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OUR appearance was certainly not ignored, nor are different opinions lacking on our merits and demerits, as the letter pages show.

We think readers will note technical improvement in this issue, which also gives a little more opportunity to get the "feel" of the magazine.

Despite the wishes of some and the fears of others, ALR lays no claim to be spokesman for all the Australian left. However, ALR does aim to serve the left as a whole, in the belief that a prime requirement for the achievement of socialism in this country is a consensus of views and action among these forces.

Important features are discernible today, stirring hopes that a new stage may be approaching in the development of the Australian socialist movement.

The perennial conflict between left and right is finding new expressions and calling for contemporary solutions, the trade unions face new situations and the Labor Party struggles towards self-understanding. The Labor Party left, probably stronger now than ever before, is searching for a coherent social theory. The right, always hostile to theory, is launching a new campaign to force Labor to take over conservative policies, attacking every socialist concept in that Party's domestic and foreign policy. This will bring questions of socialist theory into still sharper focus.

And what other socialist theory really is offering except marxism?

By no means all, but certainly the majority of Australian marxists are to be found in the Communist Party, so the extensive preparations already
begun by that Party for its 21st Congress in June next year are significant for the whole left.

This Congress is orientated towards demonstrating the present day relevance of marxism to Australian conditions on vital questions of ideology, strategy, policy and organisation in the fight for socialism.

A magazine can best assist by developing the understanding and active participation of its circle of readers, clarifying what the issues are, promoting the exchange of ideas and seeking to interest new people in socialist thought.

These complex objectives are not to be achieved by any one type of article on any set range of subjects, and inevitably what suits one may not appeal to another. The best balance of such conflicting demands must be discovered in experience, and editorial policy has a lot to learn in this respect.

ALR has what we think is a unique position among serious political journals in Australia — the bulk of its initial circulation of over 3,000 is among industrial workers and other trade unionists, sections without which the achievement of socialism will remain a dream.

We are naturally proud of this distinction and aim to develop it further, while striving to expand and improve in other directions also.

Besides new ideas and new contributors, additional publications may prove to be necessary to meet particular requirements in different fields. But the first step is the one before us — to make a success of Australian Left Review.

We appeal to our readers for assistance.
The perspective of Australian foreign policy held by the present Federal Government was tersely spelled out recently for world consumption by Sir Robert Menzies: “Australia will in the next 20 years become more involved in international affairs, especially in Asia. She will, until somebody discovers a magical peace formula, need to sustain large and growing defence commitments.” (1) (Emphasis added.)

The statement, which on careful reading may be seen to indicate increasing militarisation for an INDEFINITE period ahead, should be considered alongside another masterpiece of succinctness—that of External Affairs Minister P. M. Hasluck in August, 1964: “There is no current alternative to using force as necessary to check the southward thrust of militant Asian Communism.” (2)

Elaborating his survey of foreign policy perspective, Menzies also said: “Governments will come and go . . . but the broad principles of national policy may be expected to survive.” (3)

Since early 1964, there has developed in Australia an unprecedented public debate on foreign policy which, by common consent, has deeply divided the nation.

Is this cleavage in public opinion concerned only with method and detail of application of otherwise acceptable broad policies? How, in fact, does the present government see these broad principles in the field of foreign (including defence) policy, with reference to Asia and the Pacific?

Mr. Hasluck, as Minister, described the “two consistent strands in Australian policy towards Asia” as:—

- The search for means of maintaining security “both by alliances and by arrangements for regional cooperation”, and
Consistent willingness to “assist in raising standards of living to help Asian countries to help themselves.” (4)

The practical application of these high-sounding “strands” by the Menzies and Holt Governments has included: military involvement in the Korean War, garrisoning of Australian forces in Malaya, and more recently in Thailand and North Borneo, participation in the South East Asia Treaty Organisation, combat involvement in the Vietnam war under U.S. command and increasingly based on a combination of regular army and conscript soldiers, orientation of military procurement towards the USA and of military organisation towards US forms, sustained refusal to “recognise” China and this year the upgrading of diplomatic recognition of the Chiang regime on Taiwan.

All of these steps fall under the heading of “search for security”. Examination of almost any government document on foreign policy in recent years reveals that the two most important aspects of the government’s policy for “security” are: (1) Active opposition to what is called the “Chinese Communist threat”. (2) The military alliance with the USA.

These lines of policy have been vociferously and almost unconditionally supported by non-government political forces such as those associated with the Democratic Labor Party and its inspirer B. A. Santamaria.

The Government’s concepts have been opposed consistently by, among others, the Communist Party (which has advocated an independent Australian foreign policy for peace and friendship (5) and, to an increasing extent from 1964, by the national leadership of the Australian Labor Party.

Direct opposition to the Vietnam war as “an unjust war” and a declaration of intention that a Labor government would immediately begin steps to withdraw Australian troops (6), are ALP policies that have amounted to head-on collision with US policy on Vietnam.

It is, however, of great significance to the Australian labor movement that the basic essentials of the Government’s policy continue to be supported by an important right-wing section of the Australian Labor Party.

This was shown clearly at this year’s conference of the New South Wales branch of the ALP, long the main centre of right-wing leadership in that party.
Since Mr. Oliver made reference to the Curtin (wartime) Government as authority for his policy (7 & 8), it appears that the ALP rightwing too believes that the "broad policies are unchanging." The facts, however, do not bear this out.

The real flowering of recognisably Australian foreign policy concepts came in the 'thirties, in the aftermath of the 1926 Imperial Conference (which agreed on Dominion autonomy in foreign affairs) and the 1931 Statute of Westminster (giving Dominion Parliaments full legal independence of the British Government).

In this period, which was also marked by consciousness of Australia's growing potential as a manufacturing country, the principal themes of foreign policy discussion included: the problem of seeing the Asian and Pacific region in sharp focus as required by Australia's own needs (particularly in trade) as distinct from the secondary consideration it had always received from Britain; the problem of national security, with special reference to the recognisable threat from aggressive Japanese imperialism; the importance of China to Australia.

In 1937 at the Imperial Conference Australia's Tory Prime Minister Lyons advocated a Pact of non-aggression by the countries of the Pacific, "a regional understanding . . . conceived in the spirit and principles of the League." Japan opposed it as a means of preserving the status quo, the USA said there were enough pacts already, and the Soviet Union's newspaper Izvestia (21/5/37) commented:

"Such a pact would coincide with the interests of all Pacific countries. Collective security in the Pacific would play a tremendous and possibly a decisive role in ensuring European peace and would be a powerful factor in preventing the terrible slaughter the fascist aggressors are preparing."

But it was the war itself that crystallised Australian thinking on foreign policy. The early-war Menzies Government, carrying hangovers of Nazi sympathies born of anti-communism and typified by the action in July 1940 of actively supporting the closing of the Burma Road into China (at the demand of Japan), was followed by a Labor Government.

Those in the labor movement interested in elevating the "American alliance" plank of foreign policy have made much of Labor Prime Minister Curtin's "pro-American" statement
in December, 1941 (see note 8). There is, however, a good
deal of evidence that if this statement, made 'in the heat
of the moment after Japan attacked, really represented the
Government's thinking at the time, it was quickly modified.

Professor K. H. Bailey (Melbourne University), writing in
1943 and noting that there had always been forces in the
Labor movement asserting a "vigorously independent Austra­
lian nationalism", said that Curtin had subsequently explained
that his 1941 statement "did not mean that Australia regarded
itself as anything but an integral part of the British Em­
pire." (9)

According to Bailey, the idea that Australian defence in
1943 rested wholly on American-Australian cooperation was
an "exaggeration", since in that year British material aid
was "probably not less than Lend-Lease" from the USA.

But the clearest formulation of the first comprehensive
foreign policy of Australia came in this period from the
External Affairs Minister, Dr. H. V. Evatt. Evatt, even in
the darkest days of the Pacific war, was not concerned only
with the problems of wartime relations.

In late 1941, Evatt was urging on Churchill the importance
of a closer political and military agreement with the USSR
that would embrace contingencies in the Pacific. After Japan
attacked, Evatt adopted, for the first time, the procedure of
an independent Australian declaration of war, as distinct from
announcing (as Menzies had done) that there was a state of
war as a legal effect of a British declaration.

The Labor Government's view, as expounded by Evatt, was
firstly that there must be an all embracing system of security
and also "Australia's own security", and secondly that "peace
and stability in the Pacific in the post-war period can be
achieved only by building a way of life in the Pacific in which
the varied nations and peoples can live together in peace and
prosperity . . . plans which take into account the legitimate
aspirations of the peoples. . ." (10)

Evatt developed this theme through to the end of the war,
insisting that the Atlantic Charter could and must apply liter­
ally to the Pacific, with its main points—no territorial aggrand­
isement, no territorial changes not freely desired by the people
concerned, respect of the right of all nations to choose their
own form of government, and security for all nations from
aggression and want after the disarming of the aggressor.
It is important to recall that Evatt and other members of the Curtin Government, were not merely ALP leaders but also reflected the will of a united popular movement in Australia backing the anti-fascist war, with the trade union movement and the Communist Party playing roles of publicly recognised importance.

And when Evatt said (11) "the opportunities for expansion of our industries in the areas I have mentioned and in Asia will be almost limitless", he was voicing the latent ambitions of sections of Australian capitalism. But this does not alter the fact that the whole spirit and tone of this policy towards other Pacific territories stood in marked contrast to what is happening today.

Speaking of the duty to promote self-government in the territories, Evatt said challengingly "the post-war order cannot be for the sole benefit of one power or group of powers . . . what we have to do is to develop a greater feeling of understanding, friendship and comradeship with each other and all nations." (12)

Evatt saw the USA as a very important factor in the Pacific of the future, but it was only one factor. The future, he said, would also depend on three other closely related factors: (a) a just peace in relation to Japan and its firm implementation; (b) establishment of a Pacific security zone within the context of the Declaration of General Security of the Moscow Conference (to set up an international organisation based on the equality of all peace-loving states, large and small—i.e. the United Nations); and (c) the positive policy towards the rights and well-being of all peoples in the region. (13)

The Australia-New Zealand Agreement of January 21, 1944, the first foreign affairs agreement between the two countries, made two very significant points:—

- Wartime construction and use of bases did not, of itself, afford any basis whatsoever for territorial claims after hostilities were concluded.

- There must be no change in control or sovereignty of any islands in the Pacific (whether or not they were formerly Japanese) without the concurrence of Australia and New Zealand in a general Pacific settlement.

Having in mind that at this stage of the war the USA was already straddling a big part of the Pacific islands with bases,
there can be no doubt at all that this agreement, along with many other Australian statements, was in part a warning to the USA that it must not assume the right to dispose of the Pacific in its own way.

Although Evatt, summing up the parliamentary debate (14) denied that the Agreement was aimed against the USA (the present deputy Prime Minister J. McEwen was one who had complained of this) Evatt made no bones about the fact that something was afoot . . . "It would be outrageous if Australia and New Zealand were not consulted. . ." (15)

In the same speech, he made it clear that the Australian Government regarded the Australia-New Zealand security zone as lying south of the equator, while the US strategic zone of interest should be to the north of the line.

This position was firmly retained later when the Australian Government, acting through Evatt, rejected US efforts to get Manus Island as a permanent naval base.

In the same 1944 parliamentary speech, Evatt expressed eloquently another theme which is implicit in all aspects of the Australian foreign policy of the period: "Australia has emerged from a prolonged period of national adolescence . . . the people of Australia have developed their own point of view and a mind of their own . . . we owe it to ourselves and to other countries to express it clearly and firmly . . . a positive Australianism." He explained it meant not jingoism, isolationism or imperialism, but a recognition of certain needs and interests, security, and development.

There is a profound difference between such statements and the following summary of Australian-American relations under Menzies: "My little country and your great country will be together through thick and thin." (16)

Harold Holt went even further with his "We're all the way with LBJ." (17) C. T. Oliver's speech to the Labor Party contains some of the same essence.

Dealing with China, Evatt's broad view was that "the future development of the people of China will no longer be obstructed by restrictions on their self-respect and their right of self-government. . ." (18)

In sum, the significant principles underlying the Labor Government's foreign policy of the wartime and immediate
post-war period appear to be: support for the world (UN) system of security against aggression and within that, a Pacific system and regional systems including one in the south-west Pacific, south of the equator, centred on Australia and New Zealand; military forces for self-defence; collaboration with Britain, the USA and others but on Australian terms; opposition to the return of the old colonialism in the region.

What has happened to these concepts?

So far as the ALP is concerned, much of the policy still stands on paper, although the references to the “cooperation with the United States in the areas of the South Pacific and Indian Oceans” are in such general terms that they are successfully used by rightwingers, in effect, to justify unlimited military “cooperation” with today’s US forces anywhere in Asia.

These rightwingers turn the former policy on its head to go close to supporting the “broad principles” of the Government’s policy, and “go slow” on such vital issues as opposing the Vietnam war.

The Menzies and Holt governments have completely distorted the basis of the earlier policies.

Concerning the United Nations, Hasluck in 1965, revealed a marked cooling off by the Government: “The General Assembly is not able to function as the great forum of the world. . . . At the present time the General Assembly and indeed the Security Council cannot be relied upon as a significant and effective means of keeping the peace of the world.” (19)

Concerning “security”, the Menzies Government abandoned the concept of “Australia’s own defence” and embarked, in subordination to the USA and Britain, on a series of military expeditions ranging from Korea to Malaysia.

But even this is not all. Early in 1966, possibly during the Humphrey-Harriman visit to Canberra, Australia collected a new political responsibility—to pressurise European powers into joining in the Vietnam war. Thus, Hasluck in New York (20) said: “China’s armed expansion against its neighbours—in South-East Asia, in southern Asia or on its western borders—is a threat to the security, for example, of Europe . . . this does not seem to be sufficiently appreciated by all the
European countries.” He further recounted his ginger-up.
Europe efforts on his return. (21)

As to the “Chinese communist drive south”, the Menzies-
Holt regime has always stuck to general terms. This is hardly
surprising, since there are no troops of the Chinese People’s
Republic outside her borders, not even on the offshore islands
still occupied by Chiang’s US-protected garrisons.

