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ORGAN OF THEORY AND PRACTICE OF THE AUSTRALIAN COMMUNIST PARTY

Editor . . . . L. L. Sharkey.
TWENTY-TWO years have passed since Lenin's death, on 24th January, 1924. During those twenty-two years, events have proved the correctness of his theories. The intensifying crisis of capitalism leading to a new world war, the growth of Communist Parties throughout the world, the establishment of democratic governments of a new type were all foreshadowed in Lenin's writings.

For us, this article of Lenin's, "The Labor Government in Australia," written in 1913, is of particular interest at this time.

The Parliamentary elections took place in Australia recently. The Labor Party, which had a majority in the Lower House, having 44 out of 73 seats, suffered defeat. Now it only has 36 seats out of 75. The majority has passed to the Liberals, but this majority is very unstable, because in the Upper House, 30 out of 36 seats are occupied by Labor.

What a peculiar capitalist country is this, in which Labor predominates in the Upper House and recently predominated in the Lower House, and yet the capitalist system does not suffer any danger! An English correspondent of a German newspaper recently explained this circumstance, which is very often misrepresented by bourgeois writers.

The Australian Labor Party does not even claim to be a Socialist Party. As a matter of fact, it is a liberal bourgeois party, and the so-called Liberals in Australia are really Conservatives.

This strange and incorrect use of terms in naming parties is not unique. In America, for example, the slave-owners of yesterday are called Democrats and in France the petty-bourgeois anti-Socialists are called "Radical-Socialists." In order to understand the real significance of parties one must examine, not their labels, but their class characters and the historical conditions of each separate country.

Australia is a young British colony.

Capitalism in Australia is still quite young. The country is only just beginning to take shape as an independent State. The workers, for the most part, are emigrants from England. They left England at a time when Liberal Labor politics held almost unchallenged sway there and when the masses of the English workers were Liberals. This is the result of the exceptionally favorable, monopolist position England occupied in the second half of the last century. Only now are the masses of the workers in England beginning (slowly) to turn towards Socialism. And while in England the so-called 'Labour Party' represents an alliance between the non-Socialist trade unions and the extreme opportunist I.L.P., in Australia the Labor Party represents purely the non-Socialist trade union workers. The leaders of the A.L.P. are trade union officials, an element which everywhere represents a most moderate and 'capital serving' element, and in Australia it is altogether peaceful and purely liberal.

The ties between the separate States of Australia in united Australia are still very weak. The Labor Party has to concern itself with developing and strengthening the country and with creating a Central Government. In Australia the Labor Party has done what in other countries was done by the Liberals, namely, introduced a uniform Customs Tariff for the whole country, a uniform Federation Act, a uniform Land Tax and a uniform Factory Acts.

Naturally, when Australia is finally developed and consolidated as an independent capitalist State the conditions of the workers will change, as also will the Liberal Labor Party, which will make way for a Socialist Labor Party. Australia serves to illustrate the conditions under which exceptions to the rule are possible. The rule is: A Socialist Labor Party in a capitalist country. The exception is: a Liberal Labor Party which arises only for a short time as a result of conditions that are abnormal for capitalism.

Those Liberals in Europe and Russia who try to "preach" to the people that class war is unnecessary by pointing to the example of Australia only deceive themselves and others. It is ridiculous to think of applying Australian conditions (an undeveloped young country, populated by Liberal English workers) to countries in which a state and developed capitalism have long been established. (June, 1913, "In Australia," Collected Works, Vol. XVI.)
THE STRIKE OF THE IRONWORKERS, MINERS AND SEAMEN

L. L. SHARKEY

The origins of the decisive conflict between the B.H.P. and the Labour Party lie not only in the political climate created by the war and the events of the depression years preceding the war. The Broken Hill Proprietary controlling iron, steel and coal operations in Australia and linked with other important industries, banks and the press, is one of the most powerful monopolies in the country. Like its fellow monopolists of other capitalists it bitterly hates the labor movement and resists the end of the service workers to organise themselves in their unions and demands for shorter working hours and improved living standards. For many years, unionism was kept weak, by means of a system of inducements to the workers to continue their work and the strike-breaking bureaucracy, in a number of B.H.P. plants.

Immediately prior to and particularly during the war period, unionism grew numerically and strengthened organisationally in the various B.H.P. undertakings; particularly this was so in the case of the Ironworkers' Union. The first demand from the workers was the general growth of the labor movement including the election victories of the Labor Party.

The Ironworkers' Union was created in the early years of the B.H.P., and its allies, the millionaires press have striven as never before to discredit the Labor Governments and the Communist Party and to hamper the growth of the labor movement. As a result the fascist peril was not at its height the bourgeois press never ceased its floods of lies and calumnies and the whole labor movement. It hampered the Labor Government's efforts to organise the war effort and the trade unions in order to meet the production needs.

The bourgeoisie fears the new strength of the Australian working-class and in particular, as far as the B.H.P. section of it is concerned, the strong position of the Labor Party. It is no surprise, therefore, that this period it should wage a war, on one of these unions which had often proved a thorn in the side of the B.H.P., and its profits, the Ironworkers' Union. The destruction of the Ironworkers' Union would pave the way for similar attacks on the organisations of the skilled craftsmen, the engineers, mechanics, etc. These calls for higher wages and the whole labor movement would be weakened and the workers' demands for 40 hours and wage increase increased.

The Arbitration Court is an employers' weapon. In preparation for the B.H.P. offensive, it gave many decisions against the Ironworkers' Union. A Labor Party speaker recently asserted that the Court had 123 decisions against the Metal Trades' Union and only one in their favor, and that none one of the B.H.P., refused to accept its advice.

Not only has the Arbitration Court displayed its bias against the great fighting unions by rejecting their economic demands, but it has also undoubtedly displayed an equal class bias in relation to what can be termed political matters concerning the future of the union. This is revealed by contrasting its treatment of the A.W.U. bureaucratic hierarchy and of the Ironworkers' Union. Recently the Arbitration Court declared certain rules of the Ironworkers' Union to be "tyrannical" and "oppressive," thereby furthering the disruptive activities of an anti-union Trotskyite-Langite-Catholic Action group. The Federation is similar to those in industry of organizations. The Trotskyite-Langite-Catholic Action group works to undermine the laws governing union rules. The Court did not show the slightest respect for the Arbitration Court and despite criticism of the corruption of ballots and also by the Court, the famous A.W.U. bureaucracy was not deterred from proceedings. The N.S.W. branch, elected by an overwhelming vote of the membership, the former General Secretary, Stanley George, was expelled during the election of the ballot. Yet this form of political banditry is not regarded, it seems, as "tyrannical" by the Solomon of the Arbitration Court. The dictatorial methods of the B.H.P. are somewhat unusual privilege of a hearing before the Court while promoting a strike (heavily financed by the B.H.P.) against the Ironworkers' Union. The Arbitration Court re-registered the Ironworkers' Union over an issue, that as a rule on members being censured.

With the attack of the Arbitration Court and the Langiste-Trotskyite disruption proceeding, the B.H.P., launched its own offensive by means of a "black list" against the prisoners and an attack on senior rights at Newcastle.

