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TELEVISION takes its audiences close to events and the men who lay claim to decisive influence on those events. The cameras were very revealing of President Johnson and Prime Minister Holt in their politicians' progress through eastern Australia. Predictably, Mr. Holt came out worse—obviously obsequious, long-winded and boring. Mr. Johnson, more experienced and better coached in projecting an image, was perhaps the bigger disappointment to those who may have looked for any signs of intellectual depth or grasp of the moral and political issues in Vietnam and Asia.

Instead, there were lashings of ham and corn, a virtuoso display of American politicians' expertise and glad-handing. The unprecedented thousands of demonstrators were confirmed in their determination to continue campaigning to keep Australia independent of the United States. The uncommitted who thought through the ballyhoo, even many who went to cheer and wave flags, must have felt some apprehension that such a man sits at the control panel of immense destructive power.

Mr. Holt and most of the press were lavish with superlatives before, during and after the visit; everything was "historic". History rarely judges events as do the men who take part in them. Events called "historic" by interested parties are often unimportant and soon forgotten. The Manila Conference is certainly destined for historical oblivion. It was no peace conference; if it meant anything, this was contained in Johnson's guarantee to Westmoreland on his hurried visit to Vietnam—"everything you want". Manila was the green light for still more ferocious use of American military might in the aggressive war.

HOW goes this war? The press reports alternate between mean-spirited triumph—"militarily the war is being won", and perplexed pessimism—"we are losing the war for the minds and hearts of the people".

Five months ago, our press reported triumphantly on the Australian Army's campaign to win over the villagers of Hoa Long, a mile from its H.Q., with civil aid, a new market, food
and clothing, a school... Early one Sunday morning the farce turned into tragedy, as 1,000 troops sneaked out of their camp, sealed off the village and rounded up every male between 12 and 45, every female between 12 and 35.

These people—1,000 of them—were carted off to the provincial capital for “interrogation”. The meaning of this word was revealed by Daily Mirror reporter John Sorrell, who wrote: “I travelled the village with one of the (South) Vietnamese units, led by a veteran captain who had fought for the French at Dien Bien Phu. He found one Vietcong... The Viet captain later showed no mercy. ‘I am going to beat him up, then kill him,’ he said. I never saw the man again.”

Hoa Long is the Vietnam war in microcosm, revealing the military, political and moral issues and lessons of the war. The “enemy” is the whole population; 12-year-old girls or South Vietnam Army conscripts (“The local Vietnamese troops were not told of the search until the last moment...”).

The South Vietnam Army is led by officers who fought against the Vietminh, to keep their country a French colony. The captain was no exception; Prime Minister Ky, many of his Cabinet and military leaders, were French puppets before changing their allegiance to the Americans.

The whole structure of “government” is corrupt and anti-national. The September “elections” were a farce. Said South Vietnam Buddhist monk, Thich Nhat Hanh: “The people voted because they were told they’d get no rice if they didn’t.” Force, and force alone, keeps the Ky regime in power. And this force is now almost exclusively provided by the United States and its allies.

This “foreigners’ war” is regarded by the people as a war of aggression. “Search and destroy” gave a figleaf of propriety by assigning U.S. (and Australian) troops to the front-line fighting, and then handing over the “pacified” areas of the South Vietnamese. Now U.S. and allied troops are to “clear and hold”; foreigners are now to occupy the whole country.

The miracle of Vietnam is that the United States is suffering military reverses as well as political defeats. Never before has such an apparently unequal war gone on so long and seemed so endless. On the Americans’ own figures, they out-number the National Liberation Front by at least eight to one; they claim
a “kill ratio” of ten to one. Technological superiority is immeasurable. They have complete or virtual monopolies in planes, rockets, napalm, white phosphorus, gas and defoliating chemicals, tanks, warships . . . the list is long. The Americans have long surpassed the previous “world record” — they have dropped more bombs in Vietnam than were dropped on Europe in World War II.

WHY no American victory? The obvious and only possible reason—that the people won’t submit—cannot be admitted. Their only excuse is “Vietcong terror”. Since the balance of terror is so obviously on the Americans’ side, this is not a very convincing argument. The main evidence given is the “assassination” of village chiefs and others (up to 16,000, it is asserted).

The village chiefs were themselves practitioners of terror, the main instruments of Diem, anniversary of whose downfall was marked by a ceremonial parade in Saigon on November 1. The American professor, Bernard B. Fall, writing in the U.S. magazine *Ramparts*, states:

“. . . Diem ended the 400 to 500 year tradition of the democratic election of village chiefs by each village . . . He began making local appointments from Saigon, and the appointees—many of them outsiders—were met with open hostility by the villagers. Diem’s men would have to go outside the village to the police post to sleep safely. Many of them were known to be gouging the villages. The hard fact is that when the Viet Cong assassinated these men, the Viet Cong were given a Robin Hood halo by the villagers.”

Denis Warner confirms that this position has worsened, at least in one important respect:

“Corruption has reached limits which test credibility. Far too little of the great American aid programme reaches its destination and far too much goes into the hands of unscrupulous officials . . . I talked to one American official who said he always added extra to aid consignments so that district village officials would have a share allocated to them.” (SMH 4/11/66).

The balance of terror reveals the deep moral sickness of American imperialism. Its apologists shudder with horror at “Vietcong terrorism”, accepting with apparent equanimity at best, and all-out support at worst, the impersonal, one-sided, technologically advanced barbarity of high explosive, napalm and chemical warfare.

Western capitalism is morally sick, and the loss of moral feeling in Vietnam demands and receives its intellectual rationalisation. Dean Acheson, co-author and now Elder Statesman of
the Cold War, said in a speech at Amherst College in December, 1965:

"The end sought by our foreign policy . . . is, as I have said, to preserve and foster an environment in which free societies may exist and flourish. Our policies and actions must be decided by whether or not they contribute to or detract from achievement of this end. They need no other justification or moral or ethical embellishment . . ." (Quoted by Bernard Fall in Ramparts).

Thus a spokesman for the Christian West sententiously but clearly asserts: The end justifies the means.

One million Vietnamese died in the nine years of the independence war against the French. The deathroll since the Americans "escalated" the war two years ago already nears 250,000. Such slaughter is horrifying genocide; it must be stopped by still more resolute action of all who condemn the war. This means every socialist country acting in concert and putting aside all differences to help Vietnam; it means every person and movement opposed to the war, in every capitalist country, working in unity to exert maximum possible pressure for an end to U.S. aggression. This is particularly a task for Australia, so much a part of the U.S. war, where so much public opposition, concern and uneasiness exists.

THE anti-Johnson demonstrations may finally prove the most important event of the visit. It is no exaggeration to say this marked a new higher stage in the protest movement against the Vietnam war. A new determination, a wider social base, a more militant spirit, these were new features serving notice upon the Establishment that the opposition is growing wider and deeper.

Other straws show how the political wind is blowing. The Independent Liberal movement, irrespective of its ultimate support in votes, is an important direct challenge to government policy on Vietnam from a new social force. Divisions within the Liberal Party and still more notably between the Liberal and Country Parties, are strongly affected by the sustained opposition to the Vietnam war and conscription.

The far right is mobilising all its forces to meet the threat of the protest movement. It is only too easy to dismiss the far right as extremists, cranks and fanatics, unimportant and slightly absurd. The arrest of 19 American "Minutemen", with an astounding armoury of weapons, allegedly for use against "leftist" camps,
may cast a different light upon the Far Right here, since it peddles the Birchite propaganda which inspires the Minutemen. However, the real danger to Australian democracy does not yet come from extra-legal fascist violence.

The threat is powerful and more sinister—the strong and growing influence of the Far Right within the Liberal Party. The Liberal Party extreme right almost defeated a candidate for Warringah pre-selection, although his anti-communism is above suspicion, because he opposes apartheid. Some selected Liberal candidates are connected with Ustashi terrorists (through the "Anti-Bolshevik Bloc of Nations" and "Captive Nations Week"); they favor "war on mainland China" and see Communist influence everywhere.

This could perhaps be dismissed too if it were not known that some powerful figures in the Holt Ministry were also associated with these groupings. Killen, Kent Hughes, Wentworth and Jess have colleagues in seats of power. The threat to Australian democracy is real; it comes from the Far Right and sees its course to power as through Liberal government.

There are enough legislative powers, and a growing group of influential Ministers, to ensure an attempted crackdown on protest movements. This could arise if the government suffered loss of seats, thus feeling insecure, or maintained its majority, and felt untrammelled by public opinion. And defeat for the government could easily decide the Far Right upon other paths, such as Colonel Campbell and his New Guard took a generation ago.

The labor and democratic movement must be alert to the threats to democracy posed by the undeclared war in Vietnam and the whole dangerous course of the foreign policy summed up in the notorious: “All the way with LBJ”. As Mr. Barton, leader of the Liberal breakaway movement said (SMH, November, 7):

“I think the suggestion that anyone who opposes the Government is a communist is not only wrong, but is a symptom of a condition in this country where people are afraid to stand up for their principles because of the possibility they might be attacked in this way.”

Racialism and anti-communism are, of course, the only real Government justification for the Vietnam war. The old “yellow hordes of Asia” catch-cry has now become a more multi-coloured scare—The Red yellow hordes. The Far Right is thus the more welcome, since it is very much a White Man’s movement. In it are
to be found friends of Smith's Rhodesia and Vorster's South Africa; anti-semites; even an academic who asks us to ponder how "we" would feel if outnumbered by aborigines, as South African whites are outnumbered by blacks.

ABORIGINES are greatly outnumbered by whites; of course no one in authority has worried very much how they feel about this. White domination of the Aborigines has brought them untold suffering and misery in the 178 years of European settlement. Seventeen years of Liberal government have brought forth a new policy, assimilation, and many assurances that the bad old days have gone forever.