But the behaviour of Britain is instructive. Britain has
never treated the south-east Asian situation (e.g. in Malaya,
Singapore and Borneo) as anything other than local “sub-
version”. Big reinforcements in 1963-64 were occasioned only
by the Indonesian “confrontation” policy. In 1966, Britain
announced that the end of “confrontation” would mean
massive withdrawal of British forces from the SE Asian
region. Where then is the southward Chinese drive?

Additionally, any claim that the Vietnam war is justified
by INDIRECT Chinese pressure on Hanoi has been greatly
weakened in 1965-66 when it has been generally conceded that
the massive aid for the (North) Vietnamese Democratic
Republic and the southern NLF has come from the Soviet
Union rather than China, and further that Hanoi has been
following an independent political line including solidarity
with the Soviet Union. Logically, the Holt Government could
be expected to speak of a “southward Soviet drive”. But in
fact, the issue of Soviet aid to Vietnam—greater than China’s
could have been, is discreetly ignored by the Holt Govern-
ment.

It follows that the Government’s present policy is really
based on something other than “China’s drive south”, despite
the official statements.

A clue to this may be found in another Hasluck statement
March 23, ’65): “The participation of countries outside
Asia in its affairs is essential firstly to give to the smaller
countries of Asia security against the aggression that is arising
within Asia itself and secondly to bring the financial, techno-
logical and social and economic assistance that is needed for
the development of Asian resources.”

In short, Asia must be protected from itself (its unfinished
anti-feudalist anti-imperialist revolutionary movements); and
Australia is among those who aim to invest there.
It must be concluded that Sir Robert's "unchanging" broad principles have been interpreted in a fundamentally different way since the time of the Labor Government, and in a way dangerous to Australia.

This distortion of conclusions that were reached in the very different time of the anti-fascist wartime alliance is being compounded by the extreme rightwing in today's ALP in a way that cannot be allowed to pass unchallenged in the labor movement as a whole.

(2) P. M. Hasluck, House of Representatives, 11/8/64.
(5) The Communist Party summed up its extensive and detailed foreign policy demands in 1945 in the words "a foreign policy that will help strengthen international collaboration for peace and the expansion of world trade, and that aims at close friendship with our Pacific neighbors." (CPA 14th National Congress resolution, August, 1945.)
At that time, the Communists placed reliance on the Big Three collaboration that had already at the Crimea Conference mapped out lines of post-war cooperation; by 1948 the Communist Party had reassessed the position: "... the Anglo-American imperialists ... have set their course towards the domination and enslavement of the world." (CPA 15th National Congress, May, 1948.)
(6) e.g. A. A. Calwell, ALP Federal Leader, speech at Mosman, 21/6/66.
(7) "Right or wrong the United States is committed to the defence of South Vietnam and Australia is supporting that commitment." (C. T. Oliver, Presidential Address to ALP Conference (NSW), 11/6/66.)
The NSW President (Mr. C. Oliver) chose to lay great stress on the American alliance in his endorsed presidential address and the conference adopted proposals in the same tone.
(8) Oliver quoted Prime Minister John Curtin's controversial statement of 27/12/41: "Without inhibitions of any kind, I make it quite clear that Australia looks to America free of any pangs as to our traditional links of kinship with the United Kingdom." He used Curtin as authority for the concept of "fighting them away from Australia's shores".
(9) "Australia and The Pacific", prepared by Australian Institute of International Affairs, 1943, for American study (Princeton University Press, 1944).
(10) Speech to Overseas Press Club, New York, 28/4/43.
(11) Address at Hurstville, NSW, 4/8/43.
(12) Address to San Francisco Institute of Pacific Relations, 6/12/45.
(13) Ibid.
(14) Evatt, House of Representatives, 30/3/44.
(15) Ibid.
(16) Menzies' address to America-Australia Association, New York, 29/6/64.
(17) Holt, speech at White House, 29/6/66, following announcement of first US bombing of Hanoi and Haiphong.
(18) Evatt, House of Representatives, 3/9/42.
(19) Hasluck, House of Representatives, 23/6/65.
JOHN Sendy's article, "Democracy and the Communist Party" (ALR No 1) was thoughtful and refreshingly candid in its treatment of a subject which has in the past notoriously been regarded as sensitive and even dangerous.

My main complaint about the article is that, having opened the gate on some radical views, he was rather shy of deciding his attitude to his guests. Thus he quotes four steps to improve Party democracy proposed by K. S. Karol and adds: "These views are quoted here, not because the writer necessarily agrees with them, but because they are widely held in one form or another."

The matter is left there. But surely we will not get far until we realise that general statements favoring greater Party democracy must be fortified by arguments for and against specific proposals to realise such an objective. We must be prepared to stick our necks out, to experiment, and to be wrong, if we are to make headway in what is a vital consideration for us.

This does not, of course, mean that we have to state an emphatic position on all propositions, but we have to examine their pros and cons. For example, I am genuinely torn on the question of the desirability of allowing groups or factions to operate within the Party. One thing that strikes me is that factions were outlawed in the Soviet party in 1921; in other words the Russian communists were able to make a revolution with a party that permitted factional organisation. This rather undermines John Sendy's contention that "such activities would make a mockery of democracy, render impotent political action and destroy the party."

One factor in the Russian situation was that the Party was united by the consciousness of having a tyrannical and oppressive enemy to overthrow; this undoubtedly tended to keep the actions of groups in the Party within bounds. Even then, however, as is well known, one group within the party went so far as to betray the party's plans for insurrection in October 1917; yet its members were treated with extraordinary leniency by Lenin and their action was not used at that time to outlaw factions.

Once tsarism was overthrown, I think it is true to say that the consensus within the party tended to weaken, and various fundamental disagreements came to the fore. These may in time have threatened the functioning of the party, but the question remains whether it was sufficient to outlaw factions, or whether it would not have been better to have placed definite limits upon their rights and activities, the transgression of which would have led to expulsion. But if this had been done, it would have been necessary to have catered for the existence of more than one party, since all the disputants were clearly united in wanting to build socialism. In the prevailing conditions of the Soviet Union, the banning of factions undoubtedly assisted Stalin to establish the monolithic framework which John Sendy rightly condemns.

The extent and forms of party democracy must be influenced to some extent by the conditions it works under, but in the past this correct principle has been applied in such a way as to
justify quite unnecessary and harmful restrictions upon party democracy. The party under capitalism always works in a hostile environment (at least so far as the State is concerned) but in Australia this hostility is heavily checked by the dedication of the vast majority of Australians to civil liberties. This makes it all the more necessary that the party go as far as possible in adopting those standards of political organisation which Australians consider normal. If our estimate were that the road to socialism in Australia would be through unavoidable violence against an intense repression, we would not pay too much attention to present conditions.

But this is not the conception contained in our program; it holds that the maintenance and extension of political democracy is both necessary and possible, and that this perspective offers a prospect of a transition to socialism through mass struggle.

We cannot isolate our concept of the party from our concept of social change, and there is no doubt that a significant widening of the forms of party democracy will contribute to the fulfilment of our program by making our party more acceptable to those outside our ranks who nevertheless share our basic aspirations.

If we look at the situation in Victoria during the struggle with the Hill group, then I think most of those who took part in the debates of that time will agree that it was the most stimulating and thought-provoking period we have known. The existence of the group, and its attack upon the whole range of party policies, necessitated a study and independent grasp of the basis of those policies such as "normal" times never provoke. In the end the group had to go—but was that because it was a faction, or because it was a faction which refused to acknowledge any loyalty to the party, its principles and majority decisions? In other words, I am inclined to think that the problem is not the existence of factions as such, but the definition of the limits within which they may function and the point at which the activities of factions cease to be compatible with party membership.

There is obviously much sense in the Italian statement quoted by John Sendy, to the effect that "organised groups crystallise differences, tie the freedom of each one of us, transform creative debate into a group struggle for power". On the other hand, however, it is true that the crystallisation of differences on important issues leads to the formation of groups, whether acknowledged or not, and their clandestine existence may do more harm to the party than their open functioning, especially since the very informality of factions tends to widen differences; alongside the principled issues of disagreement, there also develop suspicion, intrigue and bitterness fostered by the absence of an open outlet for party-wide discussion. In the end, difference easily becomes equated with treachery.

Perhaps I should add, in the light of unsought publicity I have received from The Bulletin and other well-wishers that I have no personal interest in the formation of a group, whether following an "Italian line" or otherwise. I am concerned, however, with the general problem, which I believe is much more complex than is generally recognised.
Karol's four points are well worthy of intensive examination. I can see no objection to the right of public party debate in reaching decisions, so long as the decisions are carried out and confidences are not breached, and indeed this, along with the public discussion of divergences among party leaders, seems to me to be vital to the functioning of an informed democracy within the party (and no democracy is really such unless it is informed). I do not think that Karol's point about the "immense majority of the delegates to Party Congresses (being) selected from among the fulltime members of the Party apparatus" applies to our party, though no doubt the system of election to conferences and congresses could be improved.

His final point—"a system of rotation in the leading organs of the Communist Party"—has a great deal of merit. It was attempted under the revised rules of the C.P.S.U. adopted while Krushchev was party secretary; I have never seen any study of its operation, but I believe it was never implemented to anything like its full extent.

It would be a much more difficult undertaking in a party working in our conditions, but this is no reason for ignoring it. There is within our party an unhealthy view that elected positions, and functionary posts, are or ought to be for life, and this needs to be eradicated. A stated term for presidents, vice-presidents and chairman would be a good start.

REX MORTIMER.

JOHN SENDY in the A.L.R., June-July 1966, has made a valuable contribution to the present discussion on democracy in the Communist Party, although it should be added that this subject is also a vital one in relation to the internal functions of all organisations in the labor movement.

Whilst agreeing with the general trend of his suggestions, I think that greater clarity may be reached if it is first understood that the various sections of the Third International, including the Australian section, were expected to lean heavily on the Russian experience.

Both in their infant and formative years, this was done, not because of "pressure from Moscow", but from a natural eagerness to learn from the first victors in the struggle against capitalism. Such an attitude has many implications and applications, but in this discussion it requires a further study of the development of the idea of democratic centralism in the R.S.D.L.P. and Bolshevik parties in the period from 1903 to the thirties, when it crystallised out into the form now undergoing further change.

This requires an historical approach, whereas John Sendy's approach, in parts, zig-zags backwards and forwards in time—and also in place (Italy, East Europe, etc).

For example, the 1921 proposal by Lenin is used initially, although this was a later, 'tightened-up' version of democratic centralism, as is implied in the later quotation from K. S. Karol, a vital section of which is "... in Lenin's time, and despite civil war, communists used to argue about their differences in public."

In a very brief attempt to "sort it out", I would therefore suggest a brief chronology
of the development of democratic centralism over the decades:-

1) 1903-1912: A statement of the basic principles, which were, in practice, not very much heeded in that the R.S.D.L.P. was rent down the middle into two factions, Bolsheviks and Mensheviks, whose differences were so great as to produce a decisive split.

2) 1912-1921 (to my mind the most significant period): A separate, Bolshevik party which built up the Russian and non-Russian working class revolutionary movement, successfully overcame the resistance of the tsarist secret police and state apparatus, social chauvinism, carried out a successful revolution, defeated the interventionist armies and welded together the republics which later became the Soviet Union.

All these victories have been recited countless times. I only emphasise them to underline K. S. Karol's reference to the practice, under all these trying conditions, of a form of democratic centralism considerably more "liberal" than that at present practised in 1966 in parties in some advanced capitalist countries (whose working classes have some very open democratic traditions) under circumstances, international and local, far less grim than those of the Bolshevik Party in that earlier period.

3) 1921-1928: A "tightening up" of democratic centralism, though with certain, considerable freedom of discussion guaranteed, at a point in time marked by the Kronstadt meeting, the "unleashing" of N.E.P., national exhaustion and near-anarchy. Comrade Lenin's final serious illness began early in this period. Considerable archive work in the Soviet Union may already indicate whether Lenin saw this "tightening up" as a temporary or permanent measure. At any rate, the insistence of dialectics on changed policies for different "conditions, time and place" does raise this speculation to the status of a serious question.

Not to be forgotten are Lenin's worries about the fate of the Party following the elevation of Stalin to the General Secretaryship.

4) 1928-1953: In 1928, a year of general growth of a hard, dogmatic attitude on a variety of questions, the interpretation of democratic centralism was again "tightened-up", following Stalin's belief (originating in 1927, not 1937) that the longer the struggle proceeded, the fiercer it became.

Information on this in English is meagre, but the results are well known, i.e., insistence on "unanimous" decisions, strengthening the position of majorities by the extraction of abject recantations from dissenters, etc. All this makes unpalatable reading, but should by now be digested by communists everywhere.

Equally important was the disappearance of a certain freedom of the press—serious dissenting views were henceforth never printed—and a restriction of movement and speech by minorities in relation to the Party apparatus and meetings.

It is quite true that the "logical conclusion" of such tendencies as those expressed in John Sendy's article is the appearance of full-blown factions, but like a lot of "logical conclusions" (such as the relation-
ship of imperialism to world war) it doesn’t necessarily reach such an extreme. It is just by permitting that much greater flexibility of which John Sendy writes that new factionalisms can be avoided.

The sad experience of the Hill interlude should be sufficient proof that the old hard line of opposing really free discussion, within the broad guide lines of a constitution, is no guarantee that factionalism will not break loose, one way or another.