The B.H.P., is hated by the working-class as the worst exploiters of the labor of the workers and the employers of the labor movement. The solidarity of the labor movement must be firmly而且 ، and in that case a comparatively easy victory. The B.H.P. could have been secured by the Unions. It has presented itself in the shape of widespread betrayal by the T.U.C. of the harmonious voice of the communist official and an attack on seniority rights at Newcastle.
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workers from contributing to the support of the strike. Every kind or treachery their diseased minds could devise they perpetrated upon the Ironworkers' Union. In their statements in the capitalist press and in a dozen Sydney Morning Herald leaders it is clear that the object of all reactionaries was to smash the Ironworkers' Union and deal a blow to the Communist Party. 

 Arbitration was the false issue posed by the right wing to conceal their treacherous behaviour. The Ironworkers were at all times prepared to go back to the Arbitration Court provided they received fairer treatment than had been the case in the past. The removal of Judge Cantor and also that the Labor Governments, which had been discussing altering the Arbitration Court, should speed up this legislation, and that the unions be consulted on the proposed changes. In this situation the workers viewed with suspicion the sudden decision of the Arbitration Court to de-register the Ironworkers' Union. De-registration links up with the numerous attacks made on the Ironworkers' Union in recent times—the filthy leaflets and stickers issued throughout the B.H.P. plants, and the attacks of the Trotskyite-Langster-C.A. disruptors in Balmain to smash the union.

 The wages committee supported the decision of the other Unions to participate in the strike. This other course was open at that particular time than to throw into the struggle stronger forces, and so the committee had unanimously decided to come to the aid of the Ironworkers' Union and to bring about a situation where reaction would be compelled to stop from its purpose of destroying the Ironworkers' Union.

Had Prime Minister Chifley supported the A.C.T.U. decisions, instead of evading them and hiding behind the false issue of the Arbitration Court, the greatest of victories for the Australian labor movement would have been won. Far from undermining the position of the Labor Governments, it would have enormously strengthened their position. If anything has undermined the movement, it is not a "Communist plot," but their own action in opposing the strike, their provocative action in regard to returning. 

The reaction was defeated in its main aim, the destruction of the Ironworkers' Union and the Communist Party and the weakening of the whole trade union movement. This would have left the workers at large in the employing class and opened the way for a general onslaught on the workers' living standards. The gallant intervention on the part of the miners, seamen and F.E.D.A. smashed the plans of the whole camp of reaction, ranging from the B.H.P., the Press barons and Catholic Action to the A.W.U. bureaucracy. The splendid solidarity of the miners with the workers was shown in the slender majority of 53 votes for a resumption of work. The reinstatement of D. Parker by the Industrial Commission is regarded, particularly by the South Coast iron workers and miners, as complete victory on the issue on which they strived and vindication of their struggle.

The general position could be summed up:

* The miners have reached agreement with the Governments on their 'Five Year Plan'.
* The Seamen's claims are receiving attention.
* The strikes on which the Ironworkers fought the B.H.P. — victimisation and seniority — are to be the subject of a conference with the B.H.P. and the unionists have the full support of the A.C.T.U. on these fundamental issues around which the strike was waged.

The success of the Ironworkers' Union would have paved the way for a general offensive against the workers. This conspiracy was defeated by the mass movement's spirit of striking ironworkers and the generous aid rendered by the miners, seamen and F.E.D.A. members. The Ironworkers' Union will emerge stronger than before and intern-union solidarity has been greatly strengthened among the workers by the actions of the miners, seamen and other unionists. These are permanent gains which have been won for the working class.

**Course of the Industrial Cycle After the War**

From "World Economy and World Politics," Moscow, May, 1945

**Professor E. Varga, World Economic Institute, Moscow**

The end of the war in Europe makes the question of the course of the world economy the most vital problem of the capitalist world a very actual one. What is in the making for the immediate future, or to speak more exactly, for the development of the first industrial cycle after the war?

It would be too risky to attempt to forecast even now the course of this cycle, all the more so because the lack of statistical material prevents any accurate judgment even on the present economic situation. Nevertheless, the Marxist method and understanding of the tendency of the economic situation which existed after the end of the first world war, and also such statistics as are available about the world capitalist economy—make possible a scientific analysis of the problem and an indication of the general line of the industrial cycle following on the war. Obviously it would be wrong to believe that after this war what happened following the last war will be simply repeated. There are quite important differences between the two periods of industrial life and, mostly, in the economic interests of the two great industrial blocs.

This results from the distortion of the economy under the influence of the war. In peace-time the most difficult problem for capital is the accelerating phase in a new industrial cycle, how to pass over from the commodity form to the money form of capital. The problems of realisation, or to put it in another way, the problems of the market, do not exist in war-time.

The military needs far exceed the productive possibilities which have remained unused in peace-time. As a result of the lack of markets, in the present war, the Government appears on the market as a buyer with unlimited purchasing power. Under war conditions, the capitalist has to worry not about the selling but rather about the transformation of the capital which he has in money form into productive capital. He has to strive to replace the elements of productive capital: labour power, raw material, fuel, etc., and to maintain the consumers' demands that sets limits to capitalist production, as is the case in time of peace, but on the contrary, the insufficient production sets limits both to the productive and to the unproductive demand of the civilian population.

The longer the war continues, the greater the extent to which the consumers' demands of society exceed its productive capacity. The situation set up, that is, the productive capital which is not renewed in this form, sits idle in the bank in the form of surpluses and the unproductive capital is unable to renew its form as a result of the shortage of raw materials, machines, buildings and labour power. The same takes place with that portion of productive capital presently used for accumulation. The income of workers, employees, officials and officers cannot be fully spent owing to the shortage of consumers' goods and the balance, therefore, for the most part sits idle in various savings funds.

All these immense sums of accumulated consumers' demands await the end of the war, and after the removal of Government restrictions will rush into the national economy. 

Thus all the prerequisites are present, after the ending of the war and a short period of difficulties in passing over from war to peace, for the beginning of the new industrial cycle. This case was after the first world war, but the period of rising production was extremely short.

Indices of industrial production show that the highest figure was reached in the U.S.A. in March, 1920, in Britain in the first quarter of 1920 and in France in November, 1920. Thus in the two most decisive capitalist countries, the U.S.A. and Britain, the beginning of the new cycle was in the first half of the war lasted only about fifteen months.

As for the costs of Continental Europe, with the exception of the neutral countries, all of them were so impoverished (in real terms) as a result of the war, that the effect of accumulated consumers' demands in the form of banking deposits and savings, and partly also in cash, did not lead to a rise in production, but to inflation. There was an effective demand for productive capital which developed only very slowly because in these countries the material elements of production were lacking—the raw materials, machinery and transport. At that time we characterised the economic situation of those countries as a crisis of under-production, having in view the fact that the low level of production was not the result of over-production and insufficient demand for goods, as is the case with the "normal" crises of over-production. It was due to a shortage of means of production, that is, to the insufficient industrial capacity of these countries.

Statistics also show that in the course of the brief rise of the productive cycle after the war, nowhere in Europe, as distinct from the U.S.A., did production reach the pre-war level. This level was not reached in France in 1923, in Germany 1927, England only in 1929, that is, immediately before the new world crisis of 1929-33. This means that after the end of the last war, the countries remained behind in six, nine and eleven years before their industrial production reached the pre-war level.