Present-day realities have suddenly been revealed in all their shocking harshness. And this revelation has been brought about by an historic action of the Aborigines themselves. The Aboriginal stockmen's strike in the Northern Territory has many far-reaching implications. It has once again shown that direct action is the way to get results, a lesson that the Aboriginal strikers have emphasised for white workers. The results already gained are concrete—changes in regulations governing accommodation and keep; admission that supervision of previous regulations was lax or even non-existent; exposure of the callous inhumanity towards the Aborigines by Vestey's and other big cattle companies; misuse of Aborigines' social service payments by some station managements.

The strike has already forced a substantial increase in the wage scale, in the face of the Industrial Commission. This agreement, reached by the ACTU with cattle owners and government, has been rejected by the strikers and the North Australian Workers' Union because it falls short of the minimum possible settlement—the basic wage for Aboriginal stockmen.

It seems certain that the struggle will continue next year, when the cattle companies again want Aboriginal stockmen. This underlines the need for continued financial and moral support for the strikers. Support so far has been remarkable. Dexter Daniel and Captain Major, representing the Aboriginal strikers, have made a tremendous impression in Sydney and Melbourne. Thousands of dollars have already been sent to the N.T. Aboriginal Rights Council and the NAWU. As usual, the bulk of the money has come from militant unions and from job meetings. A very heartening new development is financial support from the universities, mainly from collections by radical students.
An interesting sidelight on the strike is the various responses from the Establishment. Predictably, the cattle owners reacted by accusations of “Communist influences”. The Federal Government has been discreetly silent. The metropolitan press first tried to blanket the strike and its exposure of intolerable conditions in silence. There were only two exceptions from the beginning—the Northern Territory News in Darwin, and Tribune nationally. To their credit, most metropolitan papers have subsequently come around to news and, in general, favorable comment on the strike. An interesting exception is the Packer press. The Bulletin has so far made no comment on the strike, and a rough check of three months’ issues shows only two lines reporting the fact that Wave Hill was out.

The salient fact is that this strike was “caused” by no-one except the cattle owners and the government. It was “fomented” by no-one except the Aborigines’ own leaders. It is most significant that this strike has already brought forth such new developments as the Gurindji demand that Wave Hill be turned over to them, and the assertion of Aboriginal identity as a people.

The Aboriginal strike is the signal of the end of “assimilation”, herald of the new path of development for the Australian Aborigines.

FOR ELECTION COMMENT SEE INSIDE BACK COVER.

“The reason for such a crisis in ideology is that capitalism is losing its ability to appeal to reason . . . there is no reasonable explanation for the mass napalm burning of people. There is no reason for malnutrition in the midst of affluence . . . So capitalist ideology has been forced to retreat from the arena of reason, of debate about ideas, about truth . . . has retreated to the back alleys where it makes its appeal . . . to prejudice, to fear, to jingoism . . . The idea that it is all right to burn villages with women and children in Vietnam because they are a colored people is making the rounds in the ideological sewers.”

The economic and social consequences of automation were discussed in September by communist union activists, and extracts from some of the speeches are published in this issue. The Australian Council of Trade Unions held a seminar on automation in October. The president of the Communist Party of Australia comments on some of the issues raised in these discussions.

The views expressed by trade unionists on the new problems arising from technological developments are a very useful beginning in the working out of an effective trade union strategy.

It must be said, however, that the line of approach, especially at the ACTU seminar, was to seek solutions within the present structure of trade union thinking, methods and organisation. Much more than this will be needed if the trade unions are to effectively defend their members’ rights, and help shape the future lines of trade union influence and organisation in industry and the nation.

In Australia there has been considerable progress in the application of new scientific and technological methods to production. Automation, however, is only in its infancy. What are the prospects these changes hold for the people? The British marxist, Dr. Sam Lilley, writing in the August, 1965, issue of Marxism Today had this to say:

"Automation, in spite of its youth, has gone far enough to assure us that almost any productive task can be automated. Even now it offers enormous increases in the productivity of labor. Computers can plan a factory’s production processes far more skilfully than any human production manager, giving maximum efficiency and minimum waste. Experimental work in the Soviet Union has gone far enough to show they will soon be able to make big improvements in the planning of an entire economy".

On the basis of what he called “rough calculations” he suggested that “it would now be possible to double the output of wealth per head every ten years—and go on doubling it decade after decade. This means that the output of wealth per head could be
multiplied by four in 20 years, eight in 30 years, by sixteen in 40 years. With a two-fold improvement to follow every ten years, we can surely say that the World of Plenty and the World of Ample Leisure is in sight.”

Dr. Lilley explained that capitalism is a barrier to the full use of the benefits of automation. The “World of Plenty” and of “Ample Leisure” will be realised only under socialism and more trade union attention to their final aims is necessary.

Automation, however, will certainly result in a big increase in the production of wealth under capitalism. Who is to benefit from this? At the ACTU seminar Mr. Bury, Minister for Labor and Industry, said that “technical change meant a better way of life for all the people”. It all sounds so simple and automatic, but improved living standards will not be as easy to get as Mr. Bury would have the unions believe.

The employers do not have a “world of plenty” and “ample leisure” in their sights when they automate production. They are out to increase production and reduce costs by getting rid of large numbers of so-called redundant workers, with the single clear-cut aim of making bigger profits. Improvements in living standards will not be automatic, nor will they come as handouts from arbitration. They have to be won and that calls for more organisation, unity and struggle, the crucial weapons of trade unionism. The monopoly capitalists are using the new technology to further attack the working people and the rights of the trade unions.

In this situation the trade unions will get nowhere simply by taking up a defensive position. Their way of advance is to stake their claims for a big share of the increased wealth for the working people and to fight for the rights of the workers and the trade unions.

The demands of the trade unions for higher wages, shorter hours, more holidays and long service leave, and so on, are most important. So also is the fight against unemployment and the employers’ offensive, for the rights of the workers—the right to work and to organisation and for such things as severance pay and retraining for new jobs, and so on.

The trade unions must think also of the rights and interests of future generations. Neglect of the youth, who, with the advent of automation suffer from unemployment, could turn them against the trade union movement. By defending the right of youth to work and by taking up the fight for their demands, the
trade unions will be in a strong position to rally the young people to the banner of trade unionism and unity.

Automation creates new and complex problems for the trade unions and to meet them successfully they will be compelled to examine their organisation, tactics and methods of struggle. The fact that a number of unions, conscious of the weakness and shortcomings of craft unionism, are urging union amalgamation, is a sign of the times. Unions based on the industry principle will bring a new outlook, improved organisation and greater unity to the working class struggle.

Another important matter is the rapid growth of white and blue collar workers and their organisations. The fact that ASCPA and the High Council CPS participated in the seminar on automation with the ACTU is indicative of their concern at the consequences of the new technology on their members. Collaboration and mutual support of industrial and white collar unions in the fight for the just demands of the working people is both possible and necessary in tackling this problem.

Finally, if the rights of the workers are to be effectively defended, then the role and rights of the trade unions must be increased. Abolition of the penal clauses and restrictions on the right to strike are essential. The trade unions should also strive for greater rights in industry as spokesmen for the workers.

It must be anticipated that the employers will take advantage of automation to make new attacks on the rights of trade unions and shop committees. If successful this would enable them to re-organise production to their own advantage and create conditions for large-scale dismissals of redundant workers. The trade unions should fight to extend their rights in industry and together with shop committees and other elected employees' representatives, insist upon early consultation with managements on the effect of technical changes, with full consideration being given to the interests of the work force.

Tom Wright

Sheet Metal Workers Union

AUTOMATION has come to be understood as the application of new technology including new machines, electronic computers and other devices, drastically altering methods of work and the number of workers required.
The new revolutionary technological developments affect not only manufacturing, but all sections of the economy. The use of machinery, electrification and chemicals is transforming agriculture into large-scale and intensive agriculture. In transport mechanical equipment is replacing manual handling of goods with the use of large containers and other forms of bulk handling, and mechanical rail track laying, automatic signalling, diesel and electric power in place of steam have greatly reduced the number of workers required.

Modern technology is far in advance of its general application. For example, in the middle of 1963 the estimated number of complete process control systems operating in industry was only 400 for all capitalist countries. Of this number 250 were in operation in the United States, practically all of them in monopolised industries.

The initial cost of automation is so great that only the wealthiest business organisations can find the necessary funds. For this reason automation in the majority of cases is only partial, according to the means at the disposal of the various capitalist establishments.

As automation means large-scale production, a necessary condition is the existence of an adequate and reasonably stable market. The limitations of the Australian market restrict the advance of automation in many branches of production where export outlets would be required in competition with the United States, Japan and other advanced countries.

Automation increases productivity so that the cost per unit of production is greatly reduced, and competing establishments which have been unable to keep pace in automation are placed in a hopeless position. Mergers and take-overs are the order of the day; and even large scale capitalist establishments are swallowed by giant monopolies.

A further restricting factor in the progress of automation is that it may mean scrapping existing costly plant, so the establishment of completely new enterprises using advanced techniques is easier and more likely than the transformation of old establishments. In practice, it is usual for manufacturing enterprises adopting automation to open an entirely new factory in another locality. This also helps the employer to escape the established
trade union and workshop organisation, and the system of conditions and over-award payments.

The new technology greatly increases productivity without a corresponding increase in wages, and the decreased ratio of capital spent on wages compared with other expenditure intensifies the problems of markets, as the purchasing power of the workers lags more and more behind the gross value of the goods produced.

Structural changes in capitalism brought about by the scientific and technological revolution include a large increase in the number of white collar workers as compared with other workers, but this is offset by the rapid introduction of computer techniques into offices and banks. There are now 300 or more electronic computers being used in Australia and the number will greatly increase.