Lastly, a more flexible democratic centralism should not be seen as a safety valve, permitting the Party more easily to retain intellectuals and “strange” would-be theoreticians of the rank and file who like to let off steam. Lasting benefit would come from the seriousness with which the Party-as-a-whole takes the various views put forward in the new climate. —S. C.

( Writers for the discussion pages are requested to keep their contributions as brief as possible, and in any case no more than 1000 words.—Ed.)

* * *

COMMENTS

“This is the latest in a series of moves by the party to adopt a soft-sell line”.

“Data”, Sydney Morning Herald 13.5.66

“The changing of the title of the Communist Review to Australian Left Review... demonstrates that the Mortimer faction is in the ascendancy.”

Bulletin 4.6.66

“Writing in the first issue of Australian Left Review... a prominent official of the Australian Communist Party has startled conservative members of the party hierarchy by suggesting that Marxists should get up to date in their thinking.”

“Australian” 22.6.66

“The claim of the ‘new’ journal to be ‘a marxist journal of information, analysis and discussion’ rings a little hollow—”

“Outlook” an Independent Socialist Journal, June, 1966

The Australian Left Review “catches a lot of people who don’t know any better, and enables those who do to affect a certain attitude of innocence.”

News Weekly 27.4.66

“The first issue of ‘Australian Left Review’ (June-July) 1966 contains interesting articles on Basic Wage ‘principles’, Changes in Modern Capitalism, the A.L.P. Crisis, Conscription, Drought, and Democracy in the Communist Party.

“The book reviews include important comments on Picasso and his art.”

Common Cause, 25.6.66

Party supporters ask: “How are we going to know what is party policy in this new magazine?”—G.B., Victoria.

(The Communist Party makes statements when it considers it necessary to define policy.—Ed.)

B. Taft’s article very good; W. A. Baker’s started well but ran out of steam.—R.K.

“We hope it won’t be too high-brow”—a plea coming in different forms from many quarters.
The Editor,
Australian Left Review,
You might find this appeal of some interest and worth space in a forthcoming issue of ALR. While I believe that our prime purpose should be the withdrawal of Australian troops, I think you will agree that the Australian Left should be prepared now and in the future to aid revolutionary socialist movements in the Third World.

Yours fraternally,
Hall Greenland,
Medical Aid For Vietnam Fund.

Extracts from the Appeal:—
"For nearly two months now Sydney University students have been collecting money to pur­chase medical supplies for the victims of war in Vietnam. We plan to send the medical aid in two hundred dollar instalments. Now that we have collected our first two hundred dollars we are launching a wider appeal for don­ations. We hope that you will support the fund and make the appeal known to your friends or your trade union or your church group etc. Similar funds to ours have been set up in the United States, England, France and Belgium. Throughout the world it is being recognised that passivity in the face of the carnage in Viet­nam can be equated with acqui­escence.

The Americans are bombing the Vietnamese people with more destructive power than they used against Hitler and Mussolini. In imposing their will on Vietnam, the Americans will not apparently stop short of genocide.

In response to this situation the MEDICAL AID FOR VIETNAM FUND, WITH TWO SECTIONS, has been established.

SECTION ONE is to supply medical aid to the victims of American bombing in North and South Vietnam.

SECTION TWO of the Fund is to supply medical aid to the Na­tionAL Liberation Front. The continuing strength and survival of this movement is testimony to its support and appeal. No settle­ment in Vietnam is possible with­out its cooperation and participa­tion.

Let nobody be mistaken, the sending of medical aid to the National Liberation Front is not illegal and not treason—even under our Crimes Act. And fin­ally, to the clumsy accusation that our medical aid will indirectly contribute to the death of con­scripts in Vietnam, we reply that the responsibility for conscript casual­ties in Vietnam lies with those who have sent them there against the wishes of the majority of the Australian people.

How the Aid is to Get to Viet­nam:
Aid to the bombing victi­m:s in Vietnam is to be distributed via the International Red Cross. Med­ical aid for the N.L.F. is to be transmitted either through the Red Cross or via N.L.F. rep­resentatives abroad.

CONTRIBUTIONS:
Donations should be sent to the M.A.V.F., Box 93, The Union, Syd­ney University. Please be clear as to which section of the Fund you wish to contribute."

Mike JONES, John PERCY, Aidan FOY, Margaret CAR­NELL, Russ DARNLEY, Gra­hame HACKETT, Sandra LEVY, Darce CASSIDY, Padd­y DAWSON, Dave CLARK, Robert GALLAGHER, Colin WADDY, Peter TEMPLETON, Hall GREENLAND (Treas­urer).
The format and cover of the magazine are undoubtedly a vast improvement, although one hopes that there will be some variation in cover design from time to time. The paper still seems to have a greyish shade, the printing off-centre and the proof reading not yet 100%.

The presentation of the material still leaves something to be desired. We should aim to make our magazine aesthetically pleasing as well as informative and interesting. The editors should seek to avoid the uniformity and monotony of presentation of the old Communist Review and should examine other similar publications for ideas and for suitable cartoons.

I myself found the contents quite interesting, in particular the articles by Taft and Sendy. The ideas expressed by the latter take in the opening of our columns to those of the left who are not members of our Party, but with whom unity on important questions is possible and desirable, providing their contributions are useful as stimuli to thought and reach a certain necessary standard of thought and expression. Probably such ideas are already in the minds of the editors. If so we may look forward in the near future to a magazine that will be so interesting that people will look forward to reading it and discussing the articles, in place of the situation in my active branch where among 20-odd members I was the only person who consistently read the Communist Review.

A.K., Sydney.

I thought the first issue was quite creditable, but of course it will be better when we get more variety and cross-opinion, and when the printers and proof readers improve their work. There are also some layout improvements that could be made—e.g., a better inside front cover design, better type for headings, and some use of spacing or sub-heads in the text. I think the back cover would be improved by an ad too.

So far as the book review columns are concerned, I would not be inclined to worry much about creative writing. Book reviews offer the easiest way of getting a wider circle of people contributing.

R.M., Victoria.

Considering all the difficulties and the big changes involved in what is being sought the first issue is a worthy one. Some of the questions raised will surely bring comment from wider circles. However I wish to raise several minor but important points.

Taft’s article is splendid and thought provoking. I agree with it. However many might not know what “department 1” is, and there should have been a brief explanation.

Robertson’s article refers to the domino theory, but again there is no explanation of the theory which to some is quite plausible.

Onlooker frequently uses the term ruling class which is meaningless to many of those who want to read Left Review.

R.B., Queensland.
The question arises: for whom is the Review intended? Obviously, the name is a sprat to catch a mackerel—otherwise leftist interest. But, in my opinion, it defeats its purpose by being edited and written by communists for communists. This first number, its contents and approach, is of interest to Party members, their sympathisers and supporters, but has little broad and general appeal.

A wonderful opportunity was lost, it seems to me, for introducing the new magazine. The illustration of Picasso's Guernica and McClintock's explanation of it would have attracted considerable attention. It might have been followed for instance, by John Sendy's article, or one of the book reviews, and the article on drought, which would have revealed a genuine interest in subjects of general concern justifying the title of the journal.

If it is to take the broad highway and attract readers of left interests, it must tackle subjects of general concern with a less doctrinaire approach.

The main objective of the journal need not be lost sight of—to introduce communist policy and ideology to a wider circle of readers than is reached at present—but articles with this objective should be interspersed with others of general leftist interest. Otherwise the journal will be cited as dishonest, not leftist as a matter of fact, but merely a cover for communist propaganda.

Katharine Susannah Prichard.

Among students, academics and professionals there was disappointment with the first issue of Australian Left Review, mainly because they want something more original and creative. They thought it too closely resembled Communist Review in content, and so to them was just as dull.

While such a publication must be pitched at the level of the average reader, intellectuals do present a special problem. Maybe "non-intellectual" readers also would welcome something more creative.

In book reviews an evaluation rather than a summary is what is wanted.

Despite all this, my over-all impression was not negative, a number of articles representing a good improvement over old Review standards. But the over-all standard has to be raised. While this depends mainly on contributors, judicial editorial policies can have more than marginal effect.

—H.C., Victoria.

Left Review is a major improvement on its predecessor, but if the aim is a theoretical marxist publication of interest to all socialists and including non-party revolutionary marxians (of whom I am one) in its dialogue, it is worth discussing the magazine's remaining flaws.

One of the general faults appears to be the tendency to intersperse polemic with argument. In a theoretical journal it is reasonable to expect that theories be fully developed in argumentative form — the standards set in Socialist Register demand serious consideration even from anti-marxists. There remains too, the tendency to assert points the validity of which is still a matter of socialist debate without offering references or substantiations. Considering the invitation to criticism made in "Democracy in the Communist Party" by John Sendy, I would like to com-
ment more specifically on some articles in No. 1 of Left Review.

"Changes in Modern Capitalism" is the strongest contribution, but neglects an aspect of contemporary world economics of particular significance. Since Lenin formulated his theory of imperialism as the final stage of capitalism, investment for direct profit in neo-colonial countries has ceased to be the main impetus for imperialist expansion. Most, though not of course all, investment is to create markets for goods produced in the home country, where political stability offers greater insurance for major capital investment.

Taking this in conjunction with the "credit" expedient of expanding the home market there would seem reason to suspect that Rosa Luxemburg's theory of accumulation might have more relevance to this epoch than does the orthodox marxist one elaborated by Lenin.

"The 23rd Congress of the C.P.S.U." and "Democracy in the Communist Party" both avoid discussing the implications of the Italian theory recently propagated. Perhaps there are good arguments justifying the movement towards reformism, but frankness demands that they at least be stated. In connection with these two articles, some examination of the socio-economic reasons for Sino-Soviet divergences is surely required in any marxist discussion of their significance. Furthermore, this would have been an excellent occasion to treat with the fault of both Stalinism and Maoism in debasing marxism to a semi-magical state religion. Until it is restated as a theory to be used in relation to objectively examined tendencies, international socialism will continue to be impeded by ideology — I use the word in its original sense — rather than aided by scientific theory.

Despite the brickbats, I repeat my earlier congratulations on No. 1 of Australian Left Review. In conclusion I suggest that an analysis of the potential of fascist development in Australia would be a suitable subject for an article in the near future.

IN recent years the number of film festivals has increased and few countries are without their annual tribute to today's most popular entertainment medium. Despite the impact of television, the cinema is attracting larger audiences, and this is reflected in the new festivals that mushroom each year.

The original purpose of the older festivals at Cannes and Venice was to present the best of each year's films and to make awards for direction, acting, etc. Many fine films thus received an acclaim that drew large audiences when they were screened outside the festival. The film trade in America, France, Italy and England quickly moved in and festivals often degenerated into a ballyhoo promotional stunt. This caused concern to some festival organisers. The director of the Venice Film Festival decided to clean it up. Starlets and their publicity stunts were banished from the fashionable beaches. Each film was selected by the committee and judged on its merits.

The festivals at Karlovy Vary (Czechoslovakia) and Moscow are more serious affairs. The aim there is to draw attention to outstanding films which through their form and content and in the spirit of the festival motto "For humanism in art, for peace and friendship among peoples," have contributed to the development of cinematography.

In Australia a different type of festival has developed. We have no film industry that can use a festival as a show case for its productions, and our government is not interested. In 1953 and 1954, groups of people in Melbourne and Sydney who wished to foster an appreciation of good film organised film festivals in their cities. Since then similar festivals have been established in Perth, Adelaide, Hobart and Brisbane. Most of them are held between May and June and
many of the entries are exchanged. Subscribers can purchase tickets and these are limited to 2,000, except in Melbourne which has 4,000. The films are screened over a period of two weeks or so. This year the Sydney festival offered 30 programmes of feature films, shorts and cartoons. As soon as the festival is over, the committee organises for the following year.

Film festivals are now an important part of our cultural life, and it is worth considering their influence and future development. Within the various festival committees there are differing opinions and subscribers have their views as well. Also, the film trade is very conscious of the influence that film festivals have on the box office, favorably and otherwise. This year the question of censorship was raised forcibly, especially in Sydney. It can be seen that film festivals are no longer a pleasant weekend or two where groups of devotees watch and discuss "art films." The 1966 festivals in Sydney and Melbourne were filled by subscribers months before opening, and many thousands were unable to buy tickets. A new festival, the N.S.W. Film Festival, will open at the University of N.S.W. in August and subscriptions are pouring in.

The success of any film festival depends on the selection of the programmes. Each festival has a programme committee that chooses and views films. Selection is sometimes influenced by the films shown at overseas festivals. It is natural that new films successful at Cannes, Venice, Moscow, Berlin and elsewhere receive priority. Often they are not available as commercial distributors have bought the rights, although these distributors sometimes agree to screening them at festivals. Embassies, especially those of the socialist countries, assist with programmes. Occasionally a famous silent or sound classic not previously shown here is screened. Some films are selected because they reflect the personal preferences of members of the festival committee. Generally speaking, though, the programmes are of a high quality.

The difference between Australian and overseas festivals is further emphasised by the difficulty in obtaining many films purchased by local distributors. These productions have already received publicity at Cannes, Venice and elsewhere and distributors regard local festivals as a threat to box office returns. The total subscribers in all states could reach 10,000. This audience in commercial cinemas is worth $10,000
or so to the distributor. Festivals in Perth, Adelaide, Hobart and Brisbane sometimes pay film hire, perhaps $200 to $300, but the more affluent Sydney and Melbourne Festivals want the films without payment, and the major distributors of foreign films have virtually boycotted them.

Festival committees and subscribers are divided on the matter of showing films purchased for commercial screening and some feel that festivals should show only those unlikely to be seen in the local cinemas. An argument against this claims that a festival screening often assists the commercial prospects. This is a debatable point although at the moment at least four Sydney distributors and cinemas wish to buy the Czech film *Blonde In Love* which was shown at this year's festival. A film from last year, *Woman In The Dunes* (Japan), has been bought by a Melbourne distributor.

