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**Organ of Theory and Practice of the Australian Communist Party**

Editor . . . L. L. Sharkey
THE imperialist colonial system was indicted and placed in the dock at the initial meeting of the United Nations Organisation. That was the true significance of the struggle between Mr. Bevin and the Russian and Ukrainian delegations. The colonial system, from the point of view of democracy and world progress, is just as much a reactionary anachronism as is fascist Spain. It is a system of super-exploitation which brings continuous famine and death, incredible poverty and backwardness to its unfortunate victims. It is maintained by armed violence and refusal of customary rights to the colonial peoples. The survival of the imperialist colonial system in India, Indonesia and elsewhere contains the greatest danger to future peace.

Mr. Bevin may protest that Britain was the "target" for the attack on the colonial system. That is inevitable while British capitalism remains the greatest imperialist power in the history of the capitalistic system, directly exploiting some half a billion people and, through the subsidiary Dutch, Portuguese and Belgian Empires, a hundred million or so more. The complaint of the colonial and semi-colonial peoples, Syria, Lebanon, Egypt and Indonesia naturally was directed at British imperialism. So, too, would India direct its complaint were it allowed a free voice before the UN Assembly. So, too, would Burma, Malaya, Indo-China and the African colonies indict the British ruling class. While Bevin was wriggling, evading and shooting at UNO soldiers and police were shooting down, for the thousandth time, the Indian masses. That is the unanswerable reply to Bevin.

The interference in Greece has its roots in the strategic military defence of the imperialist colonial system. So, too, with Bevin's efforts to maintain the semi-feudal dictatorship in Persia.

To attack imperialism does not mean to attack the British people as Bevin slanderously asserted. Imperialism is the outcome of monopoly capitalism, in its search for markets, super-profits and control of raw materials to the exclusion of imperialism rival monopolists of other countries. Mr. Bevin was quite plainly defending the Anglo-Persian Oil trust and, in Indonesia, the Anglo-Dutch Shell Co. M. Vyshinsky clearly indicated this when he retorted to Bevin: "The Red Army fights to defend its country and not for the oil companies."

Bevin, charged with restoring reaction, including open fascists, to rule Greece, with the slaughter of tens of thousands of democrats, the imprisonment of thousands more, and the political persecution of hundreds of thousands and with the use of Japanese fascist troops against the Indonesian liberation movement, took refuge in specious demagogy and finally claimed that "Britain was insulted." That indicates clearly enough the full measure of his bankruptcy and moral defeat.

Bevin's only strong card was that the majority who had to make the decisions were representatives of imperialist powers. Hence, Bevin was assured of a majority vote and this was coupled with the fact that the Soviet representatives did not wish to force the issue to the point of breaking up the United Nations Organisation.

Joseph Stalin long ago summed up the attitude of such "Socialists" as Bevin, who in reality support imperialism, when he wrote: "In the era of the Second International it was usual to confuse the national question to a narrow circle of questions relating exclusively to the 'civilised nations.' The Irish, the Czechs, the Poles, the Finns, the Serbs, the Armenians, the Jews and a few other European nationalities — such was the circle of non-sovereign peoples whose fates interested the Second International. The tens and hundreds of millions of the Asiatics and African peoples suffering from national oppression in its crudest and most brutal form did not as a rule enter the field of vision of the Socialists. The latter did not venture to place the white peoples and coloured peoples, the uncultured Negroes and the 'civilised' Irish, the 'backward' Indians and the 'enlightened' Poles on one and the same footing. It was tacitly assumed that although it might be necessary to struggle for the emancipation of the European non-sovereign nationalities, it was entirely unbecoming for 'decent Socialists' to speak seriously of the emancipation of the colonies, which were "necessary" for the 'preservation' of 'civilisation.'" (Stalin, "The National Question Presented.")

Bevin, Makin and Fraser, leaders of the Labor Parties of Britain, Australia and New Zealand, declared themselves before the whole world as defenders of the imperialist colonial system, thereby forfeiting any faith a thousand million colonial people and the advance guard of the working-class throughout the world may have had in them in the fight for the liberation of enslaved Africa and Asia.

Nor can one remain a progressive within his own country if he supports imperialist reaction abroad. "Labor in a white skin," Karl Marx wrote, "will never be free while it is branded in a black skin."

It must not be concluded that UNO is of no use because of these happenings. A heavy blow was dealt the activities of the imperialists by these revelations. The task of peace-lovers everywhere is to strengthen organisation against war and to strive for the maintenance of the Anglo-Soviet Alliance in spite of the imperialist policy of the British Labor Cabinet, which is already under fire from vast sections of the British labor movement.
COMMUNIST REVIEW
March, 1946

UNSCIENTIFIC POLITICS IN THE B.M.A.

Dr. G. P. O'Day.

The Medical Journal of Australia, January 19th, contains a lengthy presidential address delivered by Dr. John Dale, the well-known Health Officer to the City of Melbourne, to the Victorian Branch of the British Medical Association, in which contains no word of the address is noteworthy because it is political, because it will be read by the medical men throughout Australia, and as these men are parochial Whigs in their writings and speeches affected to worship as mystic entities the German, Italian, and Japanese States respectively to all divine origin was ascended. While in reality they developed the most powerful material states with an enormous bureaucracy, armed forces, courts, jails, torturers and executioners. These states enforced servile obedience to the commands of the monopoly capitalists and big landowners.

On the other hand, the collectivists, i.e., the Communists, do not idealise the State. They regard it as, our law schools do, as an earthly mortal organ of power directed against the external and internal enemies of the rulers. Therefore when socialism is universal, the State will no longer be necessary and will be relegated to the museums. Then and only then, the collectivists say, will man attain the fullest possible freedom, individually and collectively.

We agree with Dr. Dale that two philosophies are opposite in the world today. But this is not new. Idealism and materialism have been opposed for 2,000 years. Today idealism is the philosophy of the reactionaries. Materialism is that of the progressives. Scientific medicine, like all science, is collectivist. Hitler, Mussolini and Tojo were idealists. So, too, is Mr. R. G. Menzies. Dr. Dale expresses great fear of centralised power and bureaucracy. Is he not aware that monopoly capital is the consistent and persistent foe of centralised power? However, he aims his blows at the collectivists who have shown in actual practice in the U.S.S.R., China and elsewhere that which is incompatible with central democratic authority — more, that socialism can only be achieved in the face of the tyrannic bureaucracy that Dale affects to hate.

Christian Science adopts the idealist approach to medicine. Dale comes very close to Christian Science in his address by stating that a wicked person cannot be well. This when America's pathologists have for all practical purposes done away with the book of Leviticus among others, as well as more than most of his sect — and doctors continually see wicked people well by all medical criteria and good people remain ill. Here is another utterance of Deles: "May we be at length delivered from those who are not so good for other people." Quaint isn't it? The good doctor evidently wishes to destroy the medical profession.
POST WAR RECONSTRUCTION
Of the National Outlook
WILLIAM HATFIELD

| MUST enter a plea for faithful reading of my article if criticism is to be levelled, as against the "Planners." We hope that the medical profession will not be deceived by Dale's confused and reactionary utterance. We would urge the profession to examine politics in the same manner in which they examine their patients, i.e., scientifically.