The new technological changes make clearer the obstacles to progress imposed by capitalist relations of production. The general introduction of the most advanced technology which could provide abundance for all requires social ownership of the means of production. Only in this way can there be the planned mobilisation of national resources required, and a systematic extension of automation in the broad sense, with rising living standards and full employment.

Automation therefore calls for the all-round strengthening of socialist thought and activity.

Pat Clancy

*Building Workers Industrial Union*

The rapid technological changes in industry have brought about changes in the composition of the Australian workforce. Changes in the organisation of the production process, such as the development of sub-contracting in various industries, have resulted in an increase in managerial personnel, foremen, various kinds of planners, co-ordinators and similar administrative workers.

One outcome of the change has been the campaign about the de-proletarianisation of capitalist society, the absorption of the proletariat into a new middle class. This theory distorts the
concept of social classes; it is an attempt to represent the changes taking place in the social division of labor as class changes.

The definition of classes given by Lenin is an essential starting point when considering this question: "Classes are large groups of people which differ from each other by the place they occupy in a historically definite system of social production, by their relation (in most cases fixed and formulated in laws) to the means of production, by their role in the social organisation of labor, and, consequently, by the dimensions and method of acquiring the share of social wealth that they obtain. Classes are groups of people one of which may appropriate the labor of another owing to the different places they occupy in a definite system of social economy." (A Great Beginning)

Examination of the Australian scene reveals that, despite changes in occupation, the vast majority in the work force are wage and salary earners. The 1961 Census shows that the work force comprises 267,081 employers, 412,815 self-employed persons and 3,351,034 employees.

The figures of earnings also show that the majority are either members of, or close to, working class. Australian taxation returns for last year gave 4,153,798 persons as earning less than $4,000 a year, compared with 399,922 who earned over $4,000. The really big income earners were restricted to 5,410 who earned over $20,000 annually.

The majority of salary earners have interests close to those of the industrial working class, and should be seen as the natural allies of, and virtually a part of, the working class. The fact is that the mass of rank and file office employees and professional workers is drawing closer to the proletariat, losing its independence and relatively more secure position and becoming an object of increasing capitalist exploitation.

With the concentration of economic power into fewer and fewer hands, the objective base for unity of all sections of the working class for struggle against monopoly exploitation, extends still further.

It also seems clear that development of technology will tend to break down the division between blue collar and white collar workers. The Australian Financial Review in an editorial on August 22 referred to the status and salary differentials between
white and blue collar workers having declined from the golden days of the late 19th and early 20th centuries. This is a comment on the fact that companies are now beginning to introduce work-measurement techniques in the clerical field. This is being done in an effort to streamline their offices and to reduce staff requirements; in short, to speed up clerical work.

These developments call for a much closer relationship between the white collar organisations and the Australian Council of Trade Unions. Within the ACTU there are already a number of white collar organisations; in wages campaigns there has been a good degree of co-operation between the ACTU, the Australian Council of Salaried and Professional Associations, and the High Council of the Commonwealth Public Service Organisations.

I do not share the view that with the development of automation and technological progress the importance of the industrial workers will decline. While the proportion of workers directly engaged in production is decreasing, at the same time there are more and more job setters, maintenance workers, technicians specialising in electrical and radio equipment, and technical service personnel.

Different forms of automation have a different effect on the pattern of skills. While comprehensive automation requires highly skilled workers with broad qualifications, partial automation allows the use of relatively unskilled labor on certain operations.

The decisive role of the industrial workers is reflected in the present membership of the ACTU and ACSPA. The ACTU embraces 97 unions with a membership of 1,250,000; ACSPA has a membership of about 300,000.

While the membership of ACSPA is rising at a relatively higher rate than that of the ACTU, it still has a long way to go before it would replace the ACTU in importance and influence. The important thing is not to see the two organisations in competition, but rather to seek ways in which united activity can be undertaken and the prospect opened up of eventually joining into the one organisation.

The initiative needs to come more from the industrial unions, seeking joint action not only on matters such as the national
wage demands, but giving assistance to the white collar organ­
isations in struggles concerning demands of those organisations. In this way a solid alliance of all wage and salary earners can be established.

Laurie Carmichael

Amalgamated Engineering Union

WITH the further development of automated techniques in Australia, the trend away from the concrete concepts of the basic wage and margins in arbitration will further increase. The total wage concept now adopted in principle, with its less tangible and more abstract concepts of “economic content” and “work value” will be carried further, compounding the already difficult processes of substantiating argument in the arbitration system.

This will aggravate the growing difficulties of arbitrationists within the trade union movement. The extreme right will base themselves upon the amorphous concepts as a means of more and more trying to head off into a dead end the workers’ complaints which will arise from the effects of automation. On the other hand, there will be an increasing section of the tradi­tional reformists concerned with the lack of concrete procedures.

From the point of view of an alternative to this development in the form of mass campaigning, the needs concept (perhaps a better term should be found for it) plus a margin for skill (and perhaps a different term for this too) would still have the most attractive force. The needs concept, however, would certainly have to be associated with modern needs, in particular the capacity to absorb the great wealth of goods that can be produced and distributed. The difficulty with the word “needs” is that it carries a connotation of existence levels only, rather than the high standard of living possible from the great quantity of goods which can be produced from automated industry.

Problems arise in regard to wage claims of a general nature where automation penetrates only some industries at the one time. For example the relatively high degree of mechanisation at General Motors produces fantastic profits for that company and large scale redundancy for the workers in the industry. But the general wages approach of the whole trade union
movement at the present time fits in with the arbitration concept that the productivity of a highly mechanised industry is taken into account in a general claim, and that "efficient" industries are free to enjoy all the fruits of their automated processes.

Despite the impact of automation in the particular industries into which it is introduced, it does not penetrate all industries simultaneously, and wages problems associated with spasmodic introduction will occur over a protracted period. Even in the United States only a relatively small proportion of industry is yet automated.

If one thinks of automation as being fully introduced, it is possible to think of a wages policy which on a nation wide scale can take the whole situation into account. Where the whole of industry and commercial activity is not automated, special claims and special problems arise in those sections where it is introduced, because an overall wages policy does not apply. This is where the special claims arise, such as a three months termination allowance after 12 months employment, special payments available for people made redundant in industries whilst being retrained for others, etc.

A great deal more effort must be made to argue out the ideological problems of a mass wages policy with the onset of automation, as an alternative to the deliberately adopted "abstract" policies of arbitration.

A point regarding change of skills. Differences in skills for the performance of work will have to continue to be recognised, but a stronger stand should be taken with regard to the allegedly super skills which are often elevated to managerial and similar levels and so "bought off." There should be more striving for a higher common content and lower differentials as the possibility of higher living standards for all increases.

Jack Hutson

Amalgamated Engineering Union

WHEN talking of automation two errors should be avoided. One is the temptation to adopt a "gee whiz" attitude, that is to stand goggle-eyed at the wonders that automation can undoubtedly perform. The danger of this attitude is that it can
lead to an exaggeration of the concrete facts, which makes it difficult to make an objective assessment of what is the actual position of automation in Australia.

The second error is to overlook that automation need not necessarily be associated only with large-scale production. Considerable research and development has been applied to the problems of small-scale production because there is also a profitable market in that field. This is an approach that has particular significance for Australia as the small domestic market provides only limited opportunities for the application of full-scale automation. So in some industries the main problems arise from the application of partial automation and advanced mechanisation.

Suppliers of equipment are continually developing equipment that can be made available at an economic price for use on short-run manufacturing work in various industries. For example, the Digiturn attachment for standard centre lathe enables an unskilled operator to turn out products up to the same standard as those from a skilled turner.

Another effect of partial automation is the use of certain equipment as a pace setter for the whole manufacturing process. For example, a Melbourne firm manufacturing furniture hardware installed a fully automatic plating plant. The result has been that time study and incentive payments have been introduced into the making and finishing sections, where no new equipment has been introduced, to speed them up to keep pace with the greater rate of production of the new plating plant.

P. R.

a public service union

No matter how conscious of new problems one tries to be, there is always a tendency to graft onto tomorrow's conditions the problems of yesterday, as though the future arrived with today's problems and not its own. In no area do such attitudes persist more strongly than in the trade union leaderships. This is understandable because of the ever-present need to restore the value of labor power and to resist the attempts to lengthen and intensify the work-process. This tendency to hold to standards
of the past can become a starting point for conservatism and resistance to the new.

Today's great speed of technological change is, in itself, a new factor of importance for the unionist. The rate of change in all things has increased tremendously.

Today, the needs of modern industry and commerce in a new stage of technology have brought about a phase in automation which many specialists contend is new and distinct. This is the phase of the special purpose computer, which differs as radically from the former general purpose machine as does the specialised numerically controlled machine tool from the lathe of 1900.

Some bourgeois and socialist thinkers on these subjects seem in fairly general agreement that in this period of the special purpose computers extending into transport, mining, oil, gas, car and many other fields of production, we will be confronted also with the problems of "beyond automation"—the stage of the great link-up of the office computer systems and the automated factory assembly lines which are becoming increasingly lines of numerically controlled machine tools. By 1970, it is expected that at least 50 per cent of all machine-tools produced in the US will be numerically controlled. And such forecasts in the fields of automated change have been found to be conservative.

As then we move into another phase of automation, it might be argued that those who failed to adjust their thinking and tactics to the immediate problems of automation from the middle 1950's have now missed, in some respects, a full historical period of technological change and have not been conditioned by that experience for the more complex and wide-ranging problems of the next phase.

Should there be any validity in such a line of reasoning, there is only one reliable method of overcoming the lag: secure real information of the general trends and take full account of the "feed back of information" from workers at the points in production where technological change is making itself felt most strongly.

