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 victims 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, Graham 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 semimagical 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.