If they do so they will discover that the Labor Government is firm. Thus reforms must be examined on their merits in this our capitalist state and a non-existent bogey must not be allowed to obscure an impartial view. They must not assume that the collectivists (the Communists) are staunch enemies of bureaucracy and firm supporters of democracy. On the great issue of the day, let us hope that, as in obstetrics, the profession will devote some attention on the issue of this great order, and help to make its delivery as painless and smooth as possible.

Our policy is that we must draw our conclusions. They are simple and clear. This address reflects again to us the necessity of destroying the barriers of ideology which is the only way of doing this by the building of a Communist daily press. This is urgent today. Without the ideological confusion amongst the petty bourgeois, so clearly evidenced by Dale's address, the fascists could never hope to achieve a mass basis.

Now that we have saved our democracy from the foreign fascists, we must explain, explain and explain, as Lenin said, the Bolshevists did after the overthrow of the Tsar in 1917. Let us then think no sacrifice too great in our efforts to establish our press.

Great truths confront the people of the dangers from misleaders and charlatans is truly enormous.
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Language changes with social evolution. Man coins words to communicate thoughts and ideas. In the denotation by Webster's authoritative work. One is immediately struck with the superficiality, the perversion of meaning, for the first time in a verifiable fact. Sometimes, the definitions border on the ludicrous. But above everything else, the definitions are characterized by contributions to the real issues in contemporary class-divided society.

Are these defects deliberate? Yes they are. An interesting example is to be found in that "fount of all knowledge and final arbiter of man's wisdom" — the Encyclopaedia Britannica. Only of course in regard to social content, but even in the technical aspects of the art of defining words. In proposing the revision of Webster, one does so half jokingly, half seriously. Jokingly, because half the definitions are pretty much the same. Webster represents a wonderfully rich past, but if one pointedly wrote an essay on the word "revolution" or the word "collective," the result would be devastating. Analyze the words by the old dictionary; they are significant for the fact that the absence of words and terms connotes a lack of language. The language of the revolution is the language of the collectivist society.
PHILIPPINE PANORAMA

STAFF-SECONDANT A. KEEING

PART I

The situation in which the Philippine Commonwealth finds itself today has no exact parallel anywhere in the world. Its historical development, though not markedly different from that of other colonial territories—indeed there are some striking similarities between the Philippines and Java, India and China—has proceeded at a rather strange course in that for half a century it has been tied to the wealthiest country in the world, and one that has two ideologies for export, political democracy and beggar individualism in the finance-capital variety. It is necessary first to examine the impact of these forces by a rapid glance at past history, then to examine contemporary Filipino politics in the war’s aftermath, and finally to assess the position of the Philippines in the world today.

The discovery of the islands by Magellan during his circumnavigation of the world in 1521 was the starting point in their modern history. The great sailor took possession in the name of the King of Spain of an archipelago of 7000 odd islands in which the majority of the population were of Malayan extraction, with minorities of indigenous Negritos and of Chinese or white ancestry. Within the first half century Spain had conquered the great empire, though not without considerable violence and bloodshed. This rule by violence continued to be a feature of Filipino society for the next three hundred years and more.

To the internal peace and the exploitation of the rich products of the country the Spaniards built an extensive road system, at the focus of which they established the city of Manila, from which a strongly centralized military government operated. Big estates were granted by the Spanish kings to the most loyal soldiers and colonists, and these promptly introduced the feudal system which lasted until the 16th century. This was the only recognized method of extracting the maximum profit from a recalcitrant native population. Nor did the Spaniards see fit to alter it for the whole period of their domination. The owners of these great landed estates sublet parts of them in minute parcels to the former Filipino owners who, in return, were required to surrender between 50% and 60% of their produce. The very considerable mineral wealth of the islands was left unexploited while the production of secondary commodities was left to the village craftsmen or individual peasants.

The preaching and exhortations of the Catholic Church and its missionaries, although a powerful influence, did not fill the gaps in the democracy and industriousness suggested individually by the finance-capital variety.
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Early in 1930, various organisations of the working class and peasantry went on strike to protest against the economic policies of the country, in which all the emphasis was placed on the production of exports such as black iron and mineral deposits. Even at that time, no attention to industrial development, the proletarian movement grew and the main progressions of the various provincial councils was a few. A trade union appealed and united in the Committee for Labor Organization (C.L.O.) but the movement was still in process of organization at the outbreak of war.

In the provinces, however, a number of events took place. A question of peace was posed.zeugon in 1935 appointed a Fact Finding Survey. This body brought down a report which stated, inter alia: the average peasant does not enjoy his constitutional and inalienable civil and political rights. He cannot openly join associations or participate openly in any movement organized for his betterment without courting the displeasure of the landowner and risking being deprived of the land he tills.

Nevertheless it was during this period that the basis was laid for the underground organizations, one of which subsequently became the powerful Confederation of Peasants with more than 100,000 members in Central Luzon alone. And they provided the hard core of the resistance movement and guerrilla forces during the Jap occupation, just as today they provide the leading progressive opposition to the present totalitarian regime in Congress.

When the Japanese invasion occurred last in 1941, and MacArthur's forces withdrew, the property of vested interests, allowed himself to be manoeuvred into an untenable position on Bataan rather than attempt to prevent their use by the Americans, a large number of Nacionalista Party leaders, because of their long experience in collaborating with the Spaniards, found it easy to transfer their allegiance to Japanese fascist masters. They were made-to-order allies of Japan. Thus the Nacionalista Party produced some of the villains in Filipino history. Among these leaders were Laurel, Roces, Benigno Yulo, Osias, Vergas and most important of all because of his present role, Roxas. In view of the preposterous claims now being made by this Roxas of having been the 'spiritual generalissimo' of the guerrillas, as well as his close association with MacArthur, whose support he is seeking, it is only natural to want Osima for the Presidency of the Philippines. We must examine his record in some detail.

In the War Roxas was only a powerful figure in politics. A leading attorney, owner of a chain of newspapers and large landed estates, he was a member of the direct committee of about ten corporations, and was the legal representative of Soriano, multi-millionaire and richest man in the Philippines. When his organised resistance on Bataan was over, he left the Philippines, and a few weeks later arrived in the United States. Arthur W. RUDKIN, B Sc.