Outside the fields of technical and professional unionism, there appears to be a fairly general rejection of the concept that the
skills of the workers have continually increased since the onset of the mass-production phase of history.

These views on stationary or declining skills of the working class in Australia are reinforced by the kind of reasons advanced, and sometimes accepted by industrial tribunals, on what are known as the work-value factors of particular trades and callings. These sacred cows of the arbitration system appear to have been accepted by many.

Is there any real basis for the view that rising levels of technology, education and knowledge are proceeding in the opposite direction to the evolution of workers' skills? I think the answer is no if a full historical period is considered instead of a short phase of the history of work and skills, and if the relationship of man to his work is seen as part of the total historical process.

The increasing conflicts over the problems of job standards and skill ratings raised by the introduction of the special purpose computers are posing many new problems for the white collar unions. For example: The concept of the special purpose electronic computers as the great new electronic tools of the clerical and communications industries reinforces the conviction that white-collar skills are rapidly rising, and that special purpose computers are only powering the limits of one facet of white collar skills like the vise or the lathe powered the limits of the metal workers' skills, strength and endurance.

It follows from this concept, that the old view of skills being either manual or mental has been an over-simplification, even a distortion. That, in fact, what have been regarded as manual skills were always much more mental and perceptual skills than they were ever manual skills.

J. G.

a white collar union

THE increased tempo of technological change and introduction of automated processes are beginning to have effects in the area of white collar employment.

Insurance clerks have been confronted with the introduction of computers leading to redundancy and a decline in the number
of positions; bank employees have waged a struggle on the introduction of shift work; airline navigators will cease to exist by 1973; power and marine engineers are being challenged by completely automated ships—and this is only the beginning.

On the other hand the technological changes are leading to the creation of more highly skilled occupations in the white collar area, occupations which open up job avenues for skilled tradesmen to enter the white collar arena.

These developments have underlined the increasing cooperation in recent years between the Australian Council of Trade Unions, the Australian Council of Salaried and Professional Associations, and the High Council of Commonwealth Public Service Organisations. For example in the Electricity Authority we find the Electrical Trades Union, Federated Engine Drivers and Firemen's Association, the Municipal Officers' Association, and the Association of Architects, Engineers, Surveyors and Draughtsmen covering identical classifications. When the ETU and the FEDFA decide to go on strike or apply a ban, the two white collar organisations have to face up to the problem: can their members remain at work while others of the same classification are on strike?

The colors of the collars are becoming blurred, and similar problems are being encountered. Oil company clerks in one Adelaide establishment have recently found that at the age of 40 to 45 the "career" they had been sold by the company suddenly disappeared because the Melbourne office had installed a computer and the Adelaide office was to be closed. They were confronted with an old blue collar situation—"a brassy smile, a handshake, and unemployment."

The co-operation between the two areas, white and blue, has so far been primarily at top executive level and only incidentally at the job level. If the labor movement is to extract the greatest possible gains from the increasing technological development, it is vital that there must be closer co-operation on the job. The initiative for this co-operation must emanate mainly from the blue collars. As disputes occur, thought must be given by leaders on the job as to how the clerks, administrators and technical staff in the front office can be informed of what action is being taken, why the action is being taken, and how the action can affect them.
DISCUSSION:

A leading Australian psychiatrist, writing under the name of Democritus, takes issue with Heraclitus' views on Freud.

"NEW Frontiers in Psychiatry", in No. 2 of Left Review, has probably suffered from attempting to deal with a complex and confused subject in a way digestible to the average lay person. However, there are certain points demanding comment.

The contribution irritated me not only because I happen to disagree on various matters of theory, but because it presents one side of a controversy in a rather trite dogmatic fashion which could reasonably lead the average reader into concluding that psychoanalysis, or some neo-freudian derivative, is synonymous with psychiatry.

Also, just how fair is it to characterise psychiatrists who do not adhere to freudian or neo-freudian views as "old hat", and a dying race of men? The truth is that the psychiatric profession continues to debate the claims of the freudians, and the evidence is very clear, at least overseas, that it is the various psycho-dynamic schools which are dying.

Heraclitus himself indicates one of the reasons for this by referring to the impracticability of using psychoanalytic techniques except for a small and affluent section of the community. But he does sweeten the pill by suggesting that the effective alternative of social psychiatry owes a great deal to Freud, While this may be true of some group psychotherapeutic techniques, it is not true of all. So far as recent innovations in the psychiatric hospitals are concerned, few of the ideas are derived from psychoanalytic theories.

What Heraclitus should have pointed out is that the disenchantment with psychoanalysis has resulted, in many countries, in a strong movement towards the development of community health services, utilising sociologists and anthropologists. Although the theoretical goals of this movement vary a good deal from person to person and from country to country, their ideas are such that, generally speaking, they are regarded as heretics by the psychoanalysts.

An indication of the seriousness of the current tussle between the two groups is that in the USA the federal government is threatening to withdraw funds from the mainly analytically orientated child guidance movement, and re-channel them into the more effective and wider aiming field of community mental health.

Heraclitus several times claims that psychoanalysis is a scientific discipline. When they use the word "science" most people mean the systematised knowledge derived from observation, study and experimentation carried out in order to determine the nature or principles of what is being studied.

No matter how hard these protagonist push the "hard sell" technique, the fact is that psychoanalysis does not and cannot use scientific methods of research. By and large, the technique represents the analyst's attempt to interpret the patient's history and
symptoms within his preconceived theoretical framework, relating this back to his patient. If it is rejected, this is interpreted as "resistance" and a clear indication that therapy must continue. However, if the interpretations are accepted this is regarded as another triumph for psychoanalysis, and a proof of its validity. Tautological proof such as this is certainly not scientific method.

It has been pointed out by Orランスki, a well-known experimental psychologist, that most if not all psychoanalytic concepts, because of their subjectiveness, cannot be properly scrutinised in a scientific sense. This has been referred to at some length by H. J. Eysenck in his book, *Uses and Abuses of Psychology*.

Some indication of the subjectiveness of their findings may be gained from the troubled history of bickerings and schisms in the psychoanalytic camp. Glover, a British psychoanalyst, has gone on record with a probable explanation for this. A prospective practitioner of psychoanalysis is obliged to enter into a special type of training relationship with a senior and experienced analyst—a personal relationship so to speak—in order to receive long, intensive, and usually expensive supervision.

For economic reasons, among others, the trainee is virtually forced to drop out of training if he should find himself sceptical of what is presented in the matter of interpretation. But if he continues he must become a devotee of his training analyst, and such a coterie of devotees tend to follow an heretical training analyst in the establishment of a new school of analysis. All schools argue that they are correct, scientific, etc., but how scientific can a procedure be if an identical method of investigation results in such widely divergent conclusions?

The subjectivity of the investigatory process of the main originator of the theory, Sigmund Freud, is crucial and worthy of a few moments' study. It would be more accurate, incidentally, to use the term "formulations," for in many matters (e.g., the nature and origin of anxiety) Freud would make a hard and fast formulation on the basis of his "scientific" findings only to retract at a later date and substitute an alternate formulation.

In this regard, I would suggest reference to *Fragments of my Analysis With Freud* by Joseph Wortis. If Wortis was brash and provocative he could at least plead youth as an excuse. Freud on the contrary showed himself to be moralising, patronising, bullying and often self-contradictory—hardly the best characteristics for a man claiming objectivity.

This is still more clearly demonstrated in *Psychoanalysis: A Critique Based on Freud's Case of Little Hans* by Wolpe and Rachman (*Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease, 1960*), in which the writers review evidence of Freud bullying the child and his father into modifying the history in order to make it conform with Freud's preconceived notions.

Concerning Freud's rejection of the technique of hypnosis because symptom suppression was followed rapidly by return of symptoms, Ernest Jones the English psychoanalyst comments that Freud admitted his personal difficulty in inducing hypnotic states. One wonders how much Freud's objection was, to use his own term, a good old-fashioned rationalisation. Be that as it may, Janet, the French pioneer in hypnosis, did not experience
the same difficulty and is numbered amongst the many workers who have used hypnosis and various conditioning therapies for symptom suppression, with excellent results and without return of symptoms. See Janet's *Psychological Healing* and Wolpe's *Psychotherapy by Reciprocal Inhibition*.

I am of the opinion that not only does psycho-analysis suffer the defect of being applicable only to a small group of patients, but that it suffers many other defects, including the claim it makes of being able to explain every eventuality of human behaviour—a claim only possible because of the subjectivity and vagueness of most of its concepts. However it is this which lulls many psychiatrists into believing that there is no further room for research other than filling in certain gaps of psychoanalytic theory.

Heraclitus' treatment of the organismists and learning theory schools (Pavlov was only one of many learning theorists incidentally), illustrates his restricted concept of future research prospects. His last paragraph shows, if I may be excused for saying it, either gross ignorance, or negligent writing. Behaviorism is not mechanistic materialism, unless he be referring to the J. B. Watson school of reflexology, which was so popular in the 1920s, and which stated that all human behaviour could be understood in terms of simple reflex actions. Most, though it is true not all, learning theorists or theories of behaviorism are intimately concerned with man's inner subjective life—but not with vague subjective descriptions. Rather, they are concerned with determining the objectively measured features of perception, cognition, mood, etc.

For technical reasons the workers in this field do not generally start their investigation with man and his behavior, but with animal experimentation, hoping, in time, to move much more thoroughly into the realm of scientific investigation of man himself.

For this reason what they have to offer in clinical practice is, as yet, relatively crude and improvised, and is limited to only a number of psychiatric conditions ... as is also the case with psychoanalytic methods of treatment. But newer and more sophisticated techniques are constantly appearing — for example, see the excellent review on the subject by McConaghy in the May, 1964, issue of *Medical Journal of Australia*. It should also be mentioned that a number of figures are available supporting the view that behavioral techniques of therapy are significantly more effective than eclectic and psychoanalytic oriented therapy (see Wolpe, Rachman, Costello, Eysenck, Bentler, etc.).