It is interesting to examine the origins of feature films in the last three Sydney festivals. The various countries were represented as follows—Czechoslovakia 7, France 6, Japan 5, Poland 4, Italy 4, U.S.A. 4, Mexico 3, U.S.S.R. 3, East Germany 3, Hungary 3, India 3, Korea 2, Canada 2, Yugoslavia 2, Brazil 2, Holland 2, England 1, Australia 1, West Germany 1, China 1, Cuba 1, Rumania 1. In addition there were a number of old classics. The English-speaking films totalled 8. Twenty eight films came from the socialist countries, nearly half the total. This pattern is more or less the same at the other festivals.

The International Federation of Film Producers' Associations (IFFP) gives its recognition to a small number of film festivals throughout the world. One of the terms is that subscribers are limited to 2,000. So far only Sydney has received recognition. Melbourne with 4,000 subscribers is out of favor and does not obtain any of the films held by members of IFFP. It seems that the organisers of the Australian festivals should get together and discuss the difficulties of obtaining suitable programmes and collectively reach agreement with IFFP and the local distributors and exhibitors. Sydney and Melbourne must be prepared to pay film hire for certain films. If a producer offered his film for a fixed fee, this could be shared by all of the festivals.

There is an agreement with the Customs Department that no duty is paid on films imported for screening provided they are screened at the festivals only. All films have to be viewed
by the film censor. Festival organisers claim that they should be shown at the festivals without cuts as censorship often destroys the meaning of a film. Adults only are admitted and they are people who are viewing the films with intelligence and understanding. The Sydney Film Festival has been campaigning against film censorship and this year, commendably, published a list of all cuts made. Their campaign needs to be widened to include abolition of the clauses that allow political censorship of films. We remember well the ban on the export of *Indonesia Calling* in 1947, the censorship of films from the U.S.S.R., China and East Germany and the recent doubts about Michael Charlton's film on Vietnam.

At the festivals, viewers can enjoy feature films from Europe, Asia and America and then reflect that there are none from Australia. Small countries like Cuba and Korea can send entries but we have just a few documentaries to offer. The question of an Australian film industry should greatly concern film festivals, with more emphasis laid on forums that promote a widespread discussion on the matter. When representatives of festivals are interviewed on the press, radio and television they might constantly criticise the lack of Australian feature films. We cannot be content to relish the films from abroad and do nothing about our own potential.

The Festivals have fostered an appreciation of films that otherwise would not have been shown. They have introduced the films of controversial directors such as Bunuel (Spain), Goddard (France), Rossi (Italy) and many of the new films from Czechoslovakia. A feature of recent festivals has been the fine productions from the Czech studios. There is now an audience here for Czech films and distributors are interested. The films from the Asian countries also have become popular because of festival screenings. India and Japan are the largest film-making countries in the world and several of their directors rank with the world's best. Satyapit Ray (India), and Ozu, Kurosawa and Ichikawa of Japan are now well known here as their productions are regularly seen at festivals.

Film makers in all countries are very much concerned with social problems and the best of their films have had a significant impact at the festivals. In the past two years films dealing with war and peace were outstanding. *The Russian Miracle*, *The Adventures Of Werner Holt*, (both from East Germany), *Thomas The Imposter* (France), *Fire On The Plains* (Japan), *Passengers* (Poland) and *Dr. Strangelove*
(U.S.A.) are excellent examples of such film making. At the Moscow and Karlovy Vary Film Festivals there is much discussion on problems and trends. Directors, writers, critics and the public are encouraged to express opinions. Our festivals could have similar forums and determine an attitude to the role of films as a medium that focuses attention on current social questions. Although our film industry is in the doldrums, films are the mainstay of television programmes and features such as *Four Corners* and *Seven Days* have a large audience. Film festivals have not concerned themselves much with television films but here is a field that could stimulate local film production and it should be included in festival programmes.

The success of film festivals in Australia in the past 14 years has resulted in a wider appreciation of the role that films have in our life. The standard of film-making in all countries has risen considerably. Undoubtedly festivals with their competitive awards have contributed to this. Here in Australia public taste is being moulded. Alongside the annual events in the capital cities we could have special festivals of Asian, Soviet, French films and the like. People are festival-minded and their tastes can be satisfied with a wide variety of film fare.
When Australia said NO!

By ERNIE CAMPBELL

Fifteen years ago, the Australian people turned down the Menzies Govt’s bid to shackle democracy.

SEPTEMBER 22 is the 15th Anniversary of the defeat of the Menzies Government’s attempt, by referendum, to obtain power to suppress the Communist Party.

Suppression of communism is a long-standing plank in the platform of the Liberal Party.

The election of the Menzies Government in December 1949 coincided with America’s stepping-up of the “Cold War”. the Communist Party an unlawful association, to dissolve it, Chairmanship of Senator Joseph McCarthy, was engaged in an orgy of red-baiting, blackmail and intimidation.

This was the situation when Menzies, soon after taking office, visited the United States to negotiate a big dollar loan.

On his return from America, Menzies dramatically proclaimed that Australia had to prepare for war “within three years”.

To forestall resistance to the burdens and dangers involved in this, and behead the people’s movement of militant leadership, Menzies, in April 1950, introduced a Communist Party Dissolution Bill in the Federal Parliament.

The Bill commenced with a series of recitals accusing the Communist Party of advocating seizure of power by a minority through violence, intimidation and fraudulent practices, of being engaged in espionage activities, of promoting strikes for purposes of sabotage and the like.

Had there been one atom of truth in these charges, the Government possessed ample powers under the Commonwealth Crimes Act to launch an action against the Communist Party.

Charges Not Sustained

However, the Government, knowing full well the falsehood of its accusations, feared that, notwithstanding the class-biased
nature of the Crimes Act, it might find difficulty in substantiating them in open Court.

There had already been a thorough judicial inquiry into the aims and activities of the Communist Party by a Victorian Royal Commission, presided over by Supreme Court Judge, Sir Charles Lowe.

Not one of the anti-Communist charges contained in the Preamble to Menzies’ Bill was supported by the findings of the Lowe Royal Commission.

Later, the Petrov Commission, after a massive witch-hunt, failed to unearth a single Communist “spy”.

This should be expressly noted, in view of the fact that the Holt Government is preparing to dust-off and re-hash these charges in a White Paper today.

The Communist Party Dissolution Bill set out to declare the Communist Party an unlawful association, to dissolve it, and to seize its property without compensation.

Prime Minister Menzies, in introducing the Bill in Parliament, said it was to dispose of the Communist Party “without humbug and without appeal”.

The Bill also provided for the outlawing of any other organisations declared to be espousing “communist views” and for the seizure of their property without compensation.

The definition of “communist views” was so broad that any organisation or person advocating peace, higher living standards, or any one of the other many progressive policy points of the Communist Party, could be brought within its dragnet.

Under the terms of the Bill, Communists were prevented from holding office in trade unions or from being employed in any Government departments.

Under certain circumstances a trade union, if de-registered by the Court, could be dealt with under the Act.

There is evidence that the Industrial Groupers, forerunners of the D.L.P., were in collusion with the Menzies Government and ready to seize leadership in unions from which Communists were excluded from office.

This would have had the effect of converting the trade unions into “tame-cat” unions, warned against by the late Ben Chifley.
During the second reading of the Bill, Prime Minister Menzies read to the House a list of 53 persons who, he alleged, were Communists holding high office in the trade unions.

The next night, flushed with embarrassment, he had to retract with regard to at least five of the persons wrongly named.

This incident is not recorded in the Sydney Daily Telegraph's song of praise for "The Wit of Robert Menzies".

"Pure fascism"

The true character of the Bill was seen in democratic circles beyond the Communist Party. Labor leader Ben Chifley described the Bill as the first step towards a totalitarian state.

Deputy Leader Dr. Evatt said that Menzies' purpose was to destroy the political power of Labor.

The Labor Party leader in the Senate, Senator McKenna, described the legislation as "pure and simple fascism".

A.C.T.U. president, Mr. Albert Monk, declared the Bill to be "the first step towards totalitarianism".

A large number of university professors in Sydney and Melbourne and many prominent authors wrote letters to the newspapers criticising the Bill.

An Australian People's Assembly for Human Rights, held in Melbourne on September 14-17, and attended by 417 delegates representing 467,000 citizens, condemned the Bill.

While the struggle outside parliament reached a high level, the struggle inside was hampered by the Rightwing influences still strong in the Labor Party.

The Labor Party, which still controlled the Senate, decided not to oppose the Bill in principle, but to move a series of amendments.

These were not accepted by the Government and the Bill, substantially in its original form, was passed onto the Senate.

The Labor-controlled Senate amended the Bill and sent it back.

The Liberal-controlled lower house deleted the Senate's amendments and sent the Bill on for the second time.
Succumbing to the threat of a double dissolution, the Labor Party, against the wishes of Chifley and Evatt, reversed its attitude and let the Bill go through the Senate without further amendment.

The Communist Party and several trade unions affected by the Act immediately sought an injunction from the High Court, restraining the Government from acting, pending the hearing of a challenge to the Act's validity.

Sir Owen Dixon heard the application in Melbourne and granted the injunction sought. The case came up for hearing in the High Court on November 14, 1950, and judgment was given on March 9, 1951.

Dr. Evatt, who was briefed by the Waterside Workers' Federation, headed the panel of 12 counsel appearing separately for the Communist Party and ten trade unions.

*High Court's majority ruling*

Garfield Barwick, later to become a Knight and Minister in the Menzies Cabinet, led the 10 counsel the Government briefed.

The hearing lasted 19 days and was concluded on the eve of the law vacation in December.

On March 9, 1951, the High Court announced its judgment.

Six judges held that the Communist Party Dissolution Act was void under the Constitution.

Only the Chief Justice, Sir John Latham, a former Attorney-General in the Bruce-Page anti-Labor Government, held that the Act was valid.

On July 5, 1951, a Referendum Bill, seeking an alteration to the Constitution giving the Government power "to deal with Communists and Communism" was brought in.

The Communist Party responded by initiating what proved to be the greatest mass political campaign yet waged in defence of democratic rights in Australia.

The Party opened a £40,000 ($80,000) Referendum Campaign Fund with the aim of taking the case for "NO" into every home in the Commonwealth.

In Sydney alone five million leaflets were distributed and 140,000 posters put up.
Other sections entered the battle. "Vote No" committees were set up in unions, work places and localities. Carloads of city workers took the campaign to the countryside.

Rightwing influences in the Labor Party were thrust into the background as the A.L.P. joined in the mass campaign.

Labor leader Dr. Evatt met with a rousing reception from meetings of 700 railway workers at Eveleigh and 500 at Clyde.

In the initial stages of the campaign the prospects of success for a "No" vote did not appear to be over bright. Government spokesmen got the running in the mass media. Public opinion polls estimated that 80 per cent of the people were in favor of the Government's proposals.

Undismayed by such gloomy forecasts, advocates of a "No" vote intensified their campaigning, chalking, painting and pasting up their message on what finally appeared to be every available wall, post, rock, road and tree in the country. Some of these signs are to be seen to this day.

On the eve of the vote Australian Public Opinion Polls published its final conclusion—"Yes will win on September 22" and forecast an overwhelming majority for "Yes" in all States.

One Sydney metropolitan daily, also anticipating such a result, printed its next day's poster in advance—"Bob's Your Uncle!"

When the numbers went up, however, the Public Opinion Poll had to eat its words and the newspaper had to scrap its poster.

To alter the Australian Constitution it is necessary for both a majority of the States and a majority of the people as a whole to vote in favor.

Neither of these requirements was fulfilled in the September 22, 1951, Referendum.

Three States—New South Wales, Victoria and South Australia—voted NO, while three States—Queensland, Western Australia and Tasmania—voted YES.

The people as a whole voted 2,317,927 in favor of the Government's proposals and 2,370,009 against.

The majority—52,082—for "NO" was a slim one but it was an historic victory, halting the Menzies Government's plans to shackle Australian democracy and silence the voice of Peace.
It was at least comparable with the great anti-conscription victories of World War I.

**International Repercussions**

The victory also had important international repercussions. It put Australia in the unique position of being the only capitalist country in the world where the people, being given the democratic opportunity, voted to uphold the Communist Party's right to legal existence.

This had considerable impact on the struggle for democratic rights in other countries, including the struggle against McCarthyism in the United States.

However, it would be wrong to think that the 1951 Referendum victory put a full stop to reaction.

Having been denied general powers of suppression, the Menzies Government set out to obtain them piecemeal, by a series of amendments to existing legislation such as the Arbitration Act and to the Commonwealth Crimes Act in 1960.

This policy is continuing under the Prime Ministership of Holt, who is preparing to launch, by way of a White Paper, yet another communist witch-hunt, aimed above all at the mounting opposition to the Government's Vietnam policies.

This, too, can be defeated.
"The atom bomb which fell on Hiroshima on August 6th, 1945, killed 260,000 people" says the brochure issued under the names of eleven leading Australian citizens on the occasion of the Australian tour of THE HIROSHIMA PANELS (March-July, 1958).

Although it suffers in reproduction, Australian Left Review felt moved to display a section of this monumental work to mark the 21st Hiroshima Day and support the world wide demand "No More Hiroshimas".
The Panels are the work of Iri Maruki, an artist in the Japanese tradition, and his wife Toshiko Akamatsu with a European style.

The first panel "Ghosts" was shown in a Tokyo museum in February, 1950. "Fearing action by the U.S. authorities" says the Australian tour brochure, "people at first came to see it singly or in groups."

So encouraged were the artists by what became an overwhelming response, that they continued their work, completing 8 panels in all, each measuring 25 feet by 6 feet.
MODERN Psychiatry is that branch of medicine concerned with the manifestations and treatments of the disordered functioning of an individual's personality, which adversely affects him in three ways—his inner subjective life, his relations with others and his capacity to adapt to life in society.