CRITICISING the followers of John Dewey's school of "Naturalistic Philosophy", a writer in the English scientific periodical, "Nature" even in his definitions of science he says, "Science is fashionable" up by other kind of philosophy. "Science is fashionably but not facts in the sense of "Naturalistic Philosophy". Socialism, which sought to unite political and economic by distorted intellectual theories, and the tendency of some scientists to convert Newtonian ideas among scientists, which were proving obstacles to both social and scientific progress. In the last thirty years or so of his life, Engels devoted much time and thought to collecting notes for a book on the "Scientific Basis of Marx's Thought", but his scientific discoveries cut down to the scientific principles of alienation, the notion of alienation as a way to explain why scientific research is still work, and in several cases is more effective than the scientistic explanation. Unfortunately, Engels did not live long enough to publish, and at his death his notes fell into the hands of the notorious the Philippine Government, his palatial house on top of the aristocratic Manila Harrison mansion and as his economic adviser, his powerful support for Roxas, and his activities in bringing turmoil and disorganization of the Philippines. The third member of the evil triumvirate is Roxas, wealthiest individual in the Philippines and the only one of the three not frozen by the U.S. Government, a Spanish national. One of the biggest feudal land lords in the Philippines through his family holdings, he has controlling interests in most of the commercial and industrial enterprises in the country, including mines, breweries, shipping and transportation, insurance and banking. During the Franco rebellion in Spain, Roxas became Franco's, a fascist, engaged in a powerful propaganda machine, in close relations with the Japanese government. When asked if he was a fascist, he replied, "(To be continued)"

SCIENCE AND THE FOUNDERS OF MARXISM

ARTHUR W. RUDKIN, B.Sc.

CRITICISING the followers of John Dewey's school of "Naturalistic Philosophy", a writer in the English scientific periodical, "Nature" even in his definitions of science he says, "Science is fashionable" up by other kind of philosophy. "Science is fashionably but not facts in the sense of "Naturalistic Philosophy". Socialism, which sought to unite political and economic by distorted intellectual theories, and the tendency of some scientists to convert Newtonian ideas among scientists, which were proving obstacles to both social and scientific progress.

Dahring and Ludwig Feuerbach, are devoted to criticism of false theories. The implications of scientific discoveries, put forward by contemporary scientists and philosophical writers, are also represented in the title "Science and the Founders of Marx's Thought", which seeks to unite political and economic by distorted intellectual theories, and the tendency of some scientists to convert Newtonian ideas among scientists, which were proving obstacles to both social and scientific progress.
German revisionist, Bernstein, who kept the manuscript hidden away for about thirteen years before he finally published it, was the first to publish it, Marx-Leninism and the development of science–the development of science, not the development of science, and not the development of scientist. In his view, science was not just the study of the natural world, but also the study of human history and society. He believed that the scientific method was the key to understanding the world and that it was essential for revolutionaries to master this method in order to understand the development of society.

The translation of the Russian work into English was done by a group of scholars who were part of the Communist Party in the United States. They were determined to make the work accessible to English-speaking readers and to spread the ideas of Lenin and Stalin.

The translation was not without controversy. Some critics argued that the work was too doctrinaire and that it lacked a sense of humanism. Others argued that it was too revolutionary and that it would lead to a tyranny of the state. Nonetheless, the work was widely read and became a key text for the Communist Party.
BOOK REVIEW

China's New Democracy (Mao Tse Tung)
JOYCE METCALF

NOW that Japanese imperialism and its dreams of a colonial China have been shattered, and in China itself the most reactionary of all the Chinese bourgeoisie has been forced to desist from its insane policy of civil war against the Communist armies and the poor of Communist-led territories, the questions arise—What sort of a society does the developing Chinese revolution now demand? What are the aims and the policy around which the great Communist Party of China must rally and unite the people to ensure the advance of the revolution?

The answers to such questions are given by Mao Tse Tung, leader of the Chinese Communist Party, in an article written in 1941. This article, a masterpiece of Marxist analysis and application of Marxist historical method, applies not only to China but to other semi-colonial and colonial countries.

Thus, although the first stage of China's revolution is still fundamentally bourgeois-democratic, and its objective demands to clear the obstacles in the way of the development of capitalism, this kind of revolution is no longer the same as the bourgeois class aiming merely at the establishment of a capitalist society, but a new type led wholly or partially by the proletariat and aiming at the establishment of a new democratic society or a country ruled by the alliance of several revolutionary classes.

China's bourgeois-democratic revolution is not yet consummated, nor can the Chinese bourgeoisie solve its fundamental tasks and problems. They are not, however, facing this problem alone, and the Chinese bourgeoisie themselves must solve it. Their problem is that of a country which is in the process of being transformed into a socialist state and an international socialist state.

The present task and first step in the Chinese Revolution is the establishment of the New Democracy, of the New Democratic Republic of China, which is a national policy for a certain historical period, transitional in character but a form indispensable and unalterable. What this New Democracy is—its politics, economy, and culture—how it is a necessary development and stage in the whole process of the Chinese revolution, and how the struggle for it is a part and a most important part of the world socialist revolution—is the main theme of Mao Tse Tung's discussion.

He shows how, since the Opium Wars of 1840, China's bourgeois democratic revolution has been progressing from a feudal country into a semi-feudal, semi-colonial and colonial country. Till the first imperialist wars and the Russian October Revolution, China's bourgeois democratic revolution had characteristics similar to those bourgeois democratic revolutions in Europe which were to smash feudalism and clear the way for the domination of the various national bourgeoisies of Europe. The Chinese bureaucratic class had also the task of opposing imperialism and establishing an independent bourgeois-democratic society.

After the October Revolution the bourgeois-democratic revolutionary movements in the colonial and semi-colonial countries changed their character. With the whole world participating in the international capital-proletariat socialist revolution, when the capitalist world cannot go on without relying more than ever on the colonies and semi-colonies when the socialist state has been established and declares its willingness to assist the struggle of the liberation movements of all the colonies and semi-colonies, at such a time any revolution of the colonies and semi-colonies against imperialism or international capitalism becomes a part of the new, world revolution—the proletarian-socialist revolution, and its struggling peoples become allies with the socialists and international proletariat in the front of the world socialist revolution.

Today can lead the Chinese people to overthrow feudalism and imperialism are the proletariat, the peasants, and the petty-bourgeoisie with the main responsibility on the shoulders of the proletariat and its revolutionary party. These are the basic forces that determine the destiny of the country, and without the guidance of communism even the democratic revolution of China cannot be realized, let alone the final stage of the revolution.

China cannot go the road of a capitalist society ruled by the bourgeoisie, says Mao Tse Tung, because in the whole world history, no international capitalist or imperialist state, nor is it permitted by socialism and the Socialist movement against imperialism. China cannot be wrestled from the Socialist state nor from the aid of the international proletariat. The Democratic Republic at which the Chinese people are aiming can only be ruled by an alliance of all anti-imperialist, anti-feudal people, by several anti-imperialist classes. It must have a governmental policy of democratic centralization, and be a system of peoples congresses of various classes in the country. The new China should be the country based on genuine, universal election.