Heraclitus has a poor opinion of organismists, but I think his opinions smack too much of what he has been told, and not enough of what he has experienced. While it is true that they did, and still do, regard the problem as basically a medical-pathology problem, not all took this attitude. In fact, they have made very important contributions to our present day understanding of the physical consequences of the inner life we are both so eager to know about. See Selye and Gellhorn to gain some novel insights.

I would suggest that the writer should not forget that, anti-psychological as many of these workers were, history shows us they achieved a great deal, unless of course Heraclitus denies the help in his clinical practice of such well established treatments as
electroshock, antidepressant drugs, tranquillisers, lithium, sleep therapy, not to speak of the conventional use of sedatives. Mechanistic materialists many of them were, but we should not forget their historical contribution. And I feel there is ample unsurveyed ground yet for them to continue to contribute.

I am not sure that it is correct to say the majority of psychiatrists have a "basic psycho-dynamic orientation." Certainly, for want of a well systematised theory to be used in post-graduate psychiatric training, it is usual to present psychoanalysis to the students; and while most of them feel they have a use for one or several of the concepts (e.g., the unconscious, or various of the defence mechanisms), it is my experience that few show a fondness for the more "way out" concepts such as fixation, oedipal situation, regression, incorporation, and cathexis.

Most psychiatrists, in my experience, reject the various schools' (note "schools") formulations about symbolism, unless it be a rather bemused acceptance of unconsciously motivated errors as exampled in *Psychopathology of Everyday Life*, a book that most teeth on, leaving the *Collected Papers* of Freud unread, but prominently displayed on the office bookshelf.

I don't wish to belabor the point, but it does seem to me that psychiatrists in hospital and office practice owe a lot to descriptive psychiatry, and tend to mete out a glorious pot-pourri of psychotherapy which tends to be given the high sounding title of "rational psychotherapy." They are frequently directive and reassuring, and so often reflect their own personal views of how emotional, social or economic problems can be solved. Otherwise, they make full use of physical methods of psychiatric treatments.

It is substantially for these reasons I object to the article *New Frontiers in Psychiatry*. I agree, however, that the analytic schools have made important contributions to present day psychiatry, and there can be no doubt that they have made a number of exciting, novel and particularly astute observations of human behavior. But I do not think they constitute a new frontier. Whatever the case, I think that Heraclitus' comments should be answered if for no other reason than they are so one-sided.

(In view of the importance of the subject and the distinction of the writer, the 1000 word limit in discussion articles was waived in this case—Ed.)

UNION AMALGAMATIONS

The queries raised by J. O'N. about some of the problems of amalgamation, and the call by him for deeper re-thinking of the subject is a welcome addition to discussion on trade union questions.

He is right in pointing out that as the present rules of Labor Councils apply there is a loss in representation when unions amalgamate. When the Unions concerned are militant led it does of course reduce the numbers of left-wing delegates and can have an adverse effect for a period.

However, the real strength of unionism lies in the unions, not the central
bodies, and the more positive aspect is that amalgamations create newer, stronger organisations, which can more effectively fight for the workers' interests. How many times have we seen good policy decisions on a central body, such as the Australian Council of Trade Unions, remain a mere paper resolution, either because affiliated unions are not active about it, or, more often, the ACTU leadership does nothing to carry out the decision.

In my view, the important thing is for progressive unionists to cast aside conservative, one-sided thinking and set out to build further the influence and organisation of the trade unions. This does not mean an exclusive concern with amalgamations as the only way; but I believe amalgamation is a qualitatively higher form than federations, industry groups or similar organisational forms.

While proceeding towards amalgamation we should also be simultaneously seeking to improve the method of representation on central bodies, to make them more fully reflect the true position of affiliated unions.

I cannot agree with J.O'N's comment that State and Federal industry federations are more suitable to large or medium unions than amalgamation. Within these federations the unions remain separate autonomous bodies, with the right of deciding whether a decision should be carried out or not.

The duplication of time and effort by officials and staff continues, with officials of all the unions in the federation visiting the same job, often to speak to or for a handful of members. Demarcation disputes remain and are a source of conflict and division. It is worth noting, by the way, that since the Boilermakers-Blacksmiths amalgamation, the once frequent demarcation disputes between these groups of tradesmen have virtually disappeared.

However, I think it incorrect to be at odds about the respective merits of amalgamation or federation. Federations are an important advance in union organisation. They bring unions together on common issues and can be, and often are, necessary steps to amalgamation.

Another aspect of the question which needs consideration is the form of union organisation an amalgamated union should adopt. Amalgamation alone is not the complete answer. We need forms of union organisation which meet today's requirements, which place greater emphasis on organisation in the work place.

The old style form of union meetings, particularly evening meetings, are no longer attractive, as is shown by the general decline of, and poor attendance at, most union meetings. These meetings are often loaded up with trifling administrative questions which are boring to most unionists and prevent lively discussion on vital issues with which workers are most concerned.

A form of union structure which ensures firm rank and file control on the main policy questions, and allows maximum flexibility for job implementation would seem to be the main requirement today.

The points raised on the interference by the State forces, and anti-union organisations such as the National Civic Council, require close consideration. A correct general line, based firmly upon the fundamental
interests of the working class, and
correct methods of work by the left
forces, can counter the efforts of both
the State forces and extreme right-
wing groupings within the labor
movement.

The workers are looking for strong­
er and more united trade unionism,
organised in such a way as to give
effective leadership; it is the respon­
sibility of the left to step out boldly
towards newer and more effective
forms of organisation.

PAT CLANCY.

ECONOMIC CRISIS

ONE can agree with Alf Watt that
"the possibility of a serious collapse,
affecting Australia, if not the world,
should not be discounted" and "that
it is good politics to take this into
account."

But is this really the issue facing
the Communist Party today? Is it not
rather that we have been "preparing"
for a long time for the serious collapse
that we expected and have done all
too little to cope with the problems of
the present-day economic reality?

The merit of B. Taft's article lies
precisely in that it posed the need to
deal with these problems and gave
some of the reasons for it. These
reasons Alf Watt does not tackle.

It is unfortunately true that our
thinking on these questions has far
too long been dominated by static non-
Marxist repetition of formulas, in
place of a creative analysis of phen­
omena.

There is no doubt that cyclical
crises continue, as B. Taft points out;
there is equally no doubt that the
new objective and subjective factors
which he deals with operate and that
they have affected the course of
cyclical crises in post-war years.

A serious analysis must deal with
these factors and their likely course
of operation.

MAX LORKIN

CHINA'S "CULTURAL
REVOLUTION"

BEFORE Laurie Aarons' article
China's Ten Years, with which we
agree, appeared in ALR No. 3, the
Parramatta Branch of the Communist
Party had discussed the question and
had decided as follows:

AS Australian Communists, we are
extremely disturbed by reports of
"The Great Proletarian Cultural Re­
volution" occurring in the People's
Republic of China today.

Many outrageous attacks have been
made upon the dignity of the indivi­
dual, the right to personal privacy,
the merit of scholarship and the
worth of the art treasures of the
world — all in the name of marxism-
leninism, of international communism.
But the burning of books, the destruc­
tion of priceless art treasures, the ban­
nung of music and drama — all
denounced as "foreign" and "bour­
geois" — has nothing to do with the
name and spirit of marxism-leninism,
with international communism.

Marx was German, not Chinese. He
was however a great admirer of all
the treasures of art, regardless of their
country of origin. He was a scholar
of the English playwright Shakes­
peare, the French novelist Balzac, the
Spanish writer Cervantes and the Ger-
man poets Goethe and Heine. An authority on the poetry of Aeschylus, Marx had a special love for all the works of the classic world. “He was always a faithful lover of the ancient Greeks and he would have scourged those contemptible souls from the temple who would prevent the workers from appreciating the culture of the classic world.” (Marx and Literature by Franz Mehring, quoted in Literature and Art, (International Publishers, New York, 1947—page 142). It is said that the favourite motto of Marx was “Nihil humanum a me alienum pute”, which translated from the Latin means “I regard nothing human as alien to me”. Such was the man who gave his name to marxism.

The Russian leader Lenin, no less gifted than Marx, addressed the young generation of the Soviet Union in 1920 in these words: “It would be a mistake to think that it is enough to imbibe communist science, without acquiring the sum total of knowledge of which communism itself is a consequence... You can become a communist only by enriching your mind with the knowledge of all the treasures created by mankind.” (The Tasks of the Youth Leagues, a speech delivered by Lenin in 1920, quoted in The Young Generation by Lenin, International Publishers, New York, 1940—pages 30 & 32). Such was the man who gave his name to leninism.

Communists look to the day when all the works of all the peoples of the world are owned in common. We feel that we must protest against the outrages committed by the “Red Guards” in the People’s Republic of China which have brought the ideals of marxism-leninism, of international communism, into disrepute throughout the world. History will decide if the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution is indeed “Great”. It is certainly not “Proletarian”. It is anti-cultural, not in any sense “Cultural”. And not by any definition could this irresponsible behaviour be called a “Revolution”.

“SHAKESPEARE in his day had a progressive side. He represented something of the rising capitalist struggle against the then reactionary feudal classes. But is it correct in socialist society to glorify the capitalist ideas, to portray as the heroes of socialist society people like Hamlet, Macbeth, King Lear, Othello and to fail to portray the heroism of the ordinary workers and peasants who are the real makers of history? The reality of Shakespeare’s day is a far cry from the reality of socialist society. Certainly let us respect and preserve the progressive side but let us smash any idea that perpetuates the old. If Shakespeare is presented without criticism and in a spirit of acceptance it inevitably means the victory of bourgeois ideas.”