The scope of psychiatry is vast in terms of the numbers of sick people. About one half of all hospital beds in industrially developed countries are occupied by psychiatric patients; surveys have shown that at least one third of people attending their general medical practitioner have complaints essentially psychological in nature, and suicide, which is nearly always an end result of a psychiatric illness, is one of the commonest causes of death in young adults. (Fourth commonest in 1963 in the 20-44 age group.)

The range of illnesses regarded as psychiatric is greater than in any other branch of medicine. They range from those with a well-established organic basis with associated clinical and pathological features, through illnesses due to subtle biochemical aberrations, to those in which no physical abnormality of body structure or function can be found.

The scientific basis of psychiatry therefore is not only provided by the biological sciences such as anatomy, physiology, biochemistry, pathology etc. such as the rest of medicine rests on. As it came to be realised that only a minority of psychiatric illnesses are essentially organic in nature and that the great majority reflect the maladjustment of an individual in his personal and social relationships, a far more important contribution to our understanding of psychiatry has come from the social sciences such as psychology, anthropology and sociology.

The history and current state of psychiatry reflect in a fascinating way many of the basic difficulties in man's struggle for objective understanding of his world. These difficulties have always been great enough in understanding external
reality but when man has turned to understanding his inner reality, i.e., his subjective life of thoughts, emotions, wishes, fantasies, dreams, the difficulties until this century seemed impossible to overcome. The unique contribution of psychiatry in the last 100 years has been to develop methods by which man's inner reality and its relationship to external objective reality can be studied scientifically.

This article will attempt to sketch briefly the basic orientations in modern psychiatry, both historically and as regards their present status.

**Historical Background**

All the main current concepts in psychiatry have developed in the last 100 years. Until as late as the 17th century mental illnesses had been sharply separated from medicine, being regarded as in the province of theology, law, demonology and therefore outside scientific study. There were only a very few exceptions to this approach, most notably the Greek school of Hippocrates and Roman medicine at the time of Galen.

In essence a mentally sick person was looked upon as possessed by supernatural powers, to be either treated as a god or persecuted and destroyed as an agent of the devil, depending on a particular society's interpretation of which supernatural power was possessing the patient.

From the 17th century until a hundred years ago medicine's only significant contribution to psychiatry was its acknowledgment that mentally sick people needed hospitalisation rather than being burnt at the stake. Over this period important modifications were developed in hospitalisation and hospitals changed from being prisons with the patients manacled to the floor on view to the public like animals at a zoo, to institutions where patients were treated with dignity.

**Organic Psychiatry**

Modern psychiatry really began with the efforts of mainly English and Continental psychiatrists about 100 years ago to bring psychiatry firmly within the ambit of medicine. They did this firstly by painstakingly studying the behaviour and natural history of vast numbers of patients in mental hospitals.

Within 50 years this approach had enabled them to delineate the main psychiatric syndromes (combinations of symptoms). Psychiatrists also presumed that mental illnesses were of the same nature as purely medical illnesses and therefore that a definite organic cause could be found.
By the use of medical techniques the organic causes of what we now regard as essentially medical illnesses which manifest themselves often with abnormal mental processes such as syphilis, brain tumors and disorders of the blood vessels were established. The positive aspects of this approach were to firmly establish psychiatry within the scope of scientific inquiry, and the sorting out of straight-forward organic conditions was a necessary preliminary to psychiatry coming to grips with the understanding of non-organic conditions.

But some negative consequences flowed from this organic orientation. On the basis of finding organic causes in a minority of cases, organicists (the name given psychiatrists with this approach) have assumed that all psychiatric illnesses can be explained this way and have denied the relevance of social and psychological factors. This has led to a tremendous amount of effort being spent on trying to find elusive biochemical or obscure pathological changes which would explain the cause of the commonest psychological illnesses such as schizophrenia and the neuroses.

In spite of the effort no significant organic causes have been shown in these major groupings of illnesses. Modern-day organicists, and numerically they are still significant, argue that if such organic factors cannot be found this is due either to their being so subtle that our present techniques cannot detect them, or that the organic basis of psychiatry is genetically determined, and that our lack of knowledge of causation is determined by the lack of precision in the science of genetics.

All of this leads essentially to a position of nihilism when faced with the treatment of an individual mentally sick patient. It has made no contribution to medicine or to general science in the last 50 years and is attracting few new adherents from the younger psychiatrists.

Its main appeal is to psychiatrists who wish to work in a traditional medical way with their patients. It is still an influential approach in many countries, e.g., some centres in England, Germany, Soviet Union.

*Sigmund Freud*

In this situation the revolutionary impact made by Sigmund Freud can be best understood.

Freud was born in 1856 and studied medicine in Vienna, which remained his home until one year before his death in
1939 when, faced with persecution by the nazis, he fled to England. In the early phase of his career he became famous as a neurologist. But his scientific curiosity was aroused by the numerous patients who presented themselves to him with symptoms for which he could find no organic or physical basis.

He had heard of hypnotism being used in Paris with apparently magical effect in removing symptoms untreatable by orthodox methods of medicine. So he travelled there and observed its practice.

He observed that hypnotism could both produce and remove symptoms. He then realised that there were powerful mental forces within man hidden from the consciousness of man. He returned to Vienna and spent the rest of his life studying and treating these forces. He started by using hypnotism but quickly found that this was very limited as a therapeutic method because psychological symptoms removed through hypnotism quickly returned when the hypnotic state was ended.

Freud found that by seeing his patients regularly under relaxed circumstances and letting them talk at random about any aspect of their subjective life and then by his analysing their apparently random associations of thought, their fantasies and dreams, he was able to develop a scientific method which was simultaneously a means of investigating the origin of a patient’s symptoms and a therapeutic agent in removing the symptoms. This method is called psychoanalysis and it remains the mainstream of Freudian theory and practice and all its offshoots. Freudian thought falls into three categories:

1. His basic psychological concepts characterised by his method in approaching psychiatric problems.
2. His theories based on his clinical observations.
3. His essentially philosophical and sociological conclusions to which he devoted the last part of his life.

It was Freud’s method of approaching psychiatric problems rather than any specific observations or theories which revolutionised psychiatry.

The principle of causality is a necessary assumption without which no science would be possible, but Freud was the first to apply this to the study of all mental processes in the form of a literal and uncompromising psychic determinism which
refused to accept any mental event as accidental. He looked for the causes of mental events in terms of the events and conflicts of a person's life and came to believe that the most critical events occurred in the first few years of life.

Freud insisted that mental processes could be understood as well as physical ones if enough were known about the life and development of an individual. He continually stressed the complexity of causation of mental processes—genetic, environmental and developmental factors always being involved. He made it clear that although his field of inquiry was the study of psychological factors in mental processes, and that in formulating new laws within this field he had to develop a new terminology, he anticipated a time in the future when neurophysiologists would be able to describe these processes in physico-chemical terms. Thus he avoided the philosophical trap of dualism—of counterposing "mental" processes against "bodily" processes. He regarded all processes as having a physical basis and thus all were "bodily" processes, but differing levels of functioning of bodily processes required the development of different levels of scientific laws to explain them.

Another major contribution was his discovery that a major part of mental activity takes place outside the individual's own awareness. It is not easy for any of us to face up to the fact that inside us there are drives, anxieties, guilts of which we are not aware. This aspect of his theory provoked the most unreasoned criticism during his lifetime, but today the existence and importance of unconscious mental activity is accepted by psychiatrists of all orientations except perhaps the most extreme organicists.

Another contribution was his insistence that there is no hard and fast distinction between normal, neurotic and psychotic behaviour because the same psychological processes underlie each.

It was Freudian-influenced doctors who were the first in the 1930's to treat the psychotic patients along essentially the same lines as neurotics—psychotherapy to uncover the psychological cause of their illness, with the intensive use of appropriate drugs to bring them into meaningful contact with reality, so that psychotherapy and social rehabilitation can proceed.

The real contribution of the modern tranquillising drugs developed since 1945 is best seen in this context,
The word psycho-dynamic is a useful adjective describing the body of theory which proceeds from the basic postulates of Freudian theory as described above no matter how much it may diverge from it in details.

Freud published his main contributions in the years 1900 to 1910 and again from 1922 to 1927. During this period he dominated a small restricted circle of psychoanalysts who tended to become defensive because of the intense antagonism shown by orthodox medicine. Many of his followers during this time became narrow dogmatists who did not follow up the insights provided by Freud and so enrich and expand his basic theorising.

Then just before World War II a group of psychiatrists who took a basically Freudian outlook broke away from the dogmatic psychoanalytical circle. They felt that the least developed and therefore the least satisfactory aspect of Freudian theory was its relative lack of emphasis on social and cultural factors in personality development and functioning, in contrast to the great emphasis Freud placed on the biological basis of personality development.

This does not mean that Freud was not interested in applying psychoanalytical knowledge to social problems. In fact most of the writings of the last 25 years of his life were an attempt to understand the reciprocal relationship between an individual and his society.

However, this weakness in Freudian theory was remedied mainly by psychiatrists such as Adler, Horney and Fromm who were much more in touch with the new social sciences. The most significant contribution came from Erich Fromm who had a detailed knowledge of marxist theory. He was a German who emigrated to the U.S.A. at the beginning of World War II.

Fromm showed that the relationship between man and society is constantly changing and is not, as Freud supposed, a static one. He went on to point out that although there are certain organic drives common to all men there are also essential differences between men.

These differences are produced by social processes. What we know as human nature is a cultural product which may be limited by, but cannot be completely explained in terms
of man's biological nature. He showed how definite changes have taken place both in human personality and in the type of psychiatric illnesses in different historical epochs.

Social Psychiatry

From concepts such as these and supported by scientific workers in the social sciences has developed a currently very influential trend called social psychiatry. This includes all those facets of psychiatry which have a social implication such as the early detection and prevention of psychiatric illness, the changes within the mental hospitals in recent years as well as the scientific study of the influence of social factors such as economic class on psychiatric illnesses.

It developed into a major force within psychiatry due to the impact of World War II. Before the war psychiatrists were mainly involved in giving individual psychotherapy to a tiny minority of patients who needed it or were caught up in testing out empirical physical treatments.

Army experience during the War reminded psychiatrists of the immense influence of social and group factors on an individual's health. Simultaneously the strengthening of the influence of leftwing ideas within psychiatry meant that many psychiatrists began to see their main challenge being how to modify Freudian techniques so that vast numbers of sick people could be helped rather than just the privileged minority.

A group of British psychiatrists during the latter part of World War II began to explore the possibilities of using social forces positively in the treatment of disturbed soldiers.

This work was continued after the war, the key worker being Dr. Maxwell Jones. He opened within mental hospitals special units called therapeutic communities for some of the most alienated people in society.

It was recognised that the main difficulty of these patients lay in their social relationships and so this therapy is essentially done through meetings of patients and staff held several times each day where everything that happens in the community is studied. This approach deliberately uses group pressures and forces, the collective wisdom, strength and morality of the group being always much greater than that of the individuals making up a particular group. This is
obviously similar to the positive use of group forces in non medical fields such as politics. This approach spread quickly to the U.S.A. and in 1953 to Australia in the establishment of Fraser House within a Sydney psychiatric hospital.

It is significant that the majority of psychiatrists in this field have a basic "psycho-dynamic" orientation.

The Contribution of Pavlov

Another important contemporary orientation is that usually called Behaviourism. The main workers here are psychologists, not psychiatrists. The originator of this trend was the great Russian physiologist I. Pavlov, whose most productive years —1906-1927—closely paralleled those of Freud. His work on conditioned reflexes was conducted on animals and he only allowed himself to make a few tentative hypotheses about the application of this work to human mental processes. Then an influential group of American psychologists developed this work particularly in the study of the process of learning.

Essentially Behaviourism studies the overt response to specific stimuli and does not concern itself with man's inner subjective life. At first many scientific workers, particularly in the Soviet Union, thought that this approach would prove to be an alternative to Freudian theory. But it now appears that it has in the main confirmed from the viewpoint of laboratory techniques the major concepts which Freud developed from his study of sick people. In particular it has confirmed the role of unconscious mental processes, psychic determinism and how emotional problems are essentially caused during childhood, particularly in the first few years.

Treatment using conditioning techniques has proved to have a definite but limited place in psychiatry and many psychiatrists are now using this in conjunction with psychotherapy.

From a philosophical viewpoint Behaviourism is mechanically materialist in its orientation and so really pre-dates the much more dialectically materialist approach of Freud. It does not flow into the wide stream of Social Psychiatry which appears to be opening up far more developments than any other approach at present.
THE role of the trade union movement in the present period of rapid technological change is the subject of great discussion. Much of this discussion takes the form of learned discourses by so-called industrial experts, their comments often being thinly disguised propaganda against trade unionism, usually taking the form that the trade unions are old fashioned, capitalism has changed, the class struggle has ended and the workers have achieved their main aims in the way of wages and working conditions.

The rightwing takes up the running with efforts to reduce or eliminate trade union influence in the Labor Party. They also speak of the trade unions needing to change, to find a new way, to adopt a “new” role, by which they really mean closer union-employer co-operation, a more developed form of class collaboration.

To answer these attacks requires more than a repetition of truths about the importance of the trade unions. It demands a thorough re-examination and re-thinking about trade unionism in our country.

What kind of trade unions do we need today? The tasks confronting the trade union movement have not diminished but increased with the growth of industry, the technological revolution, and the concentration of economic power into still fewer hands.

Despite talk of “affluence” real wages are eroded by rising prices and taxes, transport costs have gone up enormously and public transport no longer meets the people’s needs, it is no longer possible to live on a 40-hour wage so overtime has to be worked, social services (pensions, hospital and medical benefits, maternity allowance, child endowment, etc.) need substantial improvements, as do housing and education.
The trade unions need to be much more active in the fight against the danger of war, defence of democratic liberties, and to press for a socialist and democratic solution to the many problems confronting the people.