The index of wholesale prices after the last war showed a very low level, which was reached in the U.S.A. in January, 1920, and in Britain in March, 1920. But what is of even greater significance is the fact that during the 1920-21 crisis, although prices fell sharply they did not drop to the level of 1913-14; and this in spite of the fact that there can be no doubt that the rising productivity of labour lowered the value of products of the same quality throughout, which was the case before the crisis. The level of prices should have fallen below the level of 1913, but the strength of monopoly and the fact that the crisis resulted in a piling up of overheads on production, taxes, rent, interest costs, and so on) maintained market prices at a far higher level than before the war. And it was only with the collapse of the speculative bubble, in accordance with the fall in value, that prices fell even below the level of 1913. The artificial maintenance of a high level of prices through the 1920-21 crisis undoubtedly contributed towards the depth and sharpness of the crisis of 1929-33.
If we compare the economic consequences of the second world war so far as the capitalist world is concerned with the consequences of the first world war, we can say without hesitation that at the end of the present war the distortion of economy in the capitalist world will be much greater than in the first world war.

Although the 1914-18 war was also a world war, it was in great measure a European war so far as its direct effects were concerned. In the case of this war, the impoverishment, which at the end of the present war the distortion of economy in the capitalist world will be much greater than in the first world war.

Moreover, the difference in the economic situation of those countries which did not become a theatre of war operations, as compared with those which did, will be much greater. The economic situation in those countries not directly involved—in the first place the U.S.A. and the British Dominions, and to some extent also Britain, South American countries and the European neutrals—will be in sharp contrast with the economic situation of the capitalist countries over-run by Germany in Europe, which will be absolutely impoverished, short of everything and involved in a complete economic calamity. On the other hand, the U.S.A., also Canada, South Africa, etc., will come out of the war with their productive apparatus much increased and improved, while in the countries dominated by Germany the means of production will, for the most part, have been worn out or destroyed and their transport systems greatly damaged. For this reason, shortly after the end of the war the countries of the first group will be ‘countries of over-production’ while in the ravaged countries, as after the first world war, there will be a ‘crisis of under-production.’ But the territory which will be impoverished by this second group will be much greater than it was after the first world war. In the countries of Eastern Europe allied with the Soviet Union, this crisis of under-production will not be so sharp thanks to their closer economic relations with the Soviet Union.

Britain will occupy a kind of intermediate position. Although it was not a theatre of war operations, there was considerable material loss as a result of the war itself. In the course of the war it spent or lost a considerable part of its overseas trade and will come out of the war with a far higher indebtedness to its Dominions and Colonies.

According to the practically unanimous estimates of British economists, it will be necessary for Britain after the war to increase its exports by 50 per cent, as compared with pre-war, in order to import the foodstuffs and raw materials necessary to sustain the pre-war standard of living. In order to guarantee this, Britain will have to carry out a very flexible economic policy.

The existence in the U.S.A. of a greater and more efficient productive apparatus and the ‘deferred’ demand of some fifty billion dollar, will undoubtedly produce in the U.S.A. a short-term prosperity just as after the first world war. This will be directed towards consumers’ goods of secondary necessity, such as automobiles, refrigerators, television sets, furniture, etc., and as the production of which during the war was either stopped or strongly restricted. The demand for goods of prime necessity such as food, clothing and shoes will be only slightly increased in the production of these during the war was very little affected. On the other hand, the demand for means of production will in all probability be lower than before the war, with the result that the expansion of the productive apparatus during the war will be very great increase in prices. We do not, however, believe that this will take place. The gradual transition of economy to peace production, the maintenance of state control on prices and their regulation during the transition period, and particularly in the U.S.A., the surplus productive capacity of the other industries, partly also in the manufacturing industries, will work against the rise in prices in countries with stable money and will in any case weaken the rise in prices.

It must here be emphasized that although in the United States there is not a great rise in prices as compared with 1939, the same prices, justified by the productive apparatus, will still be above value. In so far as the increased productivity of labour has resulted in a reduction of the social labour time embodied in each unit, as compared with pre-war, it has not been able to reduce the prices should have been lower than pre-war. For this reason, in the U.S.A. in the post-war period, we should not anticipate any significant rise in prices, while in the other countries this deferred demand will be counteracted by considerable unemployment, shorter working hours and return to the pre-war Forces. This mass unemployment will result in a reduction of the current income of the working-class and, therefore, of its purchasing power.

Certain factors, therefore, will act in the direction of curtailing the length of the ascending phase of the industrial cycle in the U.S.A., which is assumed will follow the close of the European war. But on the other hand, a number of important factors will act in the opposite direction in lengthening the ascending phase. We refer to the most important of these below.

(Variety refining, the possibility of the Japanese War continuing for some time and thus easing the transition both in the U.S.A. and Britain. This paragraph is omitted.)

As for the question of prices, the increase during the war in the belligerent countries has been much smaller than in the first world war. There are two reasons for this—
production which in all probability will be more prolonged than the crisis of 1920-21. This crisis of over-production will in turn worsen the situation of the countries of continental Europe, which by this period will have raised their industrial production as compared with the extremely low level at the end of the war, but all the same will still be struggling to overcome the crisis of under-production and the danger of inflation.

After this post-war crisis has been overcome, and the stabilization of at least some European currencies has been achieved, a new full industrial cycle will begin. But this cycle will not be like the cycle of 1921-29 with its relatively strong ascending phase (especially in the U.S.A. and in Germany), but will resemble rather the crisis of 1929-37 with its depression of a special kind and will not reach the full phase of prosperity. The factors which then prevented the full ascending phase from developing—the sharp contradiction between the unlimited drive of capital for its expansion and the restricted limits of the purchasing power of society, and the consequent chronic under-employment of the productive apparatus, together with chronic unemployment—will act with even greater force in the case of the capitalist state.

Certainly it is necessary to emphasise that the Soviet Union, whose economy excludes the possibility of a crisis of over-production, will be a stabilising factor for the economy of the countries of Eastern Europe. The cyclical crisis of over-production in the U.S.A. and Britain will find its reflection in the economy of all other countries in the capitalist world, while the absence of crisis in the U.S.S.R. will be a benefactor in the development of the capitalist world economy.

POSTSCRIPT.

The following are points from a discussion which took place at the Institute of World Economy and World Politics of the Academy of Sciences at the beginning of January, 1948; a summary of which was published in the second and third issues of the Institute's journal.

It begins with a resume of Varga's paper, which follows similar lines to the full article printed above.

The first speaker in the discussion, which the Report speaks of as "animated," was Academician L. Trachtenberg. "To me it appears," said Trachtenberg, "that the post-war perspectives limited himself to a one-sided posing of the question. In his analysis Varga started from the assumption that the capitalist world will emerge from the war approximately the same as it was before the war, that the war has not introduced any outstanding changes in world economy. After referring to those changes introduced into world economy by the war," he continued, "and that "after the war Germany will fall out of world economy as a strong economic power," he added, "the international collaboration (Whatever the form and scale of this collaboration, it cannot fail to express itself in post-war economic development) and the immense significance of the U.S.S.R. in world economy and world politics." "In such fashion," concluded Trachtenberg, "I do not deny in principle the formulation of the question which Varga has presented to us. But I consider that it should have been supplemented by others. This would have led to a more correct understanding of possible post-war economic perspectives.

Later speakers in the discussion seem to have taken up this question. The divergence war-time changes would introduce; and most speakers concentrated on the degree of State capitalist elements that would there be and their effects, especially in U.S.A. and Britain.