A Polish Professor of Economics outlines new possibilities of an "agricultural way" to build socialism. The following was part of a series of lectures given in Cuba.

MANY countries have freed themselves since the end of the Second World War from the yoke of imperialism. Under the colonial powers their economic development had been suppressed or directed into channels favorable to the flow of profits for the imperial monopolies and unfavorable to the people of the colonised countries. Now that these countries have freed themselves politically, they realise the importance of building up a sound and healthy economy. This is a difficult task after the enormous damage done to them by the imperialists. It requires new thoughts and experiments and presents many problems.

Under these circumstances imperialist economists have developed a number of "growth theories" for them: that is, theories how best to develop their economy—again to the advantage of the imperialists. Now, it is one task for marxist-leninist thinkers to show up these growth theories for what they are: new tricks to bind the economies of the newly-freed states to those of the old imperialist powers. It is quite another task for them to show constructively new ways of development, leading to the growth of an economy which serves the interests of the people of the newly-liberated countries.

In thinking out new ways a thorough knowledge of older ways of the development of independent economies is needed, as well as a clear insight into the possibilities offered by recent trends in world economic affairs. The most important recent trend is the creation of a new industry—agriculture. The emergence of modern agriculture as an industry, highly mechanised and chemi-cised must be taken into account when socialists investigate the possibilities, the way and means, for the best and fastest economic development of the "new" countries in the interest of their people.
Let us first look at the way in which the large western capitalist-imperialist powers developed: how they built up their economy. England and the United States, Germany and France all went the same way — the textile-way. They began first to build up a mechanised textile industry which made enormous profits. Part of the profits was used to enlarge continuously the textile industry and part was used for the creation of a textile machinery industry. Later, more and more capital went into the heavy industries — coal, iron and steel, and still later an electricity system and electrical products, as well as a chemical industry were created. Thus a whole industrial system, organic in its growth and its working, was built up.

Undoubtedly, the textile-way was, historically, the best for these countries, but neither the textile nor any other way is the best one for all countries. For instance, during the second half of the nineteenth century, India also went the textile way. But she was stopped by the British colonial power and India did not even develop a textile machinery industry — to say nothing of a heavy industry or an electricity system. These could develop only after India freed herself from the colonial yoke.

But it would be wrong to say that no newly-freed country should go the textile-way. If such a country had a large cotton-growing agriculture, there is no reason why it should not develop an important textile industry and textile machinery industry. Bearing in mind that the main task in developing the economy of a country is to develop its economic resources and forces for the benefit of its people, and as these are not the same in every country, then the way of economic development cannot be the same in all countries.

The Soviet Union, the first, and for almost thirty years the only, Socialist country, did not go the textile-way. "Theoretically" the Soviet Union could also have gone the textile-way, for she was a country free from all capitalist-imperialist interference in her affairs. Had she gone the textile-way she would in the course of time have accumulated sufficient sources for investments in other industries, while at the same time raising steadily and considerably the material standard of living of her people.

But the Soviet Union did not live on a dream-island. She was surrounded by imperialist powers, ready to pounce on her at any moment to crush the only socialist state, the vanguard of the labor movement of the world and the hope of all oppressed people. She, therefore, had to build up a modern, all-round industry as quickly as possible and at the same time produce weapons for her defence, for the defence of the progress of mankind.
Under these circumstances the Soviet Union had to choose the iron and steel-way: a difficult way, a heroic way, sacrificing rapid progress in material well-being for the sake of rapid progress on her revolutionary path. The sequence of world events and the glorious victories of the world proletariat in the last half century, as well as marxist theory, have proved that the Soviet Union chose the only historically possible, the only historically correct, path towards success. But if that was the only correct and logical way for the first socialist country, this does not mean that under the present radically changed world conditions every new socialist country must take the iron and steel-way. Just as the textile-way is not a wrong way, because of the case of India, for all newly-liberated countries; so the iron and steel-way is not the only right path for all socialist countries just because it was the only possible one for the Soviet Union.

Under present-day conditions, with a large and powerful socialist camp in existence and ready to assist a small country politically and economically, the following considerations are necessary in planning development:* to fully develop the given material resources of the country; to use all available means of production; to use all specific natural advantages (climate, etc.); and to take all possible advantage of the existing state of the international, especially the socialist division of labor. For the development of a healthy economy the following material factors are necessary: labor power, food for the preservation of the labor power, raw materials, machines, industrial and agricultural buildings, and ways and means of transportation—to name only the most important ones. Some of these factors can be largely (e.g., food) imported in exchange for others richly available in the country concerned. But all of them must be available for the building up of an economy and all of them must be used in the most effective way: that is, guaranteeing the optimum use of the material resources of the country and at the same time a steady rise in the standard of living of the people.

Looked at from this point of view, there are many newly-liberated countries, among them Socialist Cuba, for which the agricultural way of industrialisation appears to be the best. There are, however, objections to this way in quite a number of these countries. Why? No doubt because agriculture was the main branch of economic activity under the colonial regime. The imperialist powers developed agriculture, often as monoculture (mainly coffee,

* Professor Kuczynski is here dealing only with countries whose task is not to create a large all-round economy, such as China or India must build up.
tea or cocoa plantations). Labor was either direct or indirect (e.g., through high poll taxes) forced labor, extremely poorly paid, and because labor was kept so cheap, the technical stage of agriculture was very low. The productivity of labor was low. The producers of food lacked food and lived in extreme poverty.

But modern agriculture is quite different from the old-fashioned and colonial agriculture. Under modern conditions the problem "agricultural or industrial way" does not exist any more. The modern agricultural way is one of many possible industrial ways. Modern agriculture has become a branch of industry. If we keep this in mind, then we can overcome the—historically easily understandable—prejudice against the development of agriculture as one way of industrialising and mechanising the economy of a country.

The first socialist country in the world which has purposely chosen this way, the agricultural-way to industrialisation, is Cuba. Cuba is concentrating on the production of agricultural goods, mainly sugar, but also tobacco, tropical fruits, live-stock and live-stock products. She will raise them in the modern agricultural way, achieving high productivity through mechanisation and chemisation. The building up of a sugar chemical industry, the construction of sugar-agricultural machinery will be among the many important results in this new way of agricultural industrialisation. Of course, a considerable part of the building industry, with the most modern methods of prefabrication, will be directed towards agriculture, and the same holds true of road building.

In the universities and scientific research institutions this new trend in Cuba's economy will have important consequences. Book and pamphlet production will shift their weight towards questions of agriculture and agricultural industrialisation. New chapters will be written in the science of political economy by Cuba; new chapters in sociology and history; new lessons will be given to us by Cuba on the tactics and strategy of the class struggle, of the struggle against imperialism. Cuba's way is a pioneer way of the greatest importance, not only for the building up of socialism there, but also to show the way for many countries not yet socialist, but up to now only non-capitalist. She will be an example especially for many Latin American countries in the process of freeing themselves from American imperialism.

The eyes of hundreds of millions are on Cuba, for, in the making sure of the most modern developments of the productive forces of the world, she goes on a new way towards new goals leading her to the common goal of all mankind; the final stage of communism.
who came to the goldfields built and defended the stockade at Ballarat in December, 1854.

They were united by one common bond—refusal to brook in of their demand for the righting of glaring social

nuse of their struggle governments henceforth found it to ignore popular pressure.

Eureka became an inspiration to the labor movement fight for freedom in Australia.
BRIEFLY, one would answer no; socialism does not necessarily mean only one working class party, nor does it preclude the existence of organised political opposition expressed in electoral contests and in other ways.

However, such an answer does little to penetrate the problem which is one of great complexity, as the socialist transformation of capitalist society cannot be measured in the same terms as the "normal" changes of government people have been used to in Australia.

It is not unknown for a change of government to take place every year, or even more frequently. But it is not credible to imagine that an election would introduce socialism in September, another vote it out in March, have it reintroduced in June, and changed back to capitalism in December. This is not specially because of lack of democratic processes, but because fundamental social change requires not just a vote, but a deep-going sentiment for change and a level of political awareness and activity many times greater than that to which Australians are accustomed.

A brief reference to the experiences of some other countries will illustrate this, and provide material to probe the question. The Russian socialist revolution of November, 1917, was preceded by a bourgeois revolution in March, and a violent suppression of the socialist forces in July. It was followed by a new military attack by Germany and then by a civil war and wars of intervention lasting three to four years.

During 1917, the mass sentiment swung strongly towards Lenin's party, the Bolsheviks, who won (away from the Mensheviks and
Socialist Revolutionaries), a majority in the Soviets which had sprung up in the March revolution. These Soviets were directly elected committees of workers, peasants and soldiers which existed as a power alongside the only partially democratic parliament or Duma.

A number of revolutionary groups which had previously split away rejoined the Bolsheviks during this period—a coalition of forces, it could be said, amalgamated into one party. The second Congress of Soviets met on November 7, 1917, and decided to take power into its hands, passing decrees on peace and land to the tillers, which were the main demands of the people, along with a tackling of the food problem. The Bolsheviks, who won the majority in the Soviets, adopted the program of the Socialist Revolutionaries—the party of the peasants—on the land question rather than their own, in order to cement the alliance of peasants and workers.

Lenin said: “Touching on the question of an alliance between the Bolshevik workers and the Left Socialist Revolutionaries whom many peasants at present trust, I argued in my speech that this alliance can be an 'honest coalition', an honest alliance, for there is no radical divergence of interests between the wage workers and the working exploited peasants”. (Dec. 1, 1918, Collected Works, Vol. 26, p. 333.)