Official union policy as decided by Congresses of the Australian Council of Trade Unions, contains good decisions on most of these questions and socialism is the stated objective of the A.C.T.U. But insufficient is done to promote these ideas in depth, to develop activity in support of them, or to face up to present-day realities.

* * *

The many struggles of recent times show that there is a strong basic support for trade unionism among the workers, but it is also true that trade unionism is not growing in Australia.

The percentage of trade unionists in the total work force is falling. In 1954, unionists were 61 per cent of the work force. This percentage declined to 56 per cent in 1964. In this same period the work force increased by approximately 830,000, but affiliated membership of the Australian Council of Trade Unions went up by only 343,000.

At the present time there are approximately 1,480,000 in the work force yet to be enrolled in the trade union movement. Lest it be thought that these are only in some remote areas away from trade union influence, it should be pointed out that of the 1,224,700 workers in the manufacturing industry, only 741,300 are unionists.

In the three years 1962-63-64, the membership of white collar organisations went up by 10 per cent as against an increase of 2.6 per cent in the trade union movement generally. In New South Wales, the most industrialised state, the work force increased by 5 per cent in 1964, but trade union membership went up by only 1.6 per cent.

Changes in the composition of the work force and of the population need to be given consideration. White collar and service occupations are growing at a faster rate than the industrial and trade occupations.

In the past 20 years more than one million migrants from many different countries have made their home in Australia.

The majority—6,466,000—of our population are under 30 years of age and have no personal experience of the economic
difficulties and many struggles of the 30's. Approximately 8,000,000 are under 45.

* * *

It seems the changes in trade union work need to be made in two main fields:

1) In the thinking, ideas and outlook of the trade union leadership, and

2) In the organisational structure of the Australian trade union movement.

The criticism that many trade union leaders in Australia are narrow and conservative in outlook has some basis. Too many union leaders confine their thinking and activity to what is called union matters (even this being conceived in a narrow way) and pay little attention to the changes in society and the need to engage in activity on all matters of concern to the people.

Protection and improvement of wages and working conditions are still essential, but an exclusive concern with these ideas is not enough, for on the great social questions it leaves the arena entirely to the ideology and practical control of the ruling classes. This narrowness of outlook does not attract workers to trade unionism; it often turns them against it.

How many times have union activists been met by the question: “What are the unions doing about it?” on issues such as the standard of social services, poor community amenities, democratic rights, world peace? This is both a criticism of the narrowness of much union activity and a demand that the trade unions expand their concepts.

Of course, there are many good examples of the trade unions taking up broad national issues, which has strengthened their general influence. Official trade union policy on peace is improving, the slogan “Peace is Union Business” being well received and supported. In national peace congresses in recent years the trade union section has been the strongest numerically and the most united on the need for common action to preserve peace.

The Labor Council of New South Wales Living Standards Conference was one which set out to draw together people’s organisations on all aspects of living standards. The annual Trade Union Youth Week, and the work of teachers as the
main driving force in the campaign for adequate education standards are further examples of broad trade union work. Experiences in this work show that when the trade union movement takes up an issue of vital concern to the community, support for unionism spreads and the whole movement becomes stronger.

The issues raised by automation particularly emphasise the need for a broader trade union vision, including struggle for policies in reorganisation which recognise the workers' interests, enhance their dignity as human beings, and take account of the needs of society as a whole, instead of remaining solely within the ambit of the selfish interests of monopolies.

Narrowness of trade union outlook is not confined to people of reformist views; it also exists among leftwing union leaders, some of it arising from the limited nature of trade union resources and the present structural set-up.

Most unions are small, being able to employ only a very limited number of officials and clerical staff. Many tasks, often of a widely different nature, have to be borne by the one or a small number of officials.

At the present time there are 340 unions, many of them very small. The national links are not strong, most national unions are loose federations, the big majority of unions being active mainly on a state basis.

Very small state unions or state branches lack the resources to develop, most available time and energy being taken up in attending to the existing membership, very little remaining for reaching out to the unorganised.

One hundred and thirteen of the 164 unions registered in the N.S.W. Industrial Commission have fewer than 3,000 members; only 16 have more than 15,000 members. A dozen have fewer than 30 members, and 69 have fewer than 500.

The financial position of unions is not very strong, the average amount of funds per member in New South Wales in 1964 being £4/17/7 (Industrial Registrar's Report).

It is clear that most of the unions spend the major part of their time battling for their very survival.
Further, the Arbitration set-up not only takes up much of the time of union leaders, but acts to confine the unions to the narrowest matters, while the penalties of the system are aimed to put union action on ALL issues in a strait-jacket.

The multiplicity of unions is linked with the historic development of unionism. In this country, the formation of trade unions was influenced mainly by the craft unionism of England, the earliest unions being craft organisations.

The introduction of Arbitration in the early part of this century played a large part in the development of small unions. In 1901, before the introduction of Arbitration, there were 168 unions throughout Australia. In 1902 this number had grown to a total of 786 unions, one union for every 860 union members at that time.

Many small unions were formed with the encouragement of Arbitration officials to obtain awards and otherwise take advantage of the gains won by the larger and stronger unions. The formation of Labor Councils, various federations in different industries and the formation of the Australian Council of Trade Unions have all been designed to overcome this fragmentation of union strength.

Unions have been able to unite together in these ways and success has been achieved in a whole number of important union campaigns in past years. But today it is becoming increasingly recognised that the forms of trade union organisation must change if the challenge of our time is to be adequately met.

This has been recognised for many years in the constitution of the A.C.T.U. which calls for the closer organisation of the workers by —

a) transformation of the Australian trade union movement from a craft to an industrial basis;

b) grouping of unions in their respective industries;

c) amalgamation of unions with a view to the establishment of one union in each industry.

A.C.T.U. policy officially supports the formation of shop committees which are a vital part of the development of industrial unionism and the activising of the rank and file unionist on a wide range of issues, although little is done from the top
level to encourage them, and some union leaders are actively hostile.

Today, definite moves for amalgamation are taking place. The Boilermakers and Blacksmiths’ Unions have already amalgamated. Further discussions are taking place in the metal industry on closer unity and eventual amalgamation. The two large printing unions have amalgamated. The B.W.I.U. and the Operative Painters and Decorators’ Union have agreed upon terms of amalgamation and are campaigning for it. Amalgamations have taken place in a number of unions in the building industry in Victoria, New South Wales, Queensland and Western Australia.

The achievement of industrial unionism in Australia would enable the trade union movement to become a much more effective and powerful force. Recent moves for unity of action between the industrial and white collar workers and their organisations also could be developed much more quickly.

The unnecessary duplication of equipment and officials would be overcome and much more attention could be paid to increasing trade union membership. The increased financial and human resources would enable much greater and more effective attention to be given to broad questions.

Despite these obvious advantages the move towards industrial unionism is not proceeding quickly enough. Narrowness of outlook and conservatism, the vested interest some officials have in their jobs, exaggerated concern for the identity and historical development of the particular union, differences in political ideology and many legal barriers set up by the Arbitration Court are some of the reasons for this.

Differences in political outlook of union leaders is often seen as one of the chief barriers, and is something which should be frankly discussed.

Among the workers there is strong support for industrial unionism. Workers look with amazement on the multiplicity of union organisations and many call for one union, often expressed in the saying “We should all be in the one big union”.

The majority of union officials and activists are very sincere people with a deep regard for their particular union and the interests of the workers. Certainly there are individual careerists, downright opportunists and some scoundrels in the ranks
of union leaders. The way to amalgamation would appear to be that of basing oneself upon the best interests of the working class as a whole, of a genuine seeking to find the points of agreement, of striving for the leaderships of amalgamated unions to be a true reflection of the membership, representative of the different political viewpoints.

Union amalgamations do not come quickly, they need to be prepared for by the supporters of amalgamation working patiently in united actions in support of common objectives.

Forms of organisation need to be devised within an amalgamated union which enable each craft or calling to be satisfied that its identity is not lost, that its particular rights are preserved, that industrial unionism will actually work to the benefit of all workers.

The trade union movement can meet the challenge of today to the extent that it strengthens its organisation and develops the ideas and action which establish it as a leading force for social progress.
Fred Paterson

The Rhodes Scholar and theological student who became Australia’s first Communist M.P.

By TOM LARDNER

Frederick Woolnough Paterson deserves more than the three lines he used to get in *Who's Who In Australia*.

As a Member of Parliament he *had* to be included but his listing could not have been more terse:

**PATERSON, Frederick Woolnough, M.L.A. for Bowen (Qld.) 1944-50; address Maston St., Mitchelton, Qld.**

Nothing like the average 20 lines given to most of those in *Who’s Who*, many with much less distinguished records.

But then Fred Paterson had the disadvantage—or was it the distinction?—of being a Communist Member of Parliament—in fact, Australia’s first Communist M.P.

His academic record alone should have earned him a more prominent listing, but this was never mentioned:

A graduate in Arts at the University of Queensland, Rhodes Scholar for Queensland, graduate in Arts at Oxford University, with honors in theology, and barrister-at-law.

He was also variously, a school teacher in history, classics and mathematics; a Workers’ Educational Association organiser, a pig farmer, and for most of the time from 1923 until this day an active member of the Communist Party of Australia, a doughty battler for the under-privileged.

He also saw service in World War I.
Fred Paterson was born in Gladstone, Central Queensland, in 1897, of a big (five boys and four girls) and poor family.

His father, who had emigrated from Scotland at the age of 16, had been a station manager and horse and bullock teamster in the pioneer days of Central Queensland; but for most of Fred's boyhood, he tried to eke out a living as a horse and cart delivery man. There wasn't much in it and in the last years of his life he was a pig farmer.

As a member of such a family, Fred wouldn't have had a hope of higher education in Queensland in those days (or even in these days).

But Fred was a brilliant student (top of the year in the Junior State Examination) and won a bursary and scholarships that took him to Rockhampton and Brisbane Grammar Schools, and eventually to the Universities of Queensland and Oxford.

Fred's family was devout Church of England, and he was brought up in that faith. Quite early he had decided that his future was with the Church.

He was lucky in the churchmen he met in his formative years. The men who most influenced him in his schooldays, says Fred, were Bishop Halford of Rockhampton, and the Rev. F. E. Maynard (later Dean of Melbourne).

Both were men who believed passionately, and who taught young Fred Paterson so, that the main mission of the church was for social justice.

Both were men who practised what they preached.

In 1917, while doing an Arts course at Queensland University, Fred enlisted in the A.I.F. and spent a year on overseas service—a striking contrast to the peace time soldier and patriot, Bob Menzies, whose only interruption to his Melbourne University life was to resign his commission in the peace time army to avoid war service overseas.

Returning, Fred took his B.A. in 1919, and was appointed Rhodes Scholar for Queensland. Rhodes Scholars have to have a good sporting record, too—Fred was a top runner (he once held the Queensland quarter-mile title) and footballer.

A few weeks before his selection as Rhodes Scholar, Fred Paterson, with memories of two successful strikes in the A.I.F. organised by older soldiers than himself for better food, played
a prominent part in organising a strike among undergrads at the University against an attempt by the Senate to introduce examination fees. Though the Repatriation Department would have paid his fee as a returned soldier, and though several of his friends tried to persuade him not to jeopardise his chance of Rhodes Scholar selection, Fred never wavered.

The students decided unanimously to refuse to sit for the exams unless they were free and Fred was elected as one of the committee of three to negotiate with the Senate. The students stood firm, the strike was won and the exams were held without payment of a fee.

Fred, at this time, was still of a mind to become a churchman, but his studies in theology at Merton College, Oxford (he graduated with honors), were to take him along a different road.

"My study of theology", says Fred, "led me inevitably to belief in the materialist conception of history.

"I came to realise that man's image of God changed with his environment and his social relationships.

"I also came to realise that theology at Oxford was a study of history, no different from any other discipline, and that it had nothing to do with the dogmas of any particular church.

"I could no longer accept the Bible as the inspired word of God, and I could no longer accept belief in the Divinity of Christ."

There were other, deeper, influences at work on the young divinity student—the great world-wide social unrest that followed World War I, the Russian Revolution, the great industrial upheavals in England—but young Paterson did not then take from them the lessons that may have been obvious to others.

That was to come from a ship's steward on the old Bay liner "Moreton Bay", in which Fred returned to Australia.

The steward told Paterson that he was a Socialist, and loaned him pamphlets on Socialism. He also told him of other works that would be useful to him and, when the "Moreton Bay" reached Melbourne, he took Fred to Andrade's Bookstore in Bourke Street (remember it?) where he bought several Communist pamphlets, among them Lenin's *State and Revolution* and *Proletarian Revolution*. 
These helped Paterson move forward from the step he had first taken as a divinity student and in 1923 he joined the fledgling Communist Party of Australia.

Before this he had taught briefly at the Brisbane Church of England Grammar School and the Brisbane Grammar School, and he learned then, as he was to learn again so often later on, that the Establishment and marxists scarcely mix.

Fred was in Rockhampton in 1925, lecturing on economics to railway workers, when the great Queensland railway strike erupted. The government of the day had cut the basic wage from £4/5/- to £4.

Fred, still a novice at political and industrial action, addressed a meeting of 1,800 railwaymen and called for strike action. Only 17 voted against the recommendation, and Fred was elected to the strike committee.

Within 10 days the strikers were victorious, winning back their 5/-.

At a victory social held by the combined railway unions at Rockhampton, Fred Paterson was presented with a gold medal for his services to the strike.

Soon after this Fred's father died at Gladstone, and Fred became partner in his brother's pig farm. When his brother left the farm (to work on the wharves) Fred carried on the farm alone.

He began to study law, and here again he learned how far the ruling class will go to crush a radical.

Fred passed the Intermediate Bar Exam and the first section of the final exam with ease; this was a quiet political period for him; but, by the time he came to sit for the second section he had bought a pig farm nearer Brisbane, to enable him to attend sessions of the Full Court in Brisbane, a compulsory condition for admission to the Bar.