As for the economy of the New Democracy, it must rest on the principle of restriction of capital. China's economy is still in a very backward state. Therefore, we cannot be satisfied with the yearning for complete property rights or restriction of small capitalist production. But capitalist production which "can manipulate the life of the people" must certainly be restricted by means of nationalization of large and medium Chinese "which possess a monopoly character," such as banks, railways, aviation, etc. Further, the New Economy will be based on Dr. Sun Yat Sen's slogan of "Land to those who till it," which means confiscation of big land holdings—not a socialist agricultural regime, but turned to private property of the peasants. Restriction of capital and equalization of land rights is the basis of the New Economy.

Eighty per cent. of China's population is peasant, says Mao Tse Tung. The fundamental problem of China's revolution, as of all colonial and semi-colonial countries, is the problem of the peasantry. The war of resistance towards Japanese imperialism was fundamentally the peasantry. Next to the peasantry the working people rank second in number. Without them China cannot exist because they are the producers of China's industrial economy. Without them China's revolution cannot succeed because they are the most revolutionary elements of the population and the led by the revolutionary Party, the Communist Party.

The mast of the Shih New China is appearing on the horizon, he concludes. "We should clap our hands to welcome it."

"Raise both your hands. The New China is ours."

SEAWEED YARN

PROF. J. B. S. Haldane, F.R.S.

DURING the war a new branch of the textile industry has come into being, based on a raw material which we can get in our own country and which we can produce in large quantities. The process of producing this raw material is a chemical one, involving the breaking down of the fibres from sticking together. The yarn produced is a little tougher than cellulose acetate or viscose rayon, but it is destroyed, not only by strong alkalis, but by soap. It is not, therefore, suitable for ordinary domestic purposes. It is, however, excellent for making materials which do not have to be washed. It proved useful during the war for various purposes.

The yarn can be made alkaline resistant by treatment with solutions of chromium or beryllium salts, by soaking in a solution of formaldehyde, or better, by a combination of two methods. The
product is said to be cheap, tough, elastic, and suitable for weaving or knitting. It can also be dyed satisfactorily.

But beryllium is expensive, and both chromium compounds and formaldehyde attack the skin, while formaldehyde (formalin) also irritates the eyes and respiratory passages. "It is remarkable," wrote Legge in 1933, "how acclimatised workpeople support atmospheres, vitiated with formaldehyde vapour, which a newcomer finds unbearable." But men and women should not be called on to support such atmospheres when they can be avoided by a proper ventilating system. It is essential that the trade unions concerned should see that what may be an important new industry starts with every possible safeguard to the workers' health.

All these safeguards may have been taken already. I hope they have. But if they have not, it is very important that conditions which may be justifiable in war should not be regarded as normal in peace.

The untreated calcium alginate yarn is easily dissolved by carbonate of soda. Several patents take advantage of this property. For a cloth, raw silk can be woven of a mixture of the soluble rayon and some other fibre, and then dipped in alkali, leaving the second fibre behind. For example, a yarn can be made from alkali-soluble rayon and mohair in such a way that the mohair is coiled round the rayon in a spiral. When a cloth woven from this composite yarn is dipped in alkali, the loose mohair fibres form loops on the surface of the cloth, giving an effect for which India will doubtless pay extra. I find it hard to believe that the stuff will wear as well as ordinary cloth.

I have kept to the last the greatest advantage of these new rayons. They are totally non-inflammable. This is partly because they contain a lot of mineral matter, partly because they take up a great deal more water, as compared with wool, from a damp atmosphere. It is this property, along with their ease of production, which has made them so useful in war. It is also a most desirable character in peace, particularly for use in nurseries.

Will these new textiles be fully used? I don't pretend to know. If we go back to monopolistic restrictions in peace-time, they certainly won't. On the other hand, if they are developed to the full, they may give our textile trade the chance of a fresh start after the war, a start on a British invention, wholly made from British materials.

In this case it will be very important to regulate the harvesting of seaweed. At present anyone can do it. If it is done indiscriminately, it will be done uneconomically, and this may also spoil our inshore fisheries, and the scenery of our coasts. In fact, a Labor Government could see that these discoveries formed the basis of a flourishing new industry, without ruining the health of workers or the amenities of the seaside. A Tory Government will no more do these things than it has stopped speculation in land and building materials at the expense of the homeless.

By the way, the whole invention is an excellent example of planned research, carried out by Speaksman, Chamberlain, Astbury and others at Leeds.

It has incidentally led to an analysis of the fibre structure which will be of considerable value for the study of immunity, and perhaps for that of muscle contraction.

It is we are to get off the mark in peacetime, we need more planned research of this kind, but above all the national planning which will allow it to be used in the public interest.
REACTION IN THE TRADE UNIONS
T. WRIGHT.

A BIG change has taken place in the industrial scene since the ending of the war. Immediately after the war, quickly the working class was involved in struggles of the greatest importance for the future of the trade union movement. The involvement of the working class, miners, and seamens by no means a question only of the industrialisation of an independent shop steward, or one of a legal technicality, as to whether or not a union deregistered by the N.S.W. Arbitration Court should be recognised by the employers. The struggle was to decide whether the industrial and other gains made by the trade unions during the war period were to be maintained; whether progress was to be made towards a forty-hour week and higher living standards; whether the Federal Labor Government was to follow a progressive policy in co-operation with the trade union movement; or whether the B.H.P., and Australian reaction in general, were to be permitted to develop attacks against trade union organisation and working conditions.

While the steel industry workers, supported by the miners and seamens, by their determination, brought a successful conclusion to the strike, it became clear that the critical phase of the struggle, the Federal Government and right wing leaders of the Labor Party and trade unions were pursuing a policy of capitulation to reaction. The trade disputes in Sydney and Brisbane, the Bannister and printing industry disputes, and a number of other actions of the workers prior to the steel strike, had shown a high level of militancy, and a desire of the workers to press forward with their demands for improvements in the strike-breaking role developed by the right wing in the course of these struggles reveals the subservience of the right wing leaders and the weakness of the majority machine of the Labor Party, which is defending the interests of the employers.

The tactics of the right wing traitors is to use any and all means to avert or end strike struggles, and to divert them into the "safe" legal channels of the arbitration courts. These right wing leaders, who only a few short months ago vied with the left wing in tending marriages in the system of compulsory arbitration, suddenly discovered that they had been in error, and that compulsory arbitration means the destruction of the trade unions with a panacea for all their troubles.

To proceed in its strike-breaking role the right wing has been compelled to conduct, in close alliance with the capitalist press, an unsympathetic campaign against Communists and all militant and progressive elements in the trade unions. The press, assisted by right wing trade union officials, gives a daily report of the fight within the trade unions against "Communism." In this anti-Communist campaign Australia has reached a second low in distortion and deliberate lying against the trade union movement.