The Left Socialist Revolutionaries, although supporting the Bolsheviks in this Congress, refused at that time to become part of a coalition government. However, in December they joined the government. They withdrew in March when the Congress of Soviets ratified the Brest-Litovsk Peace Treaty with Germany. They waged a bitter campaign against this peace, and in July organised the assassination of the German ambassador, Mirbach, in Moscow, and began an armed attack on the government. This more or less coincided with other counter-revolutionary outbreaks, the beginning of the intervention of the 14 imperialist states, and a devastating famine.

One eminent non-marxist historian, Professor E. Carr, describes the party situation as it had developed by 1922 in these terms: “The fiction of a legal opposition was, however, long since dead. Its demise cannot fairly be laid at the door of one party. If it was true that the Bolshevik regime was not prepared after the first few months to tolerate an organised opposition, it was equally true that no opposition party was prepared to remain within legal
In Czechoslovakia on the eve of liberation from the Nazis in 1944, the Communist Party asked the other Czech parties to join them in a post-war coalition government based on a common program including: punishment of collaborators with the Germans by confiscation of their property and prohibition of the political parties with which they had been associated; nationalisation of banks and insurance companies and 51% government ownership in heavy industry; and distribution among the peasants of land confiscated from collaborators.

However, differences gradually emerged, their essence being over whether Czechoslovakia would continue on the path it was pursuing—towards socialism—or whether it would reverse direction and go back towards capitalism. A constitutional crisis was deliberately precipitated by resignation of twelve pro-capitalist ministers, and the refusal of President Benes to replace them with new appointees proposed by the government majority.

In this state of paralysis of the machinery of government, a huge conference of representatives of works councils (trade union branches in the factories) was called, which by 7,900 votes to 10 supported the government, set up action committees, and called for a general strike to force the President to act constitutionally. This he finally did, accepting the resignations and appointing replacements nominated by the prime minister.

These and subsequent events confirmed Czechoslovakia on the socialist course. There is still a coalition government, comprising the party formed from amalgamation of the Communists and the Social Democrats, along with the Socialist Party, the People's Party, and the Party of Slovak Reconstruction. The opposition parties brought about their own political destruction in two parts—one by collaboration with the Nazis, the other by failure to succeed in a political crisis of their own creation.

Another experience worth considering is the popular front which developed in France from 1934—the response of the communists and other working class and democratic forces to the sufferings inflicted by the depression and the menace of fascism and war.

On July 14, 1935, the anniversary of the fall of the Bastille which signified victory for the French Revolution of 1789, and fol-
lowing a series of bitter political conflicts, a great rally was organised by the Communist Party, the Socialist Party, the Radical Socialist Party, the main trade unions and many other anti-fascist organisations, leading to the People’s Front Program, issued in January, 1936. This program of a fighting coalition demanded the dissolution of the fascist organisations, the cleansing of public life, repeal of restrictions on freedom of the press, full liberty for trade unions, improvements in education, collective security for peace, nationalisation of war industries, rises in pay, a 40 hour week, regulation of banking, and many other demands. Part of this program was realised by a later government, although the rot in the propertied classes had gone too far to prevent the debacle in the face of the German invasion.

However, the experiences of the struggle in France, as well as in other countries led to a decisive turn in the world communist movement from conceptions which had developed to one degree or another of the communists winning alone in the face of everyone else as it were, to the re-assertion of the ideas of a united front between the communist parties and other parties based on the working class, and a people’s front composed of those forces and other classes, strata and groups within capitalist society.

These ideas, in no essential different from present conceptions of a “coalition of left forces” for the achievement of particular demands, and programs, and as a transitional form towards socialism, were developed by Dimitrov in his famous report to the 7th Congress of the Communist International in July, 1935, which exerted enormous influence in these directions on the outlook of communists all over the world.

It should also be recalled that in the founding document of communism, the Manifesto of the Communist Party, Marx and Engels said: “The Communists do not form a separate party opposed to other working class parties”; “they labor everywhere for the union and agreement of the democratic parties of all countries”; and declared the aim to be “conquest of political power of the proletariat” and “to win the battle of democracy”.

Recently, in Finland, a coalition government was formed in which the People’s Democratic Alliance (another coalition in which the Communist Party is the main force) has three ministers, the other parties to the coalition being the Social Democrats and the Agrarian Union (now renamed Centre Party).

The program of the coalition, with the exception of agricultural policy, is in general in the interests of the workers and others on
both domestic issues and foreign policy. The coalition, and the program around which it was formed, emerged only after long political struggle and negotiations, with many ups and downs. And alongside political developments have been important moves towards unity and more representative leadership in the trade unions.

One conclusion drawn by the Finnish communists (at their fourteenth congress recently) is that it is essential to closely define their attitude to the existing democratic institutions, civil liberties, and the multi-party system, both during the transition to socialism and after its triumph. Australian communists are tackling these questions in connection with their 21st Congress to be held in June, 1967.

While Australian communists have a number of achievements to their credit in this field as in others, and their position is usually violently distorted in the mass media, there are grounds for pointing to the failure to think through consistently some questions affecting political democracy, particularly their implications regarding political parties and political opposition. One of the reasons for this failing is the tendency to oversimplify the relation between classes and parties, to make absolute the general truth that different parties represent the interests of different classes.

What Lenin said in his article, *The Three Sources and Three Components of Marxism* is as true today as it was in 1913: “People always were and always will be the victims of deceit and self-deceit in politics until they learn to discover the interests of some class or other behind all moral, religious, political and social phrases, declarations and promises” (and the phrases, declarations and promises are, of course, usually uttered, made or offered by political parties).

However, the class structure of society is not so simple, and still less is the relation between classes and parties. One can therefore speak only in an abstract sense of “one party for one class”, and of there being only one party possible in the classless society of socialism. This is important also because it is only too easy to put a “class enemy” label on differing views, thus opening the way for use of decree or of force instead of reasoned debate and democratic processes to settle the issue. But there are and always will be in response to new situations, new ideas, values, and even fairly rapidly passing fancies, which need avenues of expression.

Ideological means should be the first and main method of combating old, reactionary or degenerate ideas, with coercion used
only when democratic norms are violated, and then by well-defined legal processes, except in emergency situations which every state, capitalist or socialist, past or present, has reserved the right and retained the means to deal with.

Whatever the reasons why it may have come about, there are dangers, hitherto underestimated, from a certain weakening of safeguards and of checks and balances when there is only one party. This does not refer mainly to the now clear violations of the Stalin period, but rather to the lack of mutual supervision and control which could be beneficially supplied by the long-term existence of separate parties and groups within a coalition sharing the same basic socialist program.

Of course, a certain composition of a coalition cannot be decreed, still less can it be decreed that it must remain static. There will inevitably be competition and the flux arising therefrom. But to regard the existence and expression of differing views as the norm instead of the exception is a sign of health and vigor. If these are stifled, or even only somewhat clogged, there results a degree of stagnation which holds society back.

All socialist countries—in differing degrees—are grappling with, or must grapple with, this problem, the existence and emerging solution of which testifies to the fact that socialist ideology and the socialist system are, by and large, out of their youthful stage and are entering the period of maturity.

Another reason for shortcomings of Australian communists in this field has been a tendency (sometimes strong and at other times much less so) to take the Russian experience as identical with marxism, as a universal truth applicable everywhere. Also, in the main correctly defending the victorious island of socialism, beset and assaulted in every side, the communists were incorrectly drawn towards justifying the one party set-up which had resulted as the theoretically inevitable outcome, and thus, at least implicitly, as necessarily applying in Australia, too.

This led, from time to time, to inadequate attention to the Australian traditions in political democracy and institutions. “From time to time” is said deliberately, as there is a great deal of which to be proud in the Communist Party’s record of seeking to define, of defending and promoting the Australian democratic temper and tradition against attacks by governments, arbitration and other courts, profit-motivated owners of mass media, and sycophants hoping for some crumbs from the rich table of American capital. It was, understandably enough, the prerogative of the first repre-
sentative of the Australian establishment, Harold Holt, to so desert any semblance of an independent Australian position as to proclaim—and act—"all the way with LBJ".

But the shortcomings have been there, and are not disposed of by references, however valid in themselves, to the limited superficial, or even sham nature of many of the democratic rights prevailing in Australia and other capitalist countries. People are deeply attached to the measure of actual freedom they have, and will vigorously defend it; they are not moved by abstract discourses on the superiority of socialist over bourgeois democracy. Socialist democracy must be, and must be seen to be, superior in all departments and not just some, and there are no compelling or long-term reasons which prevent this.

This includes the right of dissent in all fields, including politically, and embraced in that is the right of political opposition, not just differences of opinion within the forces for socialism. No principle in the theory of the state or in marxism as a whole which precludes this is known to this writer. The principle is that when the will of the majority is for social change, the minority must respect that will. If they do not, laws expressing that will, and enforcement of those laws, is necessary and justified, and will be actively supported as such, including by many who at present cannot readily envisage such situations, how they are to be resolved, and what their own reactions to them would be.

Those who may be inclined to query the proposition from the opposite point of view should take into account that ownership of the mass media will no longer be decided by possession of wealth; that new, vigorous democrats and socialists will occupy positions of authority in the machinery of government; and that references to the use of parliamentary forms in the transition to socialism can hardly be made real to Australians without recognition of the right of opposition.

In Australian conditions a coalition of left forces is a long-term project. But the issues press—Vietnam, foreign control of Australia, the gap between performance and modern possibility, the tawdry and often false values of official society. This wilfully brings together diverse forces embracing also those who care nothing for a coalition of left forces or even oppose it. This includes, despite false Liberal, DLP and right-wing claims to the contrary the Labor Party left, who do not yet favor any coalition, and certainly not one with the Communists. Communists believe, however that the logic of the situation and the course of events will compel a re-assessment on their part.
TED DICKINSON

Jim McNeill, member of the International Brigade in Spain tells of some memories of one of the leaders of the Industrial Workers of the World.