Contrary to all precedent, he used to finish his morning work on the farm, travel 30 miles by train to attend the Full Court and then 30 miles back to complete his day's work on the farm.

The low prices for pigs in the depression forced him to sell his stock and abandon the farm; but he was not idle. Back in Brisbane, he increased his political activity giving lectures in the Labour College and completed his studies for the second and final section of the Final Bar exam.
By this time he was a marked man; the authorities were after him. A short time before the exam he was arrested on a charge of sedition arising out of a speech he had made in the Brisbane Domain on the “Law and The Working Class”.

To be admitted to the Bar he had to have a reference from two members of the legal profession that he was a fit and proper person to become a barrister. Fred got the two references, but a move was then made to get the sponsors to withdraw their references. To their honor they refused.

Fred’s biggest hurdle was his sedition trial, for a conviction would have ended his efforts to become a barrister. He defended himself at the trial. Two police officers, in identical terms, swore to the words he was alleged to have used,amounting to over one hundred words.

But under cross-examination neither could recall what he had said before or after the offending words, and both admitted they had not taken any notes and were depending solely on their memory.

In his address to the jury, Fred Paterson likened the police witnesses to the Siamese twins: they did not eat together or drink together or sleep together, but they thought together, they remembered together, they forgot together. “Gentlemen of the jury”, he said, “behold the Siamese twins of the Queensland police force”.

The jury acquitted Paterson after a few minutes’ retirement. Brisbane “Truth”, reporting the case, praised Paterson for his brilliant defence and predicted a great future for him in law.

Ever after, those two policemen were known around Brisbane as “The Siamese Twins”.

His early days as a barrister were very lean; his work was mainly in the Police Court and included the defence of several unemployed arrested in street demonstrations. He recalls that he had to borrow a coat to appear in his first police court case, as unpaid defence of an unemployed worker.

His first break came when he was called on to defend two Italians at Ingham who had been charged with assaulting the local Consul of that time, and smashing his fascist badge.

Paterson’s defence got the two men acquitted and he became something of a hero among the big local Italian population.
After this, Paterson decided to practise at Townsville. Other important criminal cases came his way, although he had few civil cases (again the Establishment in action—some of the local solicitors boycotted him because he was a Communist).

One of his biggest cases was in securing the acquittal of a prominent grazier in the Gulf Country charged with cattle stealing.

Another case involved a man who had shot his brother-in-law, apparently without motive, in the presence of a policeman.

Paterson, defending him, successfully pleaded insanity—no sane man, he argued, would shoot another man without cause, in broad daylight, in the presence of a policeman.

After that it used to be said in North Queensland: "If you want to get away with murder, shoot someone when a policeman is present, then get Paterson to defend you."

In 1939 Paterson was elected as a Communist alderman in Townsville; at the next election he was again elected, polling over 9,000 votes out of a total of more than 14,000.

While on the Council he organised truck deliveries of fruit, vegetables and ice to counter ice shortages and profiteering. His work was so successful that the Council established its own municipal ice works and fruit and vegetable shops.

In the 1943 Federal election he contested the Herbert Federal seat, which consisted of seven State electorates with three candidates standing—Labor, Communist Party and Country Party. Fred topped the poll in four State electorates and in the whole Federal electorate he polled over 20,000 first preference votes, only 1,500 behind the leading candidate, the Labor sitting member.

In 1944 he successfully campaigned as Communist candidate for the seat of Bowen in the elections for the Queensland Legislative Assembly, to become Australia's first Communist M.P.

He was again successful in the 1947 elections, but was defeated in 1950, due partly to a gerrymander of the electorate, and the Red Bill scare.

Of his six years as a parliamentarian, Fred Paterson says: "They were lively, interesting years. There was a tremendous mass movement in Queensland at this time, and I was able
to make effective use of parliament as a forum for policies to assist the working class and other sections of useful people.”

In 1948, while he was still an M.P., the Queensland ruling class really went after Paterson.

It was the time of the big railway strike of 1948, enthusiastically backed by the railway unions after they had voted overwhelmingly in its favor at a secret ballot.

Police were harassing the picket line around the main railway depot at Mayne and Paterson’s legal advice on the spot thwarted the intimidating tactics of the more aggressive plain clothes men.

In the course of the strike, several strikers were arrested, and on St. Patrick’s Day 1948 Fred was on his way from the Brisbane Trades Hall to the Police Court to defend some of the men charged. He stopped near a procession near Edward Street to take notes when he saw a plain clothes policeman bashing a member of the procession and was struck on the skull from behind by a policeman’s baton, which left him bleeding and unconscious on the ground. He was later taken to the Brisbane General Hospital.

For some strange reason the police never found the culprit although many of them were within 20 or 30 feet of the bashing. Luckily for Fred, a photo was published in the first edition of the Brisbane Evening Telegraph that day, showing him a few seconds before standing quietly with his note book and pencil taking notes. This photo effectively prevented any attempt to frame him and make an excuse for the bashing. Baffled, the authorities remained singularly silent.

Some time after Fred came out of hospital police officers came to his home to get a statement, but made no use of the statement for Fred had wisely agreed to make a statement only on condition that his wife was allowed to take a shorthand record of the interview, signed by herself, read back to the police and then countersigned by the senior police officer.

Today, Paterson is living in an outer Sydney suburb.

He is in semi-retirement; he is 69, but he still manages to give useful advice and experiences, and is still as trim as he used to be, still as dedicated as a Communist as he used to be as a divinity student.
Struggle for the North by J. H. Kelly is one of the most extraordinary books to be published in Australia in recent years. Not only is it a mine of information—a complete inventory of the human, mineral, cattle and water resources of defined remote regions of Northern Australia—but it provides a comprehensive critique of all aspects of government policy toward Northern development since Federation. It also outlines (from a left-Socialist viewpoint) an alternative, detailed strategy for the economic development of the North.

Kelly, emphasising integrated development and the long view of the national interest, effectively answers critics of northern development, including those informed ones who approach the matter on too narrow a basis.

It is instructive, for example, to read 'Struggle for the North' alongside Dr. Davidson's 'The Northern Myth' since Kelly paints on a much wider canvas.

A marxist programme for rural industries and mineral development cannot be "plucked out of the air" or deduced from a series of abstract principles; if it is to be realistic, effective and attainable it must be solidly based on factual information: resource surveys, economic calculation and other "inductive" work. For this reason alone the Australian labor movement in general, and its marxist wing in particular, will gratefully draw on the analysis of Mr. Kelly, who, during seventeen years as a project-evaluation officer with the Commonwealth Bureau of Agricultural Economics, was able to complete a personal survey of every cattle station and every river system of the remote North.

The main conclusions from Kelly's analysis are:

- Private enterprise in the North (the big overseas pastoral companies such as Vestey's, Bovril etc.) has failed—being unable to bring the beef cattle industry of the remote regions up to its potential of 5.1 million head. The industry stagnates at 3 million head.

- The recommendations of a Chifley government sub-committee of Cabinet for a firm policy of limiting future pastoral leases was sabotaged. Instead, the bulk of the cattle lands of the North, previously handed over to the London-based Vestey meat empire and others, due to revert to the Commonwealth in 1965 through expiry of leases, was again handed over: in that year leases were extended from 1954 to 2004.

- The big overseas pastoral companies have always opposed railway construction as likely to lead to the splitting up of their large, inefficiently operated estates. With friendly Conservative governments and Labor governments incapable of placing the co-ordinated transport needs of the North within the framework of an economic development plan they have had their way. Hence the appearance of a piecemeal and emasculated beef-roads scheme—the result of political pressures.

- The backwardness of the beef cattle industry has been due to the maladministration of the public estate, erosion caused by carelessness, and the use of an
inefficient “open range” system of grazing. All of this amounts to what former Northern Territory Administrator Wise and Kelly call the “rape of the land”.

- Absentee landholders oppose the kind of hydrological investigation needed to assess the irrigation possibilities of the remote North, since it would threaten their hold on vast leaseholds.

- The Commonwealth government has neglected aboriginal welfare for decades, failing to prosecute cattle owners for underpayment of aboriginal stockmen. By contrast, conservative federal governments have never been backward in legislating in favour of wealthy absentee landholders of the Northern Territory, often at heavy cost to the Australian taxpayers.

- The cattle industry of the remote North is dependent on aborigines as the major labour force for the operation of the industry. Moreover, the source of the most frequent complaints about aboriginal workers is the large absentee holders: yet it is their stations which flagrantly ignore the standards for aboriginal accommodation set out in the N.T. Wards Employment Ordinance of 1959, and which reward their aboriginal workers with the bare minimum payable under N.T. legislation.

- An Act of the Commonwealth Parliament should be immediately passed to enforce measures to reconstruct the cattle industry in the N.T. It should ensure that graziers and farmers as custodians of the public estate should be punished for neglect and for refusing to conform to prescribed instructions on soil, vegetation and water resources, and on animal husbandry, fencing, the dipping of cattle etc.

- For an equivalent investment (as compared with the Ord River Irrigation Project) in a reconstructed cattle industry run by resident holders carrying an average of 7,000 head, Australia would generate more value of output, foreign exchange and employment for closer settlement of remote northern regions than the Ord Scheme.

- Rents and royalties paid by overseas corporations in the North are paltry. They are arbitrary, and levied at a level brought about by political threats and pressures from these corporations, rather than at a level to bring about an efficient structure of production and to yield some return on public monies spent on ports, railways etc. Moreover, decisions about Northern mineral development are increasingly taken by a head-office in London or New York as part of a world strategy of geo-politics, rather than in accordance with the needs of the Australian people.

- A Northern Australia Commission was bitterly opposed by Vestey's, but is essential as part of “planning machinery” for Northern development—provided it has a positive charter and is backed by statutory powers and adequate finance.

- Trade Unions must be brought into any Plan for the North sooner or later and "for full co-operation it should be sooner rather than later".

- Northern development should not be advocated for its own sake or for emotional reasons (such as the fear of "Asian hordes"). It must be part of a blueprint for the re-organisation of the economy. The present utilisation of resources in the North is inefficient and wasteful and will remain so until a socialist government takes a leading part in their re-organisation and development.

Mr. Kelly's work on minerals serves as a basis for developing
a two-pronged attack on the activities of the large mining companies themselves and on their manipulation of the Australian economy.

Trade unionists and socialists reacted sharply to the "tough" line on wages and conditions pursued by Mt. Isa Mines Ltd. last year and by Conzinc Rio Tinto this year. With plenty of oversea-capital backing and alternative mineral deposits under their control in South America and elsewhere these international giants can afford to adopt a "take it or leave it" attitude to workers—and even to local capitalists and the Australian government.

More significant, they are seeking to penetrate and establish a powerful niche in what has come to be called "permanent defence industries" (The Australian 26-2-66). As a lead-up to permanent war industry, the Menzies Government established a group of "defence advisory committees" in the 1950s, integrated with the Commonwealth Department of Supply. These committees are made up of departmental officials and the highest representatives of big-business and cover: ammunition, explosives and chemicals, leathergoods, military vehicles, weapons and their equipment, electrical goods, radar and communications, machine tools, gauges and factory equipment and materials industry. (Hansard, 28/4/63, p. 996). The all-important Materials Industry Advisory Committee is composed of Messrs. A. Simmons and I. R. Angus (Department of Supply), R. G. Parry-Okeden (Chairman of Directors, Lysaghts), M. B. Somerset (Managing Director, Associated Pulp and Paper Mills), J. A. Bult (General Manager, Electrolytic Zinc), J. D. Norgard (General Manager of Operations B.H.P. Victoria), K. A. Cameron (Chairman, Mount Morgan Ltd.), G. R. Fisher (Chairman Mt. Isa Mines Ltd.) and Sir Maurice Mawby (Chairman, Conzinc Rio Tinto of Australia Ltd.).

The last four of these represent companies specifically criticised in Kelly's book for their tactics in obtaining ownership of Australian minerals for laughably-low royalties and for other activities. Yet it is clear (as John Allison, former member of one of these "Defence Advisory Committees") boasted during the Queale Memorial Lecture in Adelaide a few years ago, that these committees exert a tremendous influence on government policy—an influence that democrats and Australian socialists ought to counter by exposing them.

On the wider issue of foreign investment, Mr. Kelly points out in Chapter 9, that much of the propaganda about the net capital and productivity gains from it is without foundation. He mentions how General Motors Holden gained control over the motor vehicle industry with an initial capital grant from the Chifley government. Less than 2 million American dollars was advanced but from this an asset of more than $600m was built up here out of profits by 1963, and in the same period $A140m was dispatched to the U.S. in dividends. A high price was paid for the use of the name "General Motors". Not only was the price high in terms of the charge made for the final product, but there were indirect costs to Australia involved in the substantial excess capacity and over-investment in the industry, as well as limitations (franchises) on the export of Australian cars. Tariff protection given to industries such as motor vehicles, to attract foreign capital here, causes an attraction of Australian labour and capital to those industries and raises their prices.

Mr. Kelly points out that this process will squeeze profits and incomes in rural industries and
leads to a reduced capital inflow into other profitable industries such as the beef cattle industry. He suggests that the empire-building process pioneered by G.M.H. will be repeated in the "giveaways" on the mineral front. A government investment of 2 million dollars in the motor vehicle industry and of public monies in minerals would lead, on the other hand, to a large return to the government instead of to foreign investors.

The data presented on the cattle industry underlines the need for a new and more comprehensive marxist programme for rural industries. Kelly's program, a left-socialist one, involves resumption of lands and their return to public control. His "efficient productive units" in the cattle industry involves resident ownership by a relatively small number of people. A marxist programme would go beyond this. It is likely to envisage the co-existence of co-operatively owned (by aborigines) cattle stations and a network of publicly-owned cattle enterprises managed by a few hundred talented managers. A system needs to be worked out under which these professionals would administer the public estate in the North, allowing them to share in returns (and have the incentive to perform efficiently) while serving the needs of the economy and the people. It must be said, however, that Kelly's short-term programme poses a challenge for socialists in Australia—the elaboration of a detailed and soundly-based long-term rural programme.