Not the least factor in this anti-Communist incitement is the development of Catholic Action's conspiratorial movement within the workshops, unions and Labor Parties. "New groups" of Catholic Action members have been discovered in the documents of Catholic Action discovered and published by the Communist Party, seeks to extend its influence over the Australian Labor Movement, and to impose its policy of betrayal and class collaboration.

The policy of Catholic Action includes: prohibition of strikes; Court control over ballots and other internal affairs of the trade unions; collaboration with employers through "Industrial Councils," a conception based on the fascist "corporate state," to provide state regulation of private industry. To foist these poisonous ideas on the Australian working class, groups of selected Catholics are being organised on a workshop and union basis, together with an organised infiltration of the Labor Party, and a planned use of Labor Parliaments as a cloak for their sectarian activity. (There can be no doubt of the truth of claims of Catholic Action to have strongly influenced the anti-communist decisions of recent conferences of the Labor Party).

An outstanding example of Catholic Action disruption, sustained period, is the struggle in the Clerks' Union. Here certain government offices, staffed during the war with a large proportion of militant and progressive salaried workers, including many of the Catholic Action type, provided a more fruitful basis than would be found in the trade unions. It is now targeting the Executive for granting of clerks thrown out of employment during the recent ironworkers' strike. This is an attack on an elementary union principle means that in future industrial struggles, clerks would be faced with the alternatives of starve or scab.

Catholic Action also met with considerable success in disrupting the ironworkers' Union, but, as far as the Balmain dispute is concerned, Catholic Action confused that it acted as ally to a Trotskyite group. Regional successes have been recorded in Government workshops in the form of Catholic Action organised disruption against the shop committees, but there are indications that in some instances these successes have been overrated. Catholic Action is to concentrate the attack against individual Communists and militant officials, and by means of slander and lying charges, unprincipled "criticism" (spread by whispering, anonymous leaflets, stickers and the daily press), harasing litigation, and other means, to undermine and weaken their opponents. This dishonest and semi-criminal activity is so much in contradiction to their religious pretensions that apparently, a special system of indulgences must have been arranged for their absolution.

Apart from the activity in a number of work- shops and unions, there has been a drive in various Labor Parliaments in New South Wales, where Catholic Action and A.U.W. elements have taken the leadership of the right wing. It was inevitable that honest elements, previously acting right wing leadership, should revolt against the blatant strike-breaking role of this new leadership, and there is no doubt that in the course of the struggles to come the extreme right wing reactionaries within the Labor Councils will be defeated.

The methods of struggle against progressive unions include: expulsions and removals from office (The A.W.U. and Queensland Branch of the F.E.D., & F.A.); decisions to prohibit Communists from holding official position [Shop Assistants]; decisions to exclude Communists from trade union membership [Builders' Laborers. N.S.W.]. In the use, and attempted use, of these methods the extremities of right wing Catholic Action is prepared to abolish trade union democracy and seek to maintain its own position by dictatorial methods. However, these methods are so blatant as to be in conflict with the law, and the Courts would be obliged to decide against the scoundrel-type of right wing Catholic Action.

Special mention should be made of the reaction- ary clique dominating the A.W.U. Their chief method of action is to expel or suspend progressive elements in expulsion. Last year they expelled a number of N.S.W. Branch officials, including A.L.P. members, Bowen, Hughes, and Potts, and the recent expulsion of Jack Latimer, an A.W.U. Convention delegate with 40 years active union membership, is threatened with expulsion because he supported proposals for greater union democracy, annual ballots, readmis- sion of N.S.W. expelled members, affiliation to the A.C.T.U. and a more virile A.W.U. campaign for the forty-hour week.

To defeat the right wing it is necessary more than ever to establish the united front in action of the Communist, Labor Party and non-Party workers, regardless of religion, and to work in agreement with all progressive and honest trade unionists. The current struggles of the workers for the forty-hour week, an increased basic wage, shorter hours, and an end to sweating, factory amenities, etc., provides a wide scope for united action. The development of these struggles will reveal the treacherous role of the right wing and facilitate their exposure and defeat.

THE COLONIAL UPSURGE
R. DIXON.

(Abridged from a report delivered to the Central Committee, 19th January, 1946.)

AM in full agreement with the report delivered last night by Comrade Sharky.

We recall how, following the end of the 1914-18 war, the colonial conditions existed in a whole number of countries and continued to develop for years up until 1923, and that was a period when Communitist Parties were actually only coming into existence. Well, the end of the 1939-45 war is also marked by a growing revolutionary upsurge throughout the capitalist world and the existence in a number of countries of actual revolutionary situations. This general revolutionary upsurge and the revolutionary situations in some countries create more and more complications for the imperialist powers.

We know that within the great imperialist countries themselves the situation is not at all a happy one for the ruling class. If you take America, there is a tremendous strike movement, in fact, the biggest strike movement in the history of American capitalism, a movement which is playing a new role. But in addition to that, the morale of the American soldiers is not too good. There has been a demand that they must return home, which has created a flurry in the leading circles of the bourgeoisie. It is not much use for Mr. Byrnes, who wants to get tough with the Soviet Union if the army is throwing down its arms and demanding return to American democratic standards. This is the main factor causing them to pursue a more conciliatory policy than they were pursuing immediately after the war with Japan.

We witness significant developments in colonial countries. The war revealed the destruction of two great props of imperialism, Nazi Germany and Fascist-Military Japan. We recognise that that was a devastating blow to imperialism. But Imperialism rests upon the exploitation of colonial peoples. It is a sad fact that the collapse of the morale of American troops has had an influence on American foreign policy, and has been an important factor in causing them to pursue a more conciliatory policy than they were pursuing immediately after the war with Japan.
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vital to imperialism because of the very important oil to be obtained there, but also because it is a decisive military position of immense strategic importance. The United States are determined to maintain a stronghold there in order to maintain a Jewish State in Palestine. They have received a backing throughout the world. Truman has declared in favour of the survival of the Jewish State. But the Arab Kings met a couple of days ago and made it clear that Palestine will not be returned to the Arabs. Ernest Bevin has to tread a pretty sticky path between powerful contenders for the effort to maintain imperialism in the Middle East.

Further East we come to India, the brightest jewel in the British crown. Anything can happen in India, and it looks as if everything will happen in this year; 1946 will be of decisive importance as far as India is concerned. Britain without colonies would be in a parlous condition, unless she achieved, as a result of gaining independence, a thorough-going understanding with India that would enable maintenance of economic relations which would help stabilize the economic position in Britain.

Burma is also the scene of a very big struggle at the moment. During the Japanese occupation an anti-Japanese movement developed under the leadership of the Communist Party. This movement was growing in strength, and it was a very interesting one. There the British Government had set up a council of 10 members, and although the Anti-Fascist People's League, which represents the vast majority of the Burmese people, was refused a seat on the council, the Burmese Communist Party was given a seat on the council, because they wanted to see their own people have a voice in the government. The Burmese Communist Party, under the leadership of the Communists, is making good progress, and it is gaining influence among the Burmese people, and is using its influence in order to try to bring about a greater degree of democracy in the government.