One speaker, Caplan, pointed out that, while a report from the T.I.C. in Hungary was noticeable at the present retreat 'will take place only up to the first crisis.' "Once an economic crisis has broken out, any Government in peace time cannot undertake extraordinary measures for reducing unemployment and thereby damping down the crisis. The scale of State expenditure in the struggle with the crisis will many times exceed corresponding expenditure in the past..." Another speaker (Gorshkin) stressed the important difference between the effect of State intervention in war and in peace: in the latter the employers who developed was inevitable. "What is it how it will flare up again and again, will be renewed with ever increasing vigor, unless far-reaching measures are taken to improve the way of life of the Australian people."

Those are the facts about the present situation. The Federal Labor Conference, however, seemed entirely oblivious of them. Instead of a realistic appraisal, of the new situation confronting the nation, we heard Labor politicians and Reformist Trade Union officials saying that "industrial anarchy will remain in the future," and that "the machinations of the Communist Party," phrases put into their mouths by the capitalist newspapers. Still, we, who work daily, should pay eyes to the facts in that way they are riding for a fall. The old cry, "don't embarrass Labor Governments," which is always raised when workers insist on Labor Governments recognising their just demands, won't wash any longer. The Labor Party, which controls five State Governments as well as the Federal Government, is in a position radically to improve living conditions, and must do so. The workers are not in the mood to be trifled with. They expect results and have the organisation and power to enforce their demands.

Mr. Chifley made a strong appeal to the Conference for "solidarity in the Trade Union Movement. This is a sentiment we fully agree with. The Communist Party ceaselessly stressed solidarity in the Trade Union Movement. But solidarity can only be built on the basis of the interests of the working class. There can be no solidarity between strikers and strike breakers and the divisions in the movement today are so sharp because of the efforts of a reactionary clique of the strike breakers."

That is something that cannot be tolerated. It is in this sense the present intense industrial conflict that the ruling classes most clearly identify the State machine, in word and deed, with their class interests, as a weapon to enforce the submission of the workers to their policy.

"The Government must uphold the Law," they shout (B.H.P. Law of course). "The Unions must be fought! Mr. Chifley and the Labor Party must stand firm" (against the workers)! And in view of the strike-breaking efforts of the reactionary clique on the Sydney Trades and Labor Council, they gleefully declare that the struggle is one between "moderate Labor and the Communist Party" and identify themselves, the B.H.P. and other reactionary Labor movements with the State machine to the pleasure and satisfaction of the latter.

When the Federal Labor Conference, at the instigation of J. Ferguson of the A.R.U., joined in the attacks on the Federal Government, and the B.H.P., thereby identifying the conference with the worst enemies of unionism, it contributed not to the furthering of the solidarity of the Trade Union Movement, but to the dissipation of the Trade Union Movement.

In deciding in favour of a referendum to increase Federal powers the Labor Conference will be only following the current demand for a complete trade union movement. It is significant that the very people who fought against a "Yes" vote in the 1944
refereend—the B.H.P., capitalist press, Liberal and Country Party politicians down to the A.W.U. bureaucracy, the Langites and their soul mates among the workers, the Catholic Actionists, and the steel strikers in the present industrial struggle.

From the newspaper reports of the Conference it will be clear that there are many people, both within the Victorian Labour Party and outside it, who feel that it is necessary to take steps to prevent the spread of Fascism in the country. The Conference therefore decided to set up a Committee of Inquiry to investigate the extent of Fascist activity in the state. The Committee will consist of members of the Labour Party, trade unionists, and representatives of other political parties.

The move was supported by the major unions and by the majority of the delegates. It is hoped that the Committee will be able to complete its work within the next six months.

In conclusion, it can be said that the Communist Review is an excellent example of how a magazine can be used to spread knowledge and understanding about political issues. It is recommended that anyone interested in politics should subscribe to this magazine.
National Government, but national humiliation.

They make our Party their scapegoat.

Such a self-righteous but really blind and prejudiced attitude towards our Party, has already led to a number of defections which, if the basic documents were available to the people to judge for themselves,

We are confident that all honest Congressmen will see that this, in the prevalent circumstances, is the best course both for the Congress and our Party. It will enable us to put our policy before Congressmen and the people without let or hindrance. It will enable the Congress to act more naturally after three years of illegality. After all, how long will the ranks not ask the leadership: How is a brother fighting brother through their own path of the country?

By the conscious adoption of an anti-League and anti-Communist policy, the Congress leadership has, with its own hand, shattered not only our dream, but that of all genuine progressive, of seeing the Congress develop as the base and bulwark of the United National Front of our people.

As long as our country remains enslaved, the only hope for our future is through a National United Front of all popular forces.

In the extremely critical and difficult period that is coming ahead, we will ceaselessly work for the establishment of a Congress-Communist unity and create the basis of Congress-League-Communist unity inside one joint front for Indian freedom.

With full faith in the patriotism of our Congress and the other Congressmen who work as unity-crusaders, patiently explaining the just viewpoint of the one to the other, and by ourselves going out to resist the unjust claims of the one against the other.

Against the disruptors, we shall appeal to the commonsense of the common man.

Against the slanderers, we shall supply truth.

Against the prejudiced, we shall pit our ardent patriotism.

The greatest argument for our policy will be the growing realisation among both Congressmen and League that the harder they fight each other or us, the firmer will be the grip of British reaction over the fate of us all.

Today we may be alone in working against the tide, but it will take the world to resist the class struggle in Great Britain.

—How long can passion drown reason?

—How long can parochialism prevail over patriotism?

—How long can we remain apart and all under foreign rule?

What we say today all will see tomorrow through our experience. We work and shall continue to work for a common front against slavery and for common freedom.

We shall win and not lose, for ours is the cause of all.

LASKI AND BRITISH LABOR

DR. G. P. O'DAY

PROFESSOR Harold J. Laski, President of the London School of Economics and Political Science, said in the article, "Socialism and the Situation in Britain", that the Labor Party is "faithful to its chosen basis." He asserts that "the British Labor Party is built upon faith in democratic socialism. It believes in freedom of speech and freedom of political action as a right in the right to constitutional opposition. It seeks therefore by constitutional means to transform British society into a Socialistic one by using the common ownership of the means of production." And it also believes that "intensified struggle between the classes makes the task of democratic government far more difficult and encourages counter-revolution."

The British Labor Party clearly means to establish State Capitalism in Great Britain to a much greater extent than is practiced in Germany today. State Capitalism is labelled Socialism by Laski and Co. Public ownership of the means of production can obviously be either State Capitalism or Socialism. It depends on the nature of the State whether capitalist or proletarian and Laski disclaims any intention of changing the State. Laski therefore confirms the Moscow estimate (made on the 24 hours of Labor's electoral victory) that the British Labor Party's program does not transcend the bounds of the economic and political system established in Great Britain, and that Britain's foreign policy would not change, i.e., would remain imperialist.

According to Laski, the British Labor Party is opposed to confiscation and is going to buy out at market value the capitalist enterprises. Persons, faithless in the Laski sense but shrewd might regard the British Labor Party as a kind of benevolent organisation using the State's resources to rescue British capitalist concerns in their present situation and situation, to ensure the incomes of the rentiers and the financial oligarchs.

Laski hopes to avoid an intensified class struggle. It would be so unpleasant to his bondholders. It is certain, however, that this policy of the Labor Party will lead to the ruin of our country and not to its freedom.

