy industry which would be capable of providing machinery for the reconstruction of every branch of economy, with the ideas:

First, of mechanising and lightening labor to the utmost and raising the standard of living of the people;

Second, of strengthening the economic basis of national defence;

Third, of rendering the Soviet Union economically independent.

This, of course, necessitated the investment of incomparably greater funds than were required for rehabilitation.

The methods by which the Soviet Union obtained funds for these purposes differed radically from the methods of capital accumulation known in the history of capitalist countries, where heavy industry was built up with the help of big foreign loans or by means of indemnities extorted from weaker countries, as in the case of Germany, whose industrial development was based on five billion marks indemnity which she exacted from France after the Franco-Prussian War.

The latter method is abhorrent to the very character of the Soviet system. As to foreign loans, these were not available to the Soviet Union, as the capitalist countries were virtually subjecting it to a financial blockade. Under these circumstances, the country could rely only upon its own resources for the funds it needed.

The chief methods employed were the systematic increase of the productivity of labor and stringent retrenchment of all expenditures. In this

way, without the help of foreign loans, and at the same time preserving the economic independence of the country, the Soviet Government was able to find the enormous funds needed for reconstruction and for building up heavy industry.

In the years 1925 and 1926, it was able, merely by reducing costs of production in industry, to find an additional two billion rubles, in industry, to find for that period; and in the succeeding three years—1927 to 1929—to secure another seven billion rubles by the same means. In the fiscal year of 1929-1930, five billion rubles were invested in industry, as compared with one billion rubles in the year 1926-27.

In the period of the First Five-Year Plan, 1928-1932, sixty billion rubles were invested in building factories, mines, power plants, collective and State farms, housing and the like. More than 1,500 new mills and factories were put into operation during this period, while many thousands of old plants were expanded and enlarged.

Economic development in the period of the Second Five Year Plan, 1933 to 1937, was considerably greater than during the period of the first Plan. Technical reconstruction of the entire economy of the country was completed. This had necessitated gigantic funds. Capital investments during this period totalled 137.5 billion rubles, or more than double the total in the First Five-Year Plan. About half this sum was expended on industrial development.

By 1937, industrial output was 2.2 times greater than in 1932, and eight times greater than in 1913. Aggregate agricultural output increased half as much again in the period of the Second Five-Year Plan.

The Third Five-Year Plan, 1938 to 1942, envisaged a total capital investment of 181 billion rubles, or more than three times the investment under the First Five-Year Plan. These investments were designed still further to strengthen the economic might and the defences of the Soviet Union

and further to raise the material and cultural standard of the people.

How effectively this was being accomplished is indicated by the results of the first three years of the Plan, 1938-1940, prior to the outbreak of war. During this period 108 billion rubles were invested in industrial expansion and 2,900 new plants were put into operation.

The average annual increase in industrial output in these three years was equivalent to 14 billion rubles, as compared with an average of 10.5 billion rubles in the Second Five-Year Plan, and five billion rubles in the first. Agriculture, transport, trade and other branches of the national economy developed with like rapidity. The increase of the national output in the period of 1937-1940 was more than equivalent to the total national income of Russia in 1913.

The third Five-Year Plan, whose fulfilment was

proceeding so successfully, was interrupted in June, 1941, by the Nazi invasion of the Soviet Union. But the sums invested under the Five-Year Plans had now converted the Soviet Union into a mighty industrial power which was not only able to withstand the assault of Hitler's armored hordes, but to play a major role in the defeat of Nazi Germany. When the Soviet Union entered the war against Japan, the Red Army's mighty blows in the Far East accelerated the defeat of that aggressor and the termination of the Second World War.

The people of the Soviet Union have now returned to their peaceful constructive labors. By decision of the government, the Fourth Five-Year Plan is being compiled. In the five-year period beginning with 1946, regions devastated by German occupation are to be completely rehabilitated and the national economy is to be reconstructed, so that by 1950 output will considerably exceed that of the last pre-war year.

## ALEXEI TOLSTOI, GREAT RUSSIAN WRITER

HENRY ROVICH

(From "Moscow News")

ALEXEI TOLSTOI lived the greater part of his life in old Russia. The first decade of his literary career, too, coincided with the last 10 years of pre-revolutionary Russia. Yet he became a Soviet writer to the last fibre of his being, a master of Soviet letters, a zealous Soviet patriot—not by virtue of the times nor of circumstance, but by the very spirit of his work.