The Parly in Malaya, in spite of its great record in the struggle against the Japanese, is under attack from the British. Just a few days ago we heard a report of the police strike in Singapore which, it appears, the police won or in any case the British had to agree to pay them for the period they were out. The police strike was a victory. We need to watch very closely the setup in Malaya because here there is a great amount of Australian Imperialism. From our observations and reports, there is very little in their efforts to restore the industries they formerly controlled.

Comrade Shaekey mentioned last night about the prestige of Australia and the Australian working class, and that the people there have faith in their government. There is a right throughout the Malayas, the Philippines, across to Indonesia in the prestige of the Australian workers and Communist political ideas.

You will see from this outline of the developments in the Malayan area and the Pacific area and a bit further afield, that the revolutionary struggle is today a world-wide and a world-wide struggle in the working class in this situation. It is a struggle where the imperialist task was rendered here by Australian moral support, far more than the practical support of the Australian workers to the leaders of the revolution. It is a struggle of the imperialist force of the Australian workers for their independence. It concentrated attention on the right of these nations to be independent.

New Zealand workers are winning a great deal of support. In New Zealand, the trade unionists are making a great deal of progress. What they have been and are in other countries, in purdah, behind veils, in the fields as slaves and children, is now becoming more evident. In Australia, as a result of a continuous struggle by a small minority of politically conscious women on behalf of their sisters, many of the legal disabilities have been lifted. Women can control their own lives, and they can have a government which is run for the benefit of the people, and not for a few.
ON FREEDOM OF THE PRESS AND THE RESPOsIBILITY OF THE PRESS

N. BALTUSKYS

When, in the autumn of 1944, Mr. Kent Cooper, Associate Executive Director of the Associated Press, stepped into the arena with the spectaculor cry of crass bias, he was in the environs of the real insight of the broad masses of the people for broader civil liberties, including liberty of the press. Oh no, and nursery schools for the pre-school child. The suggestion that there should be the responsibility that the Indu- stration Department should be strenuously sup- ported in its efforts to house the masses of the people, to educate the children, to provide them with health services and hospitalisation improved and that the most difficult problem facing the mother of several small children, the lack of any help with the in- numerable jobs in the home, must be tackled effec- tively, if we are to maintain, never mind increase, our birthrate.

International Women's Day is the rallying point for housewife, citizen and worker—they meet on common grounds as women and put forward their demands—demands that can only be fully realised in a socialist society—that actually have been realised in the Soviet Union. The U.S.S.R. Constitution states that “Women have equal rights with men in all spheres of economic state, cultural, social and political life. The equal right with men to education, work, rest and leisure, social insurance and education, State protection of the interests of mother and child, pre-parturition and maternity leave with full connection with work, protection of a wide network of maternity homes, nurseries and kindergartens.”
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It is true that the directors of the three mentioned news agencies make a show of having no political control over their organizations. Yet this is false. There are no such organizations as are generally supposed to exist. Instead of being independent, they are closely connected with the banks and large industrial concerns. The three news agencies are the American Press, the Associated Press, and the United Press. They are all controlled by the same group of wealthy capitalists, who through their newspapers, magazines, and radio stations, have a virtual monopoly of the news media in the United States.

The Associated Press, for instance, is controlled by the International News Service, which is owned by the Hearst newspapers. The United Press is controlled by the Scripps family, who own the Wall Street Journal and other influential newspapers. The American Press is controlled by the New York Times, the most powerful newspaper in the world.

These news agencies are not independent sources of news, but are controlled by wealthy capitalists who use the news media to further their own interests. They are not free from interference by the government, but are instead influenced by it. For example, during World War II, the government controlled the news media to promote its own agenda.

As a result, the news media in the United States is not a free and independent source of information, but is instead controlled by wealthy capitalists and the government. This has a significant impact on the news that is produced and distributed, as well as the views and opinions that are presented to the public. It is important for people to be aware of this, and to question the information they receive from the news media.
incorporating Great Britain, France, Latin America, Canada, Australia and New Zealand into an American Union. And it is by no means fortunate that both these arguments are politically and intellectually unsound. Those who are calling loudest for 'freedom' in general, and for freedom of the press in particular, are the most likely to lose it. For example, the Nineteenth Century and After, the frankest of the proponents of imperialist policy, recently wrote lines which follow: "The main defence of freedom abroad has, in this country, passed to a handful of Conserva
tives, who resist by protest against the disastrous agreement concluded at Yalta came exclusively from the Conservatives. Of course, not all the British Conservatives are pleased with the specific political aims of the American campaign conducted by Mr. Kent Cooper under the slogan "freedom" of the press. The Economist, for instance, bluntly declared that Cooper's slogan paved the way for the attainment of world hegemony by the United States with the assistance of the financially powerful American news agencies. To which Mr. Cooper retorted by accusing the Economist of wanting to retain the control of the world's means of communication in British hands.

Who is right — the Economist or Mr. Cooper? Both, it seems to me. In our era the "commodity" of reactionary news has become an effective instrument of capital into other countries and continents — an undoubtedly more effective one than the import of whisky, bibles and opium into non-capitalist countries in the early days of the spread of capitalism. And the role of the foreign correspondents of the reactionary press is far more important than that of the missionaries.

There are, of course, different kinds of newspapers, editors and correspondents and different kinds of proprietors, too. Some realize their responsibilities; some only dimly realize it; while some are absolutely irresponsible. But as the "commodity" of some of the bigger newspapers merges, begins in 1941, it is the American Press Agency and the "commodity" of the British Press Agency which has been growing considerably in handling the international affairs to which the big influential newspapers to which had before the war played up up the fascist news, had not in 1941 to expose them; whereas the Soviet Union, during the common war imposed on them by two great states, has not been able to get away with the same kind of evasion, the same kind of evasion, the same kind of evasion, the same kind of evasion.

At the time when the Berlin Wall was erected, the Russians decided that by previous agreement the Russians were to be the first to occupy Berlin. Could the editors of the Daily Mirror and the other newspapers who printed that canard have done it falsity even for a minute? It is hard to believe.

But as a rule, as long as the war was on, influential American newspapers continued to deface and vilify the Red Army by publishing false statements. In September of this year, however, the British government reversed the campaign of calumny against the Soviet forces of occupation in Germany. As though acting to order, British and American correspondents in Berlin began flooding their newspapers with absurd fabrications about the behaviour of Red Army men in Germany and Austria. When framing their stories of pillage, violence and black-market operations allegedly committed by Soviet soldiers, these cautious gentlemen, in order to avoid being convicted of lying, strategically avoided mentioning names, time or place.