Instead of carrying out such a policy, we commit it to our forefathers' duty to demarcate ourselves most sharply from it.

We are, therefore, directing our Party members to resign from the Congress. Our AICC members will have, however, not resign. They will answer the
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At the outset of the Stakhanov movement Stalin divined the strikingly progressive nature of the phenomenon. He saw it as the most important factor in the development of productive forces, containing the inception of the future culture and technical rise of the working class. He saw it opening the way for the attainment of the high indices of labor productivity necessary for the transition from socialism to communism and for the annihilation of the contradiction between mental and physical labor. The Party and the national state, equipped with Stalin's ideas, headed the Stakhanov movement, organised it and thereby gave it an extraordinary force.

During the Great Patriotic War, socialist competition and the Stakhanov movement acquired an unprecedented scope. In factories and mills and collective farms, popular initiative and creativeness expanded to their full power. Workers, collective farmers and intellectuals overfulfilled productive plans; in incredibly short periods of time they erected new factories, mines, and electro-stations, added new lines to railways, and cut through canals. Thousands, tens of thousands of efficiency suggestions were introduced, and led to a rise in the productivity of labor and to economies in raw materials. All this is a most important factor in the development of socialist production, and of tremendous military significance.

The basic laws of the socialist expansion of production were formulated by Stalin. In his Dialectical and Historical Materialism he declared that the transition to capitalism, which develops on the basis of a profound antagonistic contradiction between the social character of production and private property in the means of production, socialism requires a full concurrence of the socialist productive relations with the productive forces. Soviet economy has no crises of overproduction, which ensures an uninterrupted growth of productive forces as opposed to the cyclical development of capitalism. The continuous growth of production is the foremost law of the development of the socialist mode of production.

The reports made by Stalin at the Party congress contain the basic incentives to socialist competition, reaching its highest stage in the Stakhanov movement. One of the most important preconditions to that movement was the socialist character of social change which occurs with the transition to socialism. In Stalin's words: "People work not for employers, not for the enrichment of parasites, but for themselves, for their class, for their society." He called the Stakhanov movement "the most living and uncontestable movement of today." It is clear that the new progressive tendencies, arising as our economy develops, are grasped theoretically by our Party and its chief, Comrade Stalin, and put to use in socialist construction, possibly of doubt. What can this mean from the standpoint of the material position of the workers? It means that thereby the foundations have been placed for the continuing rise in the material and cultural position of workers and peasants.

Stalin's report on the results of the first five years points out how the development of a socialist industry and a collective agriculture in the U.S.S.R. have led to the liquidation of urban and rural isolation and to the development of wage labor among farmers. Village pauperism was wiped out. With the elimination of the basic causes of the impoverishment of the toilers under capitalism, the material conditions for the continuous rise in the material and cultural level of the workers of the Soviet Union. Stalin also pointed out that the uninterrupted growth of productive forces, stimulated by the socialist principle of distribution according to labor and by socialist competition, together with the development of socialist forms of economy, not only furnishes the prerequisites for the rise of the material and cultural level of the workers, but makes that rise an economic necessity. This is one of the most important factors of the crisis-free development of Soviet economy. "The systematic improvement in the material situation of the workers and the uninterrupted growth of their productive demands marks a continuous growing source for the expansion of production, guaranteeing the working class from crises of overproduction." Stalin expanded reproduction makes it possible to combine continuous rises in the material and cultural level of the workers with the uninterrupted rise in socialist accumulation. Socialist accumulation has as its source the surplus product created in socialist production. The labor of the worker in socialism produces not only the power, but must also give rise to a surplus product, which goes toward the further expansion of production in the strengthening of the country's power of defence and independence.

Up to recently, the view was widely held among certain economists that surplus product is an exploitative category, and that under socialism there is no surplus product. Stalin showed that this view is radically incorrect: surplus product exists in our economy, and without it you cannot build the new society. Labor under socialism must not only cover the worker's pay in accordance with the socialist principle of payment according to labor, but must also create a surplus product, which is necessary for the expansion of production, for the national defence, and for improving the condition of the workers. Surplus product is the material basis for the continuous rise in the material and cultural position of workers and peasants, and means for continuous socialist expansion of production and for ensuring the national power of defence.

The norm of socialist accumulation is set by the Soviet government in dependence on the costs
creases which arise in the process of socialist construction. But, taking into account the basic principles guiding the socialist expansion of production, can be formulated. The growth of labor productivity and utilization of commodity-money relations in socialist economy is related to the characteristics of socialist labor. The extent to which the socialist economy has formed the requirements of the socialist economic policy of the state. The social product does not work for a capitalist, but for himself, for society. But under capitalism the level of production of physical labor is in the higher phase of communism.

In addition to the socio-economic differences, significant are the various branches of the national economy. Whereas the distribution of the various branches of the national economy is based on the basis of a fortuitous movement of prices and profits, and on the basis of planned leadership making use of the law of value. We plan production and distribution of the socialist product not only in natural, but also in money form. In this case the law of value plays the role of an auxiliary tool of planned distribution of labor and means of production among the branches of the national economy.

Accounting for socialist labor in socialist economy is carried out in money form with the aid of the law of value. But, in contrast to capitalism, the law of value acts in socialist society not as an anarchic force ruling over men, but as an understood necessity. The Soviet state masters it and consciously puts it to use in the practice of socialist construction as a tool of planned leadership of national economy.

The productive plan envisages a definite growth in the economy. This means increasing the cost of production, that is, the decrease in the production of goods per unit of the value of the commodity. The cost of production is the product of the market, in order to purchase, with the money earned, the product. Hence, the man-inclusive satisfaction of their individual requirements.

The presence of kolkhoz-co-operative property makes kolkhoz trade necessary. The kolkhoz, and even the kolkhozniks, must realise a certain part of their production on the kolkhoz market. For the workers and employers, the kolkhoz market is an additional source for realising their pay. On the market, prices are set on the basis of supply and demand. From this we can see that the manifold satisfaction of their individual requirements.

The presence of kolkhoz-co-operative property makes kolkhoz trade necessary. The kolkhoz, and even the kolkhozniks, must realise a certain part of their production on the kolkhoz market. For the workers and employers, the kolkhoz market is an additional source for realising their pay. On the market, prices are set on the basis of supply and demand. From this we can see that the manifold satisfaction of their individual requirements.

Moreover, at the stage of socialism, there are differences between skilled and unskilled labor, between mental and physical labor. These differences have great economic importance. Skilled and mental workers create a greater value per unit of time than unskilled and physical workers, and should therefore receive higher pay, in accordance with the socialist principle of paying workers according to the extent to which they help to work. Increasing the pay of skilled and mental labor at the stage of socialism is a very important factor in socialist development and in the formation of an effective material incentive to improve. This results in a rise in socialist product and leads to the elimination of the distinction between mental and physical labor in the higher phase of communism.
of the resources of our economy. The Party and government, simultaneously setting in motion economic, political and ideological factors in realizing the most rapid growth in agriculture, ensure the tempo of economic development and the success of our economic policies. The Party and government are not only directing the economic development of the country but are also making great strides in the field of art and culture. The Party and government are firmly committed to the promotion of culture and art, and the development of the arts is an important part of the country's overall development strategy.