Memorable on this score is what V. M. Molotov had to say about him at the Extraordinary Eighth Congress of Soviets in 1936. "The previous speaker was Alexei Tolstoi, whom we all know as a writer," Molotov said. "Who does not know that he used to be a count? And what is he now? One of the best and the most popular writers of the Soviet land, Comrade Alexei Nikolayevich Tolstoi."

Alexei Tolstoi was born on January 10, 1883, in Nikolayevsk, Samara province on the Volga, and received his university education in old St. Petersburg. His first published work was a small book of verse which made its appearance at a time when reaction was rampant in the country and the Russian intelligentsia was still groping for an answer in the backwash of the 1905 revolution.

It is not surprising that the young writer, who had been brought up in an aristocratic environment and had been under the influence of various and sundry literary trends divorced from life, should have fixed his gaze on the past to the exclusion of everything else. The spiritual poverty of an order to which culture was alien, the cruelty of the landlord class, the degeneration of the aristocracy in the capital and the empty existence and brutal moral code of the provincial middle classes were

the subject matter of his short stories. Critical realism, the summits of which were the works of Maxim Gorky, became his guiding principle.

The desire to keep in step with the march of events and feel the pulse of life directly impelled Tolstoi at the beginning of the first World War to go to the Russian-German front as a war correspondent.

Then came 1917 and the revolution that swept away old Russia. Life broke through its age-old barriers and swirled around the writer who tried hard to probe the inner meaning of these events. He fathomed their full significance, but not without vacillations.

The Soviet revolution deprived Alexei Tolstoi of the old soil in which he had struck root. It destroyed the long doomed old order he had depicted; but at the same time it opened new prospects for him, supplied him with great themes and tapped creative powers in him of which he himself had not been aware. Tolstoi's work grew in stature and variety.

A few years after the revolution he wrote the first part of this trilogy *Tormentous Path* (Road to Calvary), dealing with the destinies of the Russian intelligentsia in the revolution and the birth of the new social order. Completed in 1941 when the Soviet-German war was already on, this trilogy is the best work of Soviet belles-lettres about the revolution of 1917 and the Civil War. As the successive volumes of this sweeping canvas of Russian society unquestionably reflecting the author's own experience in life appeared, one could trace his ideological growth and see how his understanding of the historical progressive purport of

events became more profound and how his affinity with the people building a new world grew greater and greater.

In his search for the historical roots of things happening now, Tolstoy turned to a study of the past. The publication of the first part of his *Peter I*, which earned him world fame, coincided with the first years of the great transformation of his country. The subsequent years of his life the author devoted to depicting two great figures in Russian history, *Peter I* and *Ivan IV (the Terrible)*. In both *Peter I* and *Ivan the Terrible*, a dramatic tale in two parts, Tolstoy portrays great nation-builders who realized where lay the interests of their people and called the latter to the struggle to raise their country to a place of honor worthy of it among the nations of the world. Only an understanding—and it came with the Soviet revolution—of the grandeur and difficulty of the tasks confronting the country could have armed the writer to create a work as significant as *Peter I*.

The Soviet epoch, which transformed old backward Russia into a modern, advanced country and won it a place among the great world powers, provided the new soil that nourished the writer and from year to year insured the growth of his talent. In this process his ties with the people, who are the principal characters in everything he wrote in Soviet times, grew stronger. In *Grain*, or instance, a historical novel, based on a vast quantity of documentary material, he ably conveys a picture of the people as builders and victors. Depicting the early years of the revolution, Tolstoy in this work portrays the arduous struggle of the people for their land and freedom and against the traitors to the revolution. Here he for the first

time in Soviet belles-lettres introduced the images of Lenin and Stalin as the leitmotif of the great conception of the struggle for a new life.

Understanding that truth can lie only on the side of the people, Alexei Tolstoy devoted his talent to their service. In doing so he did not limit himself to writing alone. He took the platform before the intelligentsia of all Europe to explain the humanism of the very being and aspirations of the Soviet Union. His voice could be heard in Paris at a time when the upbuilding of a united anti-fascist front could still have saved Europe from the plague of Hitlerism.