Reactions newspapers of the type of the Observer and the Daily Mail are not the only ones that have distinguished themselves in this despicable campaign; many others, including Labor periodicals, are involved. One particularly vile article printed in the London Tribune called forth numerous protests from the readers of this "Left" journal. One of them, R. H. Barrett, wrote: "I am amazed that a Left paper should publish such a slander on the Red Army without a single word of truthful counter-slander, without even a remark, without any attempt to prove such wild and malicious statements."

Evidently the campaign of vilification of the Red Army begins with the aim of countering the widespread sympathy entertained in Great Britain and America for the Soviet Union. The Observer, for instance, incited the population of Germany. This was obviously the purpose of a slanderous fabrication circulated by the Associated press, the idea being to arouse distrust among the Allies with Hitler. And this reader quite rightly added, in reference to the complaints of pressmen at not being admitted to the Berlin Conference, that the correspondents were unwilling to assume any responsibility, while at the same time claiming the privileges of freedom of the press, the same as the paper's indignant because what was happening at the Berlin Conference was temporarily being kept a secret.

"The Russians are abducting Germans from the British sector. The abductions occur at the rate of one a day. The victims are scientists, technicians or policemen..."

The unusual proficiency of this British correspondent is that he did not confine himself to simply slandering, but supplied his slanders with the following fact: "It is much to be hoped that this frankness will lead to a quick transformation of a situation, which otherwise could lead to strained relations between the Allies..."

The display of such 'frankness' by the British correspondent beats his American competitors hollow.

Following this on (the other hand the Allied Press, the agency of the British government, in cooperation with the German government in Germany, launched a canard to the effect that the American troops were being formed in the Soviet zone of occupation in Germany; so collective farms were allegedly being organised in the province of Brandenburg, where a special department had even been set up for the purpose. The administration of Brandenburg declared that this report was absolutely unfounded. But the London radio, broadcasting in German, continued to feed the population of Germany with such putrid dishes — with endless descriptions of the "awful plight of the Germans," and with grossly distorted accounts of the policy of the Soviet Government and of the new democratic governments in Central and Eastern Europe. These lies broadcast from London day after day, for several months now, in excellent German, bear the obvious stamp of incitement, likely to encourage fascist sentiments in Germany...

But for all the efforts of the London radio and many of the English newspapers, their democratic propaganda was for a long time rather anemic. Until Reuters came along and brought it all the way up to the speak. On November 4 it distributed the sensational story that according to reports reaching London about a million Germans were meant to be shipped to the Ukraine and the eastern parts of the Soviet zone of occupation in Germany. This large-scale movement is supposed to begin tomorrow (i.e., November 5), it stated, and added that this was a measure apart from the transfer of Germans from Poland, Czechoslovakia and Austria..."

That same day all the big English newspapers raised a desperate outcry over the "influx of millions of Germans" which was to take place the next day. The Observer, for instance, said it would be "the most terrible thing to happen in Germany since the occupation zones of the Western Allies."

"This large-scale movement is to begin tomorrow" (i.e., November 5), it stated, and added that this was a measure apart from the transfer of Germans from Poland, Czechoslovakia and Austria..."

But since the first week of November 5 passed without the appearance of the "influx of millions of Germans" from the Soviet zone announced by the English press, some explanation of this strange fact..."
had to be furnished to the British public. And so, too, Germans, which, as Mr. Chancellor, its General Manager, assures us, always places reliable and unbiased sources above all other virtues, found what seemed a way out: it furnished the newspapers with a report of its correspondence at British embassies in Germany to the effect that "the Russians have apparently withdrawn their instructions."  

This was explanation No. 1. And the English newspapers printed it under appropriate headings—e.g., "Soviet 'Reprisals for Refugees, Mystery of Russian 'Terrorism'" (Evening Standard); "Soviet Orders Toned Down" (Evening News); "Soviet Censors Order to German Refugees" (News Chronicle).  

However, it soon transpired that there had never been any Soviet order for the expulsion of Germans, and consequently that it could not have been cancelled. The report was, in fact, turned out, applied only to "several hundred non-Germans," and in any case "they were not ordered to return to Western Germany at once." Matters having taken such a turn, it believed the worthy agency to issue explanation No. 2. Through the lips of its reviewer, Robert Lloyd, Reuters admitted that the false reports which had caused questions to be raised in the course of the Communist and had led the Foreign Office to draw hasty conclusions.  

"Were due partly to the unauthorised initiative of a district official and partly to a newspaper scab based on an inaccurate translation of a Berlin radio broadcast.

What was the panicKernel newspaper which suddenly loomed out of the thick fog of this explanation?"
SOVIET ECONOMY HAS DOWNSIZED FASCISM AND solved international problems, as history has, better than the forms of the Old Liberalism, and better than the Reformist and opportunistic Socialism, which supports Marxism and is fatal to the working class. These are the reasons why our French Party exercises a crucial influence over the formation of Party workers and officials. Many central and regional schools have been founded for the teaching of the doctrines of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin. It considers that one of its primary tasks is the Marxist education of the "elite" of French workers. Permit me to advise you do likewise.

Dear Comrades, we are certain that we are on the right road—the road that leads from formal democracy to real democracy. We shall persevere, without faltering, in the cause we have chosen irrevocably.

We have numerous foes. Like you, we meet with greater misunderstanding on the part of many workers, left as well as opportunists. But we shall remain faithful to our daily, patient action of propaganda and persuasion. We cherish all our hopes of the infinite possibilities of the people. We are sure that Communism is the future of the world.

The course of events after the war justifies our position with striking evidence. The advance towards Socialism is irreversible and inevitable.

But the struggle will be severe. It will cost Communists perseverance, efforts, sacrifices, great political devotion, exact appreciation of the balance of forces, unshakeable confidence in our Marxist policies and in final success.

Both our parties are confronted with the same reproaches. We are accused of professional propaganda in a sympathy for the White movement. We acknowledge that the Soviet Union has rendered immense service to the cause of all peoples. Its arms saved the world: it created a new order and it gave the peoples of all nations a glimpse of the great people of Great Britain and the people of France played the identical part of leadership in the history of the past. All intellectuals and minds admit that the sacrifices of Soviet peoples and the great genius of Stalin have cleared the road to a new world for humanity.

It is in Soviet Russia that for the first time in the world, the exploitation of man by man has been stopped. That is true progress, true democracy, the only true human morality.

Comrades, a few weeks ago, the World Federation of Trade Unions was founded here, in London, and later on in Paris. We consider this to be the greatest event of the year 1945. If, henceforth, the manual, intellectual and technical workers of the world were to unite, they, also, in the political field, would have discovered the only issue open to this stricken world for the attaining of peace and human happiness.