In the first part of the article, the author discusses the success of the Soviet economic system and the achievements of the country in this regard. The author notes that the Soviet system is a unique and successful model that has been adopted by many countries around the world.

ART FOR ART'S SAKE?

A. JACKSON-HUBER
(A New Zealand Reader)

The “Communist Review” for October published an article by an English Reader, entitled “Music and Politics.” The writer pleads for a broader approach to music than has been accorded by party leaders and workers. In the writer’s opinion, the problem of art and music is not simply an issue of aesthetics, but rather a fundamental issue of social and political philosophy.

In his article, the writer argues that art and music are integral components of the broader social and political landscape. He contends that in order to understand the role of art and music in society, we must first understand the broader social and political context in which they exist.

The writer goes on to discuss the role of art and music in the development of socialist society. He argues that art and music are not simply decorative elements of society, but rather powerful tools for shaping and influencing the social and political landscape. The writer suggests that in order to fully appreciate the significance of art and music, we must consider their role in shaping the values and beliefs of society.

In conclusion, the writer calls for a more comprehensive and inclusive approach to the study of art and music. He suggests that by considering the broader social and political context in which art and music exist, we can gain a deeper understanding of their significance and role in society.

The writer concludes by emphasizing the importance of art and music in shaping the future of socialist society. He suggests that by fostering a more comprehensive and inclusive approach to the study of art and music, we can help ensure that art and music continue to play a vital role in shaping the values and beliefs of society.
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HISTORIC LESSONS OF THE STRUGGLE IN GREECE

Resolution of the 11th Plenum of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Greece

On April 5-10, the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Greece (K.K.E.), holding its 11th plenary session, discussed the following subjects:

1. The activities of the Party in the past year since the meeting of the Tenth Plenum and the election of the K.K.E.
2. The organisational development and the adaptation of its organisational policy to the present needs of the work of the K.K.E.
3. The convocation of the Seventh Convention of the K.K.E.
4. The election of the Political Bureau.

It was decided to hold the Seventh Convention of the K.K.E. in 1945. All decisions were unanimous.

The Plenum unanimously approved the decision of the Political Bureau to reconstitute all committees and members of the "Old Central Committee" of the last period of the fascist dictatorship of the 4th of August.

The Presidium.

The Eleventh Plenum of the Central Committee of the K.K.E. meets at this historic moment when the war is terminating and the peoples of Europe and the peoples of the Red Army are taking up the fascist aims of the war, free to enter the road of securing the victory. The victorious armies of the Red Army, the armies of the Red Army in the East and the Anglo-American and French armies from the West, are approaching Berlin.

The new agreement, an extension of the Atlantic and Tehran agreements, demands the uprooting of fascism, guarantees the free democratic development of all countries and ensures the work of the liberated countries of Europe. Even in the satellite countries of the East, the Plenum has decided on the independence of the satellite countries of the East and the peoples of the Balkans, the Greek people succeeded in liberating their country and ensuring exemplary order and social peace.

The extreme reactionary Right tries to check the revolutionary work of peace and the normal, peaceful development of the tasks assigned by the K.K.E. and the National Liberation Committee for the peoples of the Balkan countries, the black market merchants of the people's hunger and misery with Guicksburg (King George II), as the most determinant bourgeoisie and black market merchants behind the scenes—all the vicious plutocratic world trembling before the democratic emancipation of the peoples, preventing the resurgence of their patriotic and national interests above the national interest and reacted from the very beginning against the National Liberation Front. There

* The National Council called after the elections in Free Greece in 1944 elected a National Assembly.
slurred the struggle of the resistance forces, bent every effort to halt and paralyse the effective procedure of the resistance forces, did not even hesitate to come out in an open, armed collaboration with the conqueror.

Alone, even before the formation of a national government, resistance launched the civil war, dislodging the invaders from the Middle East, in the internal scene of thousands of the heroes of El Alamein in concentration camps, in the Abraham line in the Allied armed forces. In the Allied front and the war fronts a strong army in fighting shape. In the interior, in collectives, in trade unions and in the popular associations, in the National' fascist organisations with Greek and Allied arms, it was a wide war and civil war together with the conquerors and against the struggling nation.

Even after the formation of a National Unity Government, Greek reaction did not abandon its aim to crush the people's democratic movement which constituted a guarantee for democracy, in order to restore fascism. For this anti-national purpose, Papandreas, a Premier of the National Unity Government, invited sizeable British forces to Greece even before the liberation of the country, to rely on them in his move to oust a monarchic fascist conspiracy. Therefore, instead of dissolving the armistice on the道理 alike, he armed them; instead of abolishing the State machinery, he retained them and reinstated them in the State services; to the whole of the armed people, he spread the struggle against the conquerors for the liberation and the ensuring of a normal, democratic, and free Greece to liberate the people from the yoke of the enemy. Owing to this policy our Party mobilised and aroused the whole nation around the national resistance war. It created the magnificent work of the organisations of the resistance—\textit{E.A.M.}, \textit{E.P.O.N.}, \textit{E.L.A.S.} etc.—the armed force of the people, which constituted a great and precious monument in the struggle which will very soon interior and abroad, a resistance war, basically because it is a struggle absolutely in accordance with the declared, moral principles of the KKE.

Our Party proudly salutes the whole people of Greece, the heroic fighters of \textit{E.A.M.}, of \textit{E.P.O.N.}, of Athens and Piraeus who astonished all of mankind with their heroism and self-sacrifice and raised themselves to the magnificent heights of the principles for which all freedom-loving humanity is struggling. Our Party stands reverently before the fighters of the \textit{E.L.A.S.} and all those who offered their blood as a libation for the realisation of those aims in our own country.

Our Party offers a brotherly, anti-fascist, democratic salute to the parties and the organisations of the glorious \textit{E.A.M.} which embraces the most vital, democratic section of our nation and constitutes a guarantee for the freedom, independence and democratic regeneration of Greece.

The Plenum of the Central Committee of the KKE testifies to the correctness of the political line and the tactics of the Party, the resolution of the Party to the struggle against the conquerors for the liberation and the ensuring of a normal, democratic, and free Greece to liberate the people from the yoke of the enemy. Owing to this policy our Party mobilised and aroused the whole nation around the national resistance war. It created the magnificent work of the organisations of the resistance—\textit{E.A.M.}, \textit{E.P.O.N.}, \textit{E.L.A.S.} etc.—the armed force of the people, which constitutes a great and precious monument in the struggle which will very soon.

The armed intervention of \textit{RNM} and the Resistance Movement which has brought glory to Greece, this most vital, anti-fascist power of the country which is the greatest achievement of the people in their struggle for the democratic regeneration of Greece.

The Plenum of the Central Committee also testifies that in the practical application of the political line of the Party there were some marked mistakes and deviations from the organizational and tactical positions of the Party and the Left which brought more difficulties to the course of our struggle for liberation and the upbuilding of the new democratic society and state.

The most serious mistakes of a Right character are:

(a) The agreement of \textit{Leonidas}, which did not correspond to the concrete correlation of forces.
(b) The agreement of \textit{Sotiriou}, which did not correspond to the concrete correlation of forces.
(c) The agreement of \textit{Varnavas}, which did not correspond to the concrete correlation of forces.

and, consequently, did not advance and ensure to the proper degree the realisation of national unity and national resistance war against the aggressor and reaction. The \textit{Caserta Agreement}, as a continuation of the Lebanon Agreement, was also an agreement of the same character.