"I have not come here empty-handed," he said in his address to the congress of peace and friendship with the USSR held in London in 1937. "I have brought to you the young culture of our equal peoples who do not want to be alone in their struggle for the triumph of humanism in the radiant but contradictory torrent of human history. We are searching for friends to serve the cause of humanism. . . ."

With the outbreak of the Patriotic War, Alexei Tolstoy devoted much of his time to political writing. He spoke over the radio and wrote for the press, wrote leaflets for the front, urged his people to unity and staunchness and to hate the enemy. The patriotic feeling, sincerity and consummate skill he invested in his articles could not but stir the reader. Throughout he raised his warning voice against the inherent goodnaturedness of the Russian, calling upon his people never to allow the German invader "to wipe his bloody hands on his trousers and again promenade on the sidewalks of Berlin."

## BOOK REVIEW

### Creative Labour and Culture—Maxim Gorky

R. H.

**C**REATIVE Labour and Culture takes its name from the first of a collection of essays, newspaper articles and letters by Maxim Gorky, published by Current Book Distributors. All of them were written during the last ten years of his life when he was vigorously engaged in publicist work, and many of these writings appeared in *Pravda* and *Izvestia*.

There is a long and interesting introduction by Katherine Susannah Prichard which reveals the author as a man of deep sincerity, sensitivity and open friendliness; a man to whom the new Russia and the world owe much for his tireless help to the young self-conscious writer and for his unrelenting attacks on bourgeois intellectuals who scoffed at the true culture slowly emerging from Tsarist degradation.

Gorky exhibited the fullness of life which belongs only to those who ally themselves completely and actively with the cause of human progress. There is a freshness and life in these books, free from the taint of insularity and selfishness.

The three longer essays deal with the history of culture, with literature and philosophy. They are loosely constructed (only four of the fourteen pages of *Russian Literature of the XIXth Century* are devoted to a discussion of that subject) but lose none of their interest because of this. So many things crowd in: every turn reveals a new facet of what has yet to be done, or a patent example of the "decline of the West."

Gorky stresses the duties of the critic, condemns the tendency to adopt an omniscient attitude, to point to chapter and verse of Marx rather than to

the facts of reality, the living proof of Marx's teachings.

In the essay which gives the book its title, he traces the development of the "hero" from the ancient myth—"religious thinking did not arise from the contemplation of the phenomena of nature but arose on the basis of the social struggle"; "Hercules, the hero of labor" and "master of all trades," was eventually raised to Olympus among the gods—"to the best-sellers of today "the heroes of which are swindlers, thieves, murderers and detectives."

"On the 'Good Life'" deals with "fairly intelligent people who thought that ruminating on death made them more intelligent." He is ruthless in his appraisal of the contradictions of philosophy which seeks to reconcile people to a system which is the negation of humanism.

Much of the interest of the book lies, not only in its record of the ringing challenge flung out to the world and the Soviet citizens themselves, but also in its application to the Australian scene. How many of these replies could be addressed to members of our own pseudo-intellectual coteries!

The other essays and letters are concerned with the "little old men" who jump for joy when they read of self-confessed errors and shortcomings in

the Soviet press; the dwarfed emaciated Russian under the Romanovs and the Soviet man with his face shining in the new day; the successful struggle against well-equipped counter-revolutionary armies; the Red Army itself; the cinema; and finally, a letter in reply to an old woman textile worker who said she was "striving her utmost to 'stamp out my ignorance and become a still more useful person to our society.'"

There is a chronology of Gorky's life terminating with the trial in 1938 which revealed the manner in which his death two years before was hastened as part of a plot to remove leading Soviet citizens. This is dealt with in detail by Miss Prichard in the introduction.

Quite unintentionally, Maxim Gorky infused into his work his own vital personality. These essays, coupled with the intimate personal letters included in the Introduction, reveal him as a sensitive artist with a robust sense of humour, acutely aware of his early mistakes but completely unafraid to own them. He is in this book in firmer outline than in many an autobiography of a lesser figure.

"CREATIVE LABOUR AND CULTURE,"  
by Maxim Gorky—1/6 copy, Current Book  
Distributors.

## MIXED BREEDS AND PROGRESS

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

**WE** take sex for granted, because most of the animals which we know best have two separate sexes. But a number of quite familiar animals, such as the snail and earthworm, are hermaphrodites, combining the two sexes. So, of course, are most plants. A few animal species, such as stick insects and some woodlice, consist of females only.