This attractively produced book—with a dozen completely new maps and numerous photographs to supplement the analytical content—is a must for the general reader, trade unionists and all thoughtful socialists.

—Robert Kirk.

"THE KING BETWEEN"
— David Martin. Cassell, $2.85.

In the mythical kingdom of Lhaodia, ageing King Anabol walks a dangerous tight-rope. On his eastern borders the Americans have amassed a great military arsenal; to his north are the Chinese, from whom the ancient oracles of the Pure Doctrine have foreshadowed death and disaster for Lhaodia. So Anabol embarks on a struggle for neutrality. His weapons — his great dream of a Freedom Road across Lhaodia and the need for surgical attention to his prostate gland. To whom will he entrust the building of the road, and the operation? On the answer to this question will depend the independence of his tiny realm.

The topicality of this theme in today's South East Asia is perhaps the most outstanding feature of David Martin's "The King Between". Against the skilful play and counterplay of diplomatic intrigue move the characters whom history has flung together—U.S. Ambassador Kiest and his wife Marley, whose liking and respect for Chinese Ambassador Teng make her suspect in Washington; beautiful Didon, Anabol's French wife; Howard Johanson, American Intelligence "hard-liner"; little Prince Sua, 12-year-old heir to the throne, caught bewilderingly between the modern West and ancient East; the scholarly and sinister mystic Trukpetch Survongse.

Mounting tension over the development of the Freedom Road provides political background for the explosive potential of human relationships. As pressure is put on the little kingdom by "hard-liners" from both sides, as an-
cient superstitions and the casting of a horoscope may decide the fate of a nation and of world peace, the tentative relationship between General Teng and Marley Kiest flickers with a promise of more hopeful solutions for mankind. But as the unexpected denouement approaches with gathering speed, it is inevitable that such people are going to provide the sacrificial offerings to the power-hungry. As General Teng put it: "It is hard to grow roses on barbed wire."

David Martin reveals a most intimate knowledge of Asian customs and has woven them into the fabric of his story with an attention to detail which is sometimes overwhelming. The meeting of East and West in tiny Lhaoaia unleashes violent passions and violent situations, and perhaps it is right that one should feel despair as long as "hard-liners" in East and West determine policy.

It is a tribute to the author, however, that one just escapes a feeling of defeatism in the final irony. Perhaps this is because of the absurdity of the little king's gland difficulties anyway; perhaps because there is a tongue-in-cheek lightness in handling the pawn-like manoeuvres on the giant chessboard. At any rate, one feels it may be hard, but not impossible, to grow roses on barbed wire one day.

—Dudie Martir.


In this important work Mr. Rowley gives this warning:
"History may judge Australia in New Guinea for what it failed to do rather than for the good work it did.

"Australia's time in the Territory is rapidly running out. Have we sufficient resources, finance, imagination to help New Guinea on the firm road to nationhood? Can we go on improving the future of a complex, still primitive territory as though it was a smooth running branch of the Public Service?"

Since the book appeared, challenges to land alienation, the demand for a real living wage, the conflict over mining royalties, the indications of the emergence of an opposition in the House of Assembly, and an increasing insistence that all decisions affecting New Guinea, including its relations with its neighbors, be referred to the House, all emphasise Mr. Rowley's main point that "it's later than we think."

Mr. Rowley's academic experience fits him to deal with the problems analysed in this work. He is a Master of Arts with wide experience in adult education.

He was principal of the Australian School of Pacific Administration for 14 years. He served with U.N.E.S.C.O. as an expert in Adult and Workers Education in Iran, Laos, Cambodia, South Vietnam, Philippines and Indonesia.

Surveying the world movement of anti-colonialism, Mr. Rowley concludes that the Federal Government should now be making firm decisions about when and how it is to give independence to the peoples of New Guinea who comprise one-sixth of those owning allegiance to the Australian Commonwealth. To delay granting independence until we ourselves are ready could have serious consequences.

The title is carefully chosen as, before the European landfall in the 80's of last century, there was no urban development at all. New Guinea's two million lived in isolation in more than 10,000 villages.

A large portion of the book deals with native society and its development in contact with the white administration.

Mr. Rowley draws attention to the diversity of physical types. Some are tall and slim, others are very short and squat with the great chests and legs of those used to running up and down steep slopes. Skin color, too, is in endless variety, from light brown, "he rich black of the Buka.

Language differentiation is great, but modern studies seem to indicate that they originally stemmed from only a few languages. He quotes Dr. Wurm as stating that the time span for this differentiation could be 3,000 to 4,000 years.

Mr. Rowley trenchantly analyses the system of contract or indentured labor. He says it is saved from the brand of slavery by the fiction of the contract which in most cases is not understood by the indigenous party to the contract.

Mr. Rowley's account of racial discrimination, how it arises and is maintained, is an important portrayal of this feature of colonial life.

He shows how it operates and developed. How so many whites are not conscious of the attitudes which infuriate the New Guineans. He states that there is a widespread belief in the necessity for "white supremacy in New Guinea. This is deeply resented by the New Guineans.

The author deals with the impact of Australian law which is not understood and because of this there is only token acceptance of the law.

The book has a long and informative chapter on the history and development of Christian religions.

The author says that missions have had some great successes in some areas but the strongly-held views of the people are tending to change Christianity. This is particularly evident in Manus.

The chapter "Villagers React" deals with the various resistances — referred to by the whites as Cargo Cults — which arose from the attempt of the people to draw into action the spirits of their ancestors to try and end what they saw as intolerable oppression.

The author's view is that the establishment of local government councils, which give New Guineans some say in their own affairs, with their wider participation in the emerging social order, would tend to push the old magico-religious activities into the background.

Urban development and the emergent working-class is covered in the chapter "Villager in Town". The development of the industrial worker is sympathetic, he is dealing with as are the problems of the workers in their struggle for better housing, better working conditions and their efforts to lift their pathetically low wage rates.

Mr. Rowley's view is that power is still firmly in the hands of the Administration whose district apparatus has very extensive powers behind the democratic facade of the elected House of Assembly.

This arrogation of power to the hands of the colonial power is, in his view, contrary to the trends
of world opinion and is fraught with serious consequences. As the author puts it: "A riot in the streets of the capital of Port Moresby might well prove more politically significant for the Territory and Australia than resolutions in the House."

This analysis by a competent observer is probably the most important work of its kind.

In a field where so many writers seem to approach the question of criticism of the administration with fear and trembling, Mr. Rowley forthrightly criticises the whole approach to the New Guinea people by the administration and by the Europeans as individuals.

The book is a product of deep study of the problems created by the impact of modern European civilisation and its form of society on the primitive culture of the New Guineans, a society which has been in existence for probably 4,000 years.

Mr. Rowley is not a socialist, but his love of humanity and his demand for a "fair go" runs like a red thread through his work.

—Jim Cooper


When "civilised" man interferes with Nature he is in trouble. Through need or greed, he hacks down the forests, affects the climate, denudes slopes, erodes and exhausts the soil, kills and pollutes rivers, wipes out living creatures including indigenous peoples, and generally plays merry hell with nature's checks and balances and his own sources of subsistence.

"The Great Extermination" is a grim story of reckless exploitation of Australia's natural resources, animal, plant and soil, and a warning of the implications for present and future generations, written by a number of scientists, experts in their own field, its editor and contributor A. J. ("Jock") Marshall, Professor of Zoology and Comparative Physiology at Monash University.

The book should shock into protest and action even the complacent who rest on the illusion that the natural resources of our continent are as boundless as its horizons.

Professor Marshall well says that parts of the story "may make you sick and despairing of your fellow men". (One might say, rather, "despairing" of capitalist society.)

So modern Australian man is the villain of this piece; man the enemy of his own future, and the evidence presented is convincing enough, although, again, some will prefer differentiation, to put in a plea for the common man, the "little man" who is after all part and product of the society he lives in.

If he is wanton and often brutal in his greed and races after the "quick quid", he is only in step with his governors and the master class who play the tune, and, in the long run he pays the piper in ruined farms and elimination of his sources of livelihood, as the text amply illustrates.

From early days of settlement pleas, warnings and endeavors by the few concerned at the increasing misuse and decimation of our natural resources come to a dead stop against the barriers of greed, political intrigue and corruption, the plain dumb-headedness of governments, and ruthlessness of business interests they represent and an uninformed public.

In his contribution, each scientist illustrates the effects of man's cupidity upon the particular subject of research—animal or bird, reptile or fish,
rivers and streams, forest and plain.

Some blame the sheepmen who eroded the soil through overstocking; others blame vote-seeking politicians who closed their eyes to the slaughter of native fauna; or bureaucrats who permitted the butchery of our forests.

The author's treatment of the extermination of our resources is mainly historical and there is little reference to the immediate problem of the men with a long-range "covetous eye" (and already firm grip) on vast acreages of land for pastoral and mineral exploitation.

Monopoly is not noted for its concern for conservation or posterity, and in view of modern techniques for rip and tear the prospect of its activities is horrifying unless scientists and honest administrators, backed by an informed working class, can intervene in time.

The most notable omission from the book, however, is the "greatest" extermination in our entire history. Aborigines receive scant mention, or recognition that they were and remain the most valuable, if least valued, of all Australian "resources".

Physical extermination of the Aboriginal people by bullet, poison and direct starvation may have ceased, but extermination of their identity and culture proceeds apace.

The omission is curious since the standpoint of the book is basically humanist in its concern for man's education and regeneration into understanding of his relationships with nature.

Yet, where we may lose much knowledge, culture and material value through the disappearance of rare animals and plants, we lose much more in the passing not only of ancient arts and skills but of a way of life, of collective living and alliance with nature. We lose most in forgetting the human relationships of all human beings.

"The Great Exterminator" is not all gloom and disaster in spite of its sub-title.

As well as its evolutionary lessons and the liveliness and wit of much of the writings, there are fascinating accounts of the history and habits of our unique fauna. So much can be learned of the relationship and interdependence of all living organisms, from micro-organisms to man, with each other and with the terrain that both sustains and is sustained by them, that some such sub-title as "First Steps in Ecology . . . Some lessons in Dialectics" could be justified.

Gleams of hope for a balanced, scientific development of what we have, and reclamation of what can be salvaged gimmer through the whole unhappy tale.

There are indications of some governments' awareness of and response to the writing on the wall; some attempts here and there to protect flora and fauna and of rational land use; some reservations of large acreages as sanctuaries and national parks, some reafforestation, and a reflection of some public awakening in the development of conservation societies and a national Australian Conservation Foundation.

People become conservation-minded from many motives; love of wild life and trees, from aesthetic or tourism considerations. Even the "bleeding hearts" that irritate Professor Marshall can be part of the general stream that can achieve true conservation and development of our national heritage.

Professor Marshall concludes: "The future of our land lies with you."

—Joyce Tattersell,
Protocol for the Prohibition of the Use in War of Asphyxiating, Poisonous or other Gases, and of Bacteriological Methods of Warfare.

Geneva, June 17, 1925.

PROTOCOL.

The undersigned Plenipotentiaries, in the name of their respective Governments:

Whereas the use in war of asphyxiating, poisonous or other gases, and of all analogous liquids, materials or devices, has been justly condemned by the general opinion of the civilised world; and

Whereas the prohibition of such use has been declared in Treaties to which the majority of Powers of the world are Parties; and

To the end that this prohibition shall be universally accepted as a part of International Law, binding alike the conscience and the practice of nations;

DECLARE:

That the High Contracting Parties, so far as they are not already Parties to Treaties prohibiting such use, accept this prohibition, agree to extend this prohibition to the use of bacteriological methods of warfare and agree to be bound as between themselves according to the terms of this declaration.

The High Contracting Parties will exert every effort to induce other States to accede to the present Protocol. Such accession will be notified to the Government of the French Republic, and by the latter to all signatory and acceding Powers, and will take effect on the date of the notification by the Government of the French Republic.

The present Protocol, of which the French and English texts are both authentic, shall be ratified as soon as possible. It shall bear to-day's date.

The ratifications of the present Protocol shall be addressed to the Government of the French Republic, which will at once notify the deposit of such ratifications to each of the signatory and acceding Powers.

The instruments of ratification of and accession to the present Protocol will remain deposited in the archives of the Government of the French Republic.

The present Protocol will come into force for each signatory Power as from the date of deposit of its ratification, and, from that moment, each Power will be bound as regards other Powers which have already deposited their ratifications.
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STRUGGLE FOR THE NORTH by J. H. Kelly

Australasian Book Society, 240 pp., $4.25.

Mr. Kelly outlines a vigorous programme of economic development, makes a severe criticism of political maladministration, shows the harmful effects of overseas and absentee land-ownership, and exposes the appalling exploitation of Aborigines in the cattle industry.

This book presents the only detailed inventory and analysis of all natural resources in the north — land, water, minerals — exhaustively documented with many maps, photographs and tables.

MY YEARS IN THE COMMUNIST PARTY

by Ralph Gibson

International Bookshop, Melbourne, 268 pp., $1.75.

In this book Ralph Gibson relates in very readable form his personal experiences against the background of the struggles of the people and the activities of the Communist Party.

THE VIETNAMESE NATION

Contribution to a History

by Jean Chesneaux

English translation by Malcolm Salmon

Current Book Distributors. Approximate price: $3.25.

Circa 304 pp. Publication date: September, 1966.

This work by the noted French orientalist, M. Jean Chesneaux of the Sorbonne, is an acknowledged standard work on its subject. The original text has been revised and a new chapter added to bring it up to date for the purposes of the English translation, which has been approved by the author.