(b) The endorsing by Communist members of the Cabinet of the Government's economic measures and its political attitude to the active intervention by the leadership of the Party in order to make clear the responsibilities of the K.K.E. in the face of the Greek government and its National Unity.

In particular, the Plenum of the Central Committee of the K.K.E. underlines the mistakes committed during the December conflict, mistakes of a military and Leftist political character caused by the incorrect estimation of the disposition and the role of the English Government of Churchill, the under-estimation of the forces of reaction, in the interior and abroad; the over-estimation of our own potentialities and, in the main, the lack of the necessary political flexibility. These mistakes prevented the Party leadership from having a clear perspective of the course of the conflict and brought them to miss opportunities for an agreement with the English military authorities under more favorable terms than those of the \textit{Varkiza Agreement} which led to the defeat of Athens.

(c) The call of non-combatant persons, also a defenceless population, the people of the country, to enter the armed struggle against the conquerors and defend the people's organisations of the resistance—\textit{E.A.M.}, \textit{E.P.O.N.}, \textit{E.L.A.S.} etc.—the armed force of the people, which constitutes a great and precious monument in the struggle which will very soon.

The armed intervention of \textit{RNM} and the Resistance Movement which has brought glory to Greece, this most vital, anti-fascist power of the country which is the greatest achievement of the people in their struggle for the democratic regeneration of Greece.

The return of the monarchy will be the greatest danger for the organisation and the sharpening of internal dissention at the expense of peace, of the reconstruction of the society and of the liberation movement in the Greek people; at the expense of the friendly relations with Greece and the democratic authorities outside, etc., etc., the circumstances in which reaction puts forth stubborn and furious efforts for the return of the monarchy.

The new government of \textit{RNM} is again a fascist government, an army-fascist government, a government of reaction and barbarism, the basic political aim of the Communist Party of Greece is again to oppose this fascist government, the fascist regime, the fascist state, the fascist army, the fascist nation, etc., etc., the circumstances in which reaction puts forth stubborn and furious efforts for the return of the monarchy.
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The new government of \textit{RNM} is again a fascist government, an army-fascist government, a government of reaction and barbarism, the basic political aim of the Communist Party of Greece is again to oppose this fascist government, the fascist regime, the fascist state, the fascist army, the fascist nation, etc., etc., the circumstances in which reaction puts forth stubborn and furious efforts for the return of the monarchy.

The new government of \textit{RNM} is again a fascist government, an army-fascist government, a government of reaction and barbarism, the basic political aim of the Communist Party of Greece is again to oppose this fascist government, the fascist regime, the fascist state, the fascist army, the fascist nation, etc., etc., the circumstances in which reaction puts forth stubborn and furious efforts for the return of the monarchy.
AN American actress described Russia as polite, a Party of Greece offers them with that; especially the "terrific." Terrific in solution of problems. Terrific to energy of reconstruction. And the problem itself is terrific. Flying-tree-top height on the eight-hour journey from Moscow to Prague, I saw, rolled out for hundreds of miles, a panorama of destruction which knows no parallel in Europe. Far away to the north, Leningrad had suffered appalling havoc. Rostov and Kharkov were towns covered in factories.

Stalingrad was a brickyard.

Reconstruction, however, proceeds at astonishing tempo. I compared Leningrad's new face with London's still-scared streets. It was hard without films and photographs to credit Leningrad's tale of destruction. For today Leningrad resumes its normal splendor, its normal order. The men, in the main, have been the workers who did it. Women lay bricks, splashed on plaster and paint and do a thousand other jobs reserved for men. Short of stature, strong of limb, Russian women work with skill, energy and intelligence. Many are mothers who, with their children, work night and day.

Families reassemble for the evening meal.

There is no stint of German labor employed on reconstruction and reconstruction. A German mechanic tends a car in Leningrad. A gang of Germans excavates a new road in Erivan. At Stalingrad, a thousand miles or so, tanks located German prisoners labour in street or factory. Germans even join in skilled jobs on the tractor.

A German woman may, if he is a skilled mechanic and industrious, be promoted to skilled tasks. Machine shops and foundries have been driven through the years. It was indeed essential. The influx of refugees brooked no delay. Twenty years ago, the city of Stalingrad was a field of mud-roofed houses and dirty, cobble-streets. The population was 27,000. Infants in Crast Erivan died like flies.

Today, Erivan's specious plan, made ten years ago by a famous Academician, is already out of date and plans are for a still more spacious plan for nearly half a million inhabitants. Erivan has grown into the splendid city of a civically proud people. Naturally arctic, the Armenians have experienced a burst of creative activity under the Soviet regime.

It is the same in Uzbekistan, one of the Central Asian republics. Tree-shaded Tashkent, its capital, is to my mind one of the finest cities in all the Soviet Union. Being by tradition a Moslem and has Christian city, it lacks pictorial art but excels in colour and decoration. Tashkent has now a population of 300,000. A city which a decade ago had neither theatre nor opera house now produces opera which would raise a storm in London.

Other things stand out in Tashkent: cotton mills which have nothing to learn from Lancashire or the U.S., and scientific cotton culture which has much to teach the world. I spent a whole morning at the scientific station with the agronomists who have grown cotton, brown, green and grey, and with a texture, where desired, approaching that of wool. It was pleasant to handle a blanket, like a sage-green country, of undyed cotton.

The progress of the young republics which have developed a new life within the Soviet Union is perhaps the most striking of all the sights I saw in Russia. The further story of that: development I plan to tell in a book to be called Soviet Russia in 1946.

Parallel to the story of the republics is the story of the youth I met and knew intimately. Youth whose years ran step by step with the Soviet Revolution. A youth which now, like the Republics, has come of age. My quest from first to last was to see what Soviet Russia had done for life; individual life, and the group life of the various outstanding nationalities. That is the question of the day. I sought the answer to that: it develop the people's lives—creative, inventive, progressive, living and lovable? None could afford to lose its youth. Germany, too, Eupeusia without an affirmative answer. Many things remain to be done. Shadows mingle with the lights, but the upshot spells success.

THE SOVIETS REBUILD

HEWLETT JOHNSON, Dean of Canterbury.

(From "New Masses")
The American Revolution took place in the early stages of that stormy period of world history when the thousand-year-old decaying feudal civilization of the world was awaiting its death blow.

Within the feudal society the infant capitalist mode of production was gradually undermining the ancient feudal foundations and their ancient feudal superstructure, thus creating the conditions for fundamental social and ideological changes. The accordant soil whereby oppressed peoples burst forth under new capitalist leadership in a series of great revolutions that truly transformed the western world. The American Revolution was an organic part of this momentous transition from medieval feudalism to the new capitalist mode of production, republicanism and democracy.

The wellsprings of the American Revolution and American democracy are to be found in the unique environment of the American continent. Our colonial civilization was imported from abroad and contained the precious substance of the most advanced social relations developed in Europe. European civilization in the 17th and 18th centuries was already stable and highly developed. While feudalism was a static social formation, and feudalism was still dominant on the Continent, in Britain capitalism was far advanced even before the founding of the American Republic. Unlike the French colony of Quebec (founded about the same time), which was a miniature reproduction of French agrarian society, in its feudal property of land, the English colonies to the south were started as capitalist enterprises, and it was the American Revolution that finished it off with a substantial feudal stigma inherited from the mother country.