Why are two sexes needed? It is perfectly true that in most animal species, including our own, the female cannot normally breed without the help of a male. But it is quite easy to get several species of insects, such as the silkworm moth, to breed without males. And it is fairly easy to get unfertilised frog's eggs to develop by chemical or mechanical means, while one author claims to have produced young from virgin rabbits, though there is a case for suspending judgment till his work has been repeated.

Anyway, in the course of evolution many species have done away with the male sex, or with the separation of the sexes; so one may fairly ask what is their value, and why are there generally two sexes in animals.

There are probably two different reasons. Inbreeding seems to be harmful to a great many kinds of living things. Darwin was the first to do

accurate experiments on this matter. He compared the vigour of plants produced by cross fertilisation and self-fertilisation, and found that the former were generally larger and healthier. This has been confirmed in a great many animals and plants. Sometimes inbreeding—whether by self-fertilisation or the union of close relatives—produces abnormality, slow growth, and sterility. This would be the case with human beings, if incestuous unions were allowed.

It is generally said that the ancient Egyptian kings married their sisters. Actually they usually had several wives, some being unrelated and one being a half-sister, that is to say, a daughter of their father by a different mother. This was a far less serious matter than a union with a whole sister, since new "blood" was constantly brought into the royal family.

With some animals, such as mice and guinea pigs, mating of whole brothers and sisters can go on for 30 or more generations without any great harm. But even here there is almost always a great increase in vigour and fertility once an out-cross is made.

Prolonged inbreeding of this sort always leads to a very uniform population. For example, if one

member of a line of inbred mice has brown hair with a white belt, all of them will resemble it in a high degree. So inbreeding can be and is used to fix any character in domestic animals which the breeder desires.

Outbreeding has also the great advantage that it allows the re-combination of different desirable characters. For example, if one race of wheat is resistant to frost, and another to the mould called rust, the first cross between them will probably not combine these characters; but they will be combined in some of the progeny in the next generation.

Thus occasional outcrossing speeds up either artificial or natural selection. The American biologist, Wright, believes that evolution occurs most quickly when a species is divided up into a number of small groups, each usually breeding with itself, but occasionally crossing with another group. This enables many different combinations of characters to be tried, but gives a chance for exchange of characters between those types which succeed. Thus the division of a species into two sexes is useful because it allows re-combination of this kind.

I have recently read several Nazi books on biology. They all appear to assume that racial mixture is a bad thing, and many of them state that the Germans should aim at becoming uniformly fair-haired, blue-eyed, tall, narrow-headed, and alike in all other respects. Such an ideal would, I think, be fatal to any people which realised it.

The importance of inborn characters has been greatly exaggerated. However, they do exist. I do not think that any amount of training would have made me a musician or a sprinter, though I have some inborn aptitude for mathematics and weight-lifting.

To meet the many different calls of life, it is surely desirable that a people should have a fair diversity of natural talents. If it had been the destiny of the Germans to order the rest of mankind about, as Hitler thought, there might have been some point in having them all alike. But — fortunately — they are not going to be a master race. They are going to have to work at a great many different jobs, and it will be a good thing if they are born with different aptitudes.

It may well be that different races, especially those whose ancestors have lived in one spot for ages, differ in their inborn abilities to a slight extent, each being adapted to its own way of life. This has been used as an argument against unions between different races. It is a bad argument, because modern men and women live in utterly new environments, and have to face new tasks. If the people of India are better capable than the British of standing great heat, a little Indian ancestry might be very useful for a British coalminer in any of our deeper pits.

No race has ever lived in an environment like a modern city, and perhaps different races may contribute different qualities needed in city dwellers. We do not know enough about ourselves to answer such questions with anything like certainty, even on the biological, let alone the social, level.

So far as concerns culture it certainly seems desirable that small nations, such as the Scottish, Irish and Welsh, and even groups which cannot be called national, such as the Cornish, Manxmen and Scottish Highlanders, should preserve their own traditions and ways of life, so far as they are compatible with modern methods of production. But it is also undesirable that any nation should shut itself off from the world, and inevitable and right that in a great city like London or Glasgow, men and women of many nations should mix. So far, as can be seen at present, the same thing is desirable from a biological point of view.

(World Copyright Reserved.)