These young delegates, so numerous here, represent to my eyes the future of Great Britain. Before them lie exciting tasks: that of the builders of a new world. But, to fulfil their great mission, they must study and every day expand the possibilities of action and the forms of organization of the Communist Party. Such is the immortal teaching of Lenin.

A great Communist Party, well instructed, firm in discipline, skilful in action, will be able, on the other hand, to hold the old system, despite this threat, still search every road by which they can strengthen their position, find political strategies to improve capitalism and imperialism. Thus we face a new imperialism. We are living now in a period which will determine whether the capitalist world is going to be fully satisfied and, and the independence which we can achieve, even freed fully from the Dutch, will still be nominal, that of other small countries under the influence of big capitalist countries.

Although for many years we have been in a modern world, and although the society of our country has been changed and influenced by the existence and outlook of our people, especially in the villages, was still feudal. To maintain our subjection the Dutch retained all reeking of feudalism in order to restrict the development of our people. Thus for example government officials are merely tools made by the Dutch exploiters from the feudal heritage of our society.

Dutch exploitation sought its strength in alliance with the Dutch capitalists and even more so with the feudalism to become a special type of fascism. Colonial fascism far surpassed that of Hitler or Mussolini. It was the Latin state of the Sinhalese and the Chinese and the Dutch.

The fate of Indonesia is bound up with the experience of political crises, economic crises, and there exists the possibility of conflict and perhaps of another world war.

Indonesia is surrounded by countries under the influence of the capitalist imperialism of English and Dutch. The fate of Indonesia is an important factor in the world situation. The relations between the peoples countries and the other countries in the world.

Throughout the Dutch history, the Dutch have been the main force of imperialism, and the Dutch government and the Dutch, in fact, today, the Dutch, and, indeed, the Dutch, are in the beginning the Dutch and the Dutch have created conditions for the development of conditions in the Pacific, the Far East, and the Far East, and the Far East, and the Far East, and the Far East, and the Far East.

After the defeat of the Japanese and the defeat of the Japanese, the Dutch, and indeed, the Dutch, would not be in Indonesia except by going to the Dutch. They are in Indonesia except by going to the Dutch. They would not be in Indonesia except by going to the Dutch. They are in Indonesia except by going to the Dutch. They would not be in Indonesia except by going to the Dutch.
an enemy, we still permit the spirit of feudalism which still exists as a sort of nationalism. This would become nationalism with a vengeance if it were to set up the power of society in revolution. We must never forget that we are taking part in a democratic revolution led by the working class, not only of the rich, but also of the poor, not only of the landlords, but also of the peasants. . . . So in setting up the power of society in revolution, we must never forget that we are taking part in a democratic revolution led by the working class, not only of the rich, but also of the poor, not only of the landlords, but also of the peasants. . . .

Having defined the nature of our struggle as above, it is clear that nationalism must be led by democracy, not by superstition, and by not by nationalist groups, who have been slaves to fascism, either Dutch colonial fascism or Japanese colonial fascism.

The revolutionary democratic struggle begins with the eradication of all traces of Japanese fascism, which prevents understanding amongst those who are still influenced by Japanese instructions and propaganda. Those who sold their souls and honour to fascism must be separated from our revolutionary leadership (that is, those who worked in propaganda, Japanese secret police, those who took any part in the Japanese fifth column). All of them must be considered as traitors to our struggle and are not to be identified with the workers who worked for the time being only, to secure the necessities of life. Thus all political collaboration with the Japanese is mentioned above must be regarded as fascism itself, or a tool of fascist Japan, and is a betrayal of the struggle and the cause.

The State of the Republic of Indonesia which we create as a means in the revolution of our people. The struggle against Japanese fascism and democratic struggle, cleansed from all traces of Japan and its fascism. . . . The entire government must be democratically as quickly as possible, so that the majority of the people may participate in government affairs. This may be accomplished by setting up, and forming, bodies of the people from the village up to the highest government authorities. All means of authority must be democratically controlled so as to minimize dissensions among the people. With the formation of new means of government any difficulties can be straightforwardly worked out. This is the village itself, and the government will have the means which can be used in carrying out the democratic revolution in the social and economic sphere in the village. . . .

Of itself, too, our position in relation to the outside world will increase in strength. With the strengthening of the organization of our state in a democratic manner, the world will believe that we are quite capable of controlling our state and our people without disturbing the economic, political, and social life of the people of this country. As long as we live in a capitalist society, we are forced to avoid the enmity of world capitalism, and so must allow every capital with the reservation that the security of the state must not be disturbed.

Of great importance in our struggle is our attitude and policy towards the inhabitants, that is, those of European or Asiatic birth, Christians, Ambonese, etc. It is essential that we adopt a satisfactory attitude and policy towards these groups. Furthermore this can develop into a grave error, as we have seen in the case of Japan and Germany. In this stage of capitalism, the capitalist class is highly concentrated, especially in New York and London, and more and more there is a central control of world economy, especially in Wall Street. As a result of this we can see that the whole world is in a real economic crisis. These conditions make the world one international unit. Thus the resistance and struggle of the working class against this can only produce any result if this truth is fully realized. The activities and struggle of the working class must be on an international scale.

Our working class is now directing its struggle towards defending the State of the Indonesian Republic. This is as it should be, but . . . the national solidarity of the working-class must be raised to an international level, so as to be in tune with the struggle of the working class throughout the world. The excess of the spirit of nationalism can hinder the working-class from perceiving the international nature of the struggle, and may be the cause of their defeat, or at least of the retreat of the working-class struggle for their own country. It is essential that in the nationalist struggle the basis of the struggle is overlooked and forgotten, that they will be deceived or imposed on, it is necessary that in the nationalist struggle the working-class knows how to struggle for its own purposes.

The State of the Republic of Indonesia which we create as a means in the revolution of our people. The struggle against Japanese fascism and democratic struggle, cleansed from all traces of Japan and its fascism. . . . The entire government must be democratically as quickly as possible, so that the majority of the people may participate in government affairs. This may be accomplished by setting up, and forming, bodies of the people from the village up to the highest government authorities. All means of authority must be democratically controlled so as to minimize dissensions among the people. With the formation of new means of government any difficulties can be straightforwardly worked out. This is the village itself, and the government will have the means which can be used in carrying out the democratic revolution in the social and economic sphere in the village. . . .

Of itself, too, our position in relation to the outside world will increase in strength. With the strengthening of the organization of our state in a democratic manner, the world will believe that we are quite capable of controlling our state and our people without disturbing the economic, political, and social life of the people of this country. As long as we live in a capitalist society, we are forced to avoid the enmity of world capitalism, and so must allow every capital with the reservation that the security of the state must not be disturbed.

One of the most pressing problems of the moment is that of the youth. It cannot be denied that it seems as though the present awakening of our nationalism is largely represented by our youth. . . .

The private owners of the Bank of England have had a good run. For 260 years they have manipulated the country's finances to suit the interests of their class and to line their own pockets.
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