The seeds of the American Revolution were planted in the colonies when Britain broke its ancient laws and hallowed traditions to permit the great and unfettered acquisition of land. What began as an advance against the feudal property of land, in the course of time, was to produce an unparalleled commercial expansion. The pre-eminent factor in this expansion was the exploitation of large-scale cotton, tobacco, and tobacco, the cotton grower of the world
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The Four Lineage Matrilinial Society.

THIS type of society has resulted from a fusion of two or two lineage societies and follows the same pattern as the two lineage society of this type of fusion is actually occurring to this day between the Wora and Ngarinyinyin people of the Gulf of Carpentaria and the Dagil people of the Western District of Australia, and this is how it happens. To follow our analogy, let one society be the Greens, another the Browns and the other the Blacks and Whites. Greens can only marry Browns and Blacks can only marry Whites, whilst the children take their lineage from their mothers. As the societies grow and mingle inter-marriage takes place. Now if a Green woman happened to marry a Black man she would regard him as a Brown whilst he would regard her as a White. She would call the children Green and he would call them White, thus the children would be both Green and White. As soon as the fusion becomes more complete all people have two maternal ancestors, Greens and Blacks on one hand and Browns and Blacks on the other.

In the process of fusion the totem is used. In the early stages one language and neither can understand each other very well, but on the question of marriage and relations it is important to know which lineage is the son of the other tribe belong to and so they adopt a common term for some animals or plant. Thus the Hawks and the Whales and the Kingfishers, likewise the Hawks would be called and the Whales and the Kingfishers.

The Nazi racial theory states that other races are inferior to the Germans and are women of criminal propensities, out to wreck civilisation. Though in particular the Jews are men whose ancestry have been falsely identified as Christians for several generations are as evil as Jews who keep every item of the Mosaic Law. The Negroes are only fit to be slaves. The English are only fit to be servants of the Asians. The Greeks are only fit to be servants of these Angles and of the Angles the descendants of the Angles and the Saxons with the Welsh, thus contaminating their Nordic blood.

The number of people in Britain and the U.S. hold similar views, which are used to bolster imperialism and the unfair treatment of coloured people.

The Dutch criminologist Bonger, who was terms are common to both tribes this would greatly upset them, for they wish to find out what relationship one is to the other the first question is 'What are you'? Kingfisher or Brown is just as good as Whites.

It was made law that a Green man or woman could only marry a Black man or woman, and as each individual had two maternal ancestors, a Green woman gave rise to a White offspring not a Green, and vice versa, whilst a Brown woman gave rise to a Black offspring not a Brown, and vice versa. Examination of the results singly mean this: A Green woman can only marry a Black man whose mother is Brown and whose father is White—she could not marry a White man and father, hence father-daughter taboo is eliminated. In the same way a Green man could only marry a Black woman whose mother is Brown but only marry a Black woman whose mother is White—Green man cannot marry a Brown woman and neither can understand each other very well, but on the question of marriage and relations it is important to know which lineage is the son of the other tribe belong to and so they adopt a common term for some animals or plant. Thus the Hawks and the Whales and the Kingfishers, likewise the Hawks would be called and the Whales and the Kingfishers.
fraudulent bankruptcy. In Germany they were a little more often guilty of insulting behaviour. But on the whole they committed fewer crimes than the rest of the population.

The differences are enormous in some cases. Theft and murder in Germany were about three times as common among non-Jews as Jews. But fraudulent bankruptcy in Hungary was 40 times as common among Jews as among others, and 12 times as common in Austria.

In the Netherlands there are figures not only for Jews, but for Protestants, Catholics, and members of no church. In round numbers, 54 per cent of Dutch were Protestants, 35 per cent Catholics, two per cent Jews, and seven per cent irreligious. The numbers convicted annually per 100,000 members of each religious group between 1901 and 1909 were 416 Catholics, 309 Protestants, 213 Jews, and 84 of no religion.

This is, of course, a complete refutation of the view, which we can hear on the B.B.C. on most Sundays, that religion is needed for morality. It is probably due to the fact that most of the members of no church were Socialists who took their obligations to the community seriously. This is borne out by the fact that the one crime which was almost as frequent among them as among others was "rebellion against authority."

The Jews, though law-abiding as a whole, had bad records for receiving stolen goods, embezzlement, and swindling, and ranked between Catholics and Protestants as regards murder.

The Catholics were slightly worse than Protestants in almost all respects, but there was no outstanding feature.

From 1931 to 1933 the differences between the religious groups were far fewer, and the Jews were intermediate between Catholics, who still had the worst record, and Protestants. The most striking change was that the Jews now headed the list for rebellion against authority, though they were below even the churchless as regards the frequency of murders. It looks as if they had become more conscious of social injustices and were not very tactful in their protests.

I have little doubt that English statistics would tell a fairly similar story. We should find the Jews less likely to commit crimes of violence, and more likely to commit various kinds of fraud.

This is natural enough. An agricultural labourer or a miner has very poor opportunities of committing forgery or fraudulent bankruptcy. A shopkeeper has many opportunities. A Jew is more often a shopkeeper than an agricultural labourer or a miner. Unless we know what fraction of shopkeepers were Jews, how many shopkeepers were guilty of fraudulent bankruptcy, and how many of these were Jews, we cannot say whether a Jewish shopkeeper is more likely to commit this crime than his Christian or atheist neighbour.

Certainly economic position is quite as important as race or religion in determining crime. Thus in Germany from 1874 to 1896 arson was 18 times as frequent among agricultural workers as among the professional class, while rape and such-like crimes were equally common in the two groups. Ricks and barns are very easy to burn if one loses one's temper.

National tradition is equally important. About 1930 one in every 4,500 Bulgarians was convicted of homicide each year, which is about 100 times the rate for Norway, or for England and Wales, the least murderous European countries. Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia were also very murderous, while Greece, Poland, Portugal, Finland, Hungary, Rumania and Italy were pretty bad.

Is this a matter of race? In Massachusetts from 1914 to 1922, persons born in Italy were eight times as likely to be convicted of murder, manslaughter and assault, as persons born in America. This looks bad for the "Mediterranean race" — until we discover that persons born in America, but one or both of whose parents were born in Italy, had just the same conviction rate as American-born children of American parents.

American Negroes certainly have a higher frequency of most crimes than whites of the same sex, but white men are much more criminal than Negro women, let alone white women. So if Negroes should be stigmatised as a criminal race, males should be branded as the criminal sex.

No one knows whether, if they were brought up in precisely the same environment, people of Jewish origin would be more or less prone to any particular sort of crime than others. We do know something about the effect of special teaching. Sir Percival Sharp found that in Liverpool 4.45 per cent of the children in Catholic schools were brought before the juvenile courts, 3.56 per cent of those in Anglican schools, and 2.16 per cent of those in council schools.

Similar results were obtained elsewhere. Of course, it can be argued that the church schools were mainly in slum areas. If so one can only say that good housing makes better children than religious teaching. Probably any teaching — whether in sectarian schools or "public" schools — which makes a set of children think they are better than their neighbours, tends to make them bad citizens.

Some day we may know whether racial differences are of any importance at all in determining crime. But we know already that they are far less important than differences in education and tradition.

* Columbia University Press, New York. 16c.
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