

than at Ballarat ten years later, and run up by Edward Henty and William Learmonth rather than by Lalor and Raffaello. When the diggers decided to fight at Eureka, there would have been cavalry to guard their flanks, and Eureka might have been our Majuba!

Oh, well, better luck next time. No wonder the Victorian government gave Buckley a pension in the end. If they had had an inkling of the amount of trouble he had saved them, they would have knighted him.

JOHN MANIFOLD

CHINA — THE OTHER COMMUNISM,
by K. S. Karol, Heinemann,
\$8.15.

THIS IS a book which no professional or amateur "China-watcher" should miss. It was written on the basis of an extensive four months tour during 1965.

The book is particularly noteworthy because of Karol's personal and political background. Now residing in Paris, and Polish by birth, he spent seven years in the Soviet Union, serving in the Red Army during the war and leaving the Soviet Union after the conclusion of the war.

A severe opponent of the Stalinist period in the Soviet Union and of the Communist movement, and a critic of many contemporary Communist and Soviet policies, Karol is no enemy of socialism. He has written widely on the Soviet Union, Poland and the Communist movement, having been Paris correspondent for the *New Statesman* and a contributor to the annual *Socialist Register*. He is currently writing for *Nouvel Observateur*.

The book is no mere travelogue. It is chock-full of history, commentary

on political, theoretical and ideological attitudes, interviews with top men in the regime and obviously faithful records of enlightening conversations with peasants, Commune leaders, workers, artists, students.

Correctly Karol dwells upon the fantastic achievements of the new China. He indicates that before visiting China he was personally convinced that the old regime was morally and politically indefensible but it was an abstract conviction. He had no real conception of the hell which was the daily life of millions of Chinese peasants. "It is often said", writes Karol, "that the Maoists are more the continuers of certain Chinese traditions than they are disciples of Marx. And, indeed, it would be absurd to deny that a traditionalist element informs their methods. But what other country in the world has known such a radical break with the past? The Russian rural areas were profoundly changed by the October Revolution, then by collectivisation. But in the time of the Czars the peasants did not sell their children or wives and did not live in a permanent state of near-famine.

"The Chinese revolution has advanced the peasantry—that means the vast majority of the population—more than 'twenty years in a day'. At one swoop it abolished hateful centuries-old customs. It has made an unprecedented break with the past, and to the new generation of Chinese that past will be (it already is) as incomprehensible as it is to us. I even ask myself if, for example, the young people who have grown up since the revolution fully understand why Article 3 of the 1950 marriage law states that the sale of children is vigorously forbidden in China."

Karol briefly discusses the Chinese army and soldiers. He points out that

we in the "Western" world are frequently appalled at inflammatory statements and articles appearing in Chinese journals which seem to call for the militarisation of the country presenting a spectre of aggression and conjuring up images of jack-booted, steel-helmeted soldiers "intoxicated with nationalism and possessed by the spirit of conquest." He claims, with complete justification in this reviewer's opinion, that the Chinese army is essentially defensive, that Chinese soldiers in no way resemble those of Hitler or Mussolini, but quotes Field Marshal Montgomery's advice to "western" leaders, given ten years ago, "Never land even a single soldier on the Chinese mainland."

One of the most interesting and enlightening chapters is devoted to culture, art and intellectuals and contains an extensive description of an interview with the since-deposed "cultural" leader Chou Yang. Returning to Paris after that interview, Karol was amazed to read of Chou Yang's "fall", for imputed to him were views which he vehemently argued against in the interview. As reasons for Chou's denunciation Karol advances the following: "while he was a supporter of art in the service of the people, he seems to have claimed a certain autonomy for the cultural section, an indirect co-ordination, and a more cautious indoctrination. He may, as they allege, have declared, in defending books which were not strictly political, that it is not by talking all the time about Chairman Mao that one best applies Mao's thought. . ."

However, one feels that for such titans of the Chinese Communist Party as Liu Shao-chi, Teng Hsiao-ping, Peng Chen, Peng Teh-huai to be denounced in similar terms to those used against Chou Yang, much deeper policy considerations were involved.

An extensive chapter *China and the World* comments upon the split in the world communist movement, the withdrawal of Soviet experts from China, the Sino-Indian border conflict, China's dubious association with Pakistan, relations with the ill-fated Indonesian Communist Party and the seldom discussed Sino-Soviet row over nuclear weapons. Karol's views on these matters are interesting and highly controversial. Often his assessments while obviously valid in part also contain many dubious and incorrect aspects.

In discussing the reasons for the growing isolation of China in the communist movement Karol is more penetrating. "A party", he maintains, "which succeeded in making a victorious revolution in its country is not necessarily the best adviser for those comrades who are struggling in other countries and in other parts of the world. It has inevitably a tendency to recommend the formulas which were successful in its own case, and its prestige is such that those formulas are uncritically accepted as if they were infallible weapons.

But revolutions neither lend themselves to export nor to imitation: they are "children of necessity" and the necessities are different in each country."

The author's conclusion is that a fundamental fact must be faced: "China is at the centre of world politics and too many things depend on her for one to be content to condemn or ignore her. Rather it is time to understand her."

Many readers will disagree with some of Karol's views and statements. Some may even be outraged by them. But no serious reader will lay the book aside.

JOHN SENDY