TED Dickinson was a wobbly, that is, he was a member of the Industrial Workers of the World, the international movement of workers that flourished in the first quarter of this century.

The IWW attracted some great and colorful characters, and Ted Dickinson could be numbered as one of them. A man of great humor and kindliness, yet still a tough and uncompromising fighter for the "working stiff".

Here and in Britain he was a central figure in all the free speech and unemployed struggles of the twenties and thirties. A lieutenant in the British Battalion in the International Brigade in the Spanish Civil War, he died before a Franco firing squad in February, 1937.

I could write reams about Ted Dickinson, but I haven't reams of space, so I'll deal only with some of the more memorable events.

Ted was born at Grimsby, England, in 1904, and came to Australia with his family as a child. His mother was widowed early and had to take in washing to keep the family. She later remarried and moved to Armidale, NSW, but Ted moved back to Melbourne.

Ted studied with the Workers' Educational Association, which led him to Marx. About this time (1923-24) he became associated with the great wobbly, Charlie Reeves, one of the famous 12 IWW leaders who had been sentenced to 15 years' jail in 1917, but were released after serving a few years.

The IWW had become dormant with the jailing of its leaders, but, on his release, Charlie revived the movement in Perth, Adelaide and Melbourne. Ted Dickinson and "Ham and Eggs" Lyons (so-called because of his part in a ship strike involving a demand for ham and eggs for ships' crews) revived it in Sydney.
Ted soon became one of the leading figures in the IWW. Five feet ten, brown hair, blue-eyed, carriage as straight as a ramrod, he was an enthusiastic speaker, writer and organiser, with tons of ability. He was a regular speaker in Sydney’s Domain and had a big following. He had a musical voice and often led the Domain crowds in the singing of the old wobbly songs.

When “Direct Action”, the IWW paper was revived in Adelaide, Ted became its editor. I was a member of the editorial board.

Perhaps best of all, I remember the time Ted Dickinson and I went to Adelaide in the 1927 free speech fight. Adelaide had written to the Sydney branch for help after the entire Adelaide branch had been jailed.

When we reached Adelaide there was no one to contact, so we distributed leaflets we had had printed in Sydney, announcing that prominent speakers from NSW would speak in the Botanic Gardens on the following Sunday.

At 3 p.m. on the Sunday, as we pushed our way through the dense crowd around the IWW stump (it was really a stump, a huge tree cut about 4ft. from the ground), we found that one of the branch had been released from jail and had announced our arrival to a big crowd of unemployed.

The first chill wind of the depression had already reached Adelaide. A thousand had been put off the railways and public works that week-end, and hundreds of others from private jobs. Hundreds of them were at the meeting. There was a strong force of police, too.

During the meeting Ted noticed in the crowd five clergymen who had travelled in the train with us from Melbourne. Ted invited one of them to take the stump, but he refused. Ted then referred scathingly to some who were content to ride on the back of the central figure of history but remained deaf to the dangers of wars and unemployment.

He then called for volunteers to speak, and 40 took the platform, although they had been told that no fines would be paid.

A strong Free Speech committee was formed at a meeting that night. During the week Ted received a summons charging him with blasphemy, “in so far as you used the words ‘Ride on the back of Jesus Christ’.” Funds for the defence came in from unions and at further Sunday meetings the crowds threw in generously.
By lunch time at the court hearing eight witnesses had all said that they had not heard the words “Jesus Christ”. Some had heard the words “central figure in history”. During the adjournment the prosecutor asked Ted how many more witnesses he was calling. The answer, in a lazy, casual voice, was “Oh, two hundred”.

On the resumption of the hearing the prosecutor, in an agitated voice, told the magistrate that he understood the defendant intended to call another 200 witnesses. Could His Worship make a decision about all the other cases waiting to be heard? Several solicitors got up and said they had had witnesses at the court all the week and had been held up because of 40 free speech cases.

The magistrate then said the defendant was innocent until proved guilty and he could call as many witnesses as he wished to prove his innocence. Ted then said: “The eight witnesses I have called are representative of the 200 I intended to call who, in turn, are representative of the 3,000 at the meeting. In view of the congestion of the court, I will leave my case in Your Worship’s hands”. His verdict: “I have some doubts about the prosecution case. Case dismissed”. The evening paper billboards that afternoon carried the headline: “200 Witnesses”.

In the weeks following, many took the stump. It was proving so costly to the State that convictions that once earned a month’s sentence dwindled to 14 days, seven days, then 24 hours.
At the end of six weeks we received a message to see the Police Commissioner, who guaranteed that, if we submitted a list of speakers, all would be given permission to speak. So ended the free speech fight.

Ted was involved in many unemployed and industrial struggles after that, including the 1928 watersiders' strike and lockout in which he received nine months' jail.

In the late 1920s Ted Dickinson married and went to England, where he helped form an anti-fascist movement that co-operated with the Communist Party against the British Government's appeasement policy and against Oswald Mosley's blackshirts. He also took part in the many unemployed struggles and the hunger marches of the '30s.

In 1936, when Franco and his generals, with the backing of Hitler and Mussolini, rebelled against the Spanish Republican Government, Ted joined the British Battalion which was to fight so gallantly with the International Brigade in defence of the Spanish Republic. Ted's character and ability were such that he was soon commissioned a lieutenant in the British Battalion.

Tom Wintringham who commanded the British Battalion has said of him: "Ted Dickinson was a brilliant man with such a personality that, although he spoke little Spanish, he could make quick contact with the Spaniards. We always sent him ahead in advance parties and always when we arrived we found everything shipshape".

Ted was killed during the battle of the Jarama Valley, in the defence of Madrid, on February 13, 1937. The day before the British Battalion had beaten back a heavy Moorish attack with heavy losses on both sides.

On February 13 the Moors resumed their attack, but this time they advanced giving the clenched fist anti-fascist salute and singing the Internationale. Bill Meredith, a runner who had started back with a message from HQ wrote what happened and his account has become part of the official history of the British Battalion:

"At the time of leaving HQ there was no sign of any disturbance at the outpost. It was not until I had started out that I heard the strains of the Internationale. As I got nearer I was surprised to see large numbers of fascists coming over singing the Internationale and their hands raised in the anti-fascist salute."
"Our boys were holding up their fists in welcome to them. I had not the least doubt that here was a mass desertion from the fascist lines.

"Yank Levy seemed to be the first to realise that a trick had been played. By this time there were swarms of fascists in the trench.

"‘For Christ’s sake, get back’, yelled Yank. The singing was still going on; fascists were swarming into the position.

"Fry and Dickinson, his second-in-command, stood together and, although I hardly noticed Fry, I well remember Dickinson, his style and dress. Overcoat, top boots and smartly-clipped moustache, legs apart and back as straight as a poker, he looked every inch a soldier, despite being surrounded by fascists.

"He looked at them with contempt written all over his face and it was obvious that his capture would never shake his calm courage. These two, Fry and Dickinson, were two of the finest leaders under whom men could go into battle.

"The next instant Fry fell wounded. Dickinson, partially screened by a Scotsman, Tommy Bloomfield, undid Fry’s sam brown officer’s belt and threw it into some undergrowth. He knew the fate of officers falling into fascist hands.

"They were being marched with hands above their heads when young Elias asked in broken Spanish for permission to smoke. Permission granted, he reached into a pocket when a machine gun sputtered and he fell dead. The same burst of fire killed Stevens.

"Dickinson then said, ‘If we had a bunch of Australian bushmen here we’d have pushed you b——s into the sea long ago’.

"His words were not understood, but his tone was. He was stood aside, his back to an olive tree. Three Moors advanced. Just as the order to fire was given, Dickinson said, ‘Keep your chins up, boys. Salud’.

"Three shots rang out and Dickinson fell.

"All the others were lined up to be shot when a German officer appeared and countermanded the order. He realised they could be exchanged for important prisoners”.

An unforgettable character, Ted Dickinson.
IN recent years Australia awakened to the fact that something was amiss with its cities. Transportation networks were rapidly becoming acutely congested and there was a promise of worse to come. Car ownership rates were rising, public transport patronage declining, accident rates were high, delays and traffic snarls increasingly commonplace.

It was thought that the increased costs of production due to the above factors—quite apart from the lowering of the quality of life involved for the citizens—might introduce diseconomies large enough to adversely affect Australia's competitive position on the world's markets.

Forecasts of population growth were noted. City planners, transport authorities, car owners' pressure groups, and public administrators took heed of the warning signs and decided that "something must be done about the transport problem."

Attention was focused on a series of "transport studies" being executed in the USA. One after another the major cities in Australia initiated a series of so-called studies, ostensibly designed to produce a program which, if implemented, would solve their transport problems. Some of these studies are still in progress, while most of those completed are shelved and conveniently forgotten.

The aim of the studies is to design the most efficient transport network for a town plan where one has been drawn up. But two things about these town plans should be noted:

1. In no city has the state or city government either the will or capacity to actually implement the town plan.

2. The plans themselves are merely a statement of what exists, modified by forecasts of what the position will be if the present trends in growth of population, employment, etc., continue (for example the Brisbane study).
In cities where there were no town plans, those carrying out the transportation study have used their own ideas about how the city might develop, again taking existing trends as the basis, tempered by finding out what "Old Uncle Tom Cobley and all" felt about future city growth (for example the Hobart study).

The study procedure is as follows: a sample of the population is interviewed to ascertain their travel habits in relation to their various activities. Volume counts are made on roads, public transport etc. and a theoretical model of the existing situation is developed by expanding the sample survey to represent the total population.

The forecast town plan is expressed in terms of population and employment, and using the theoretical model of the existing situation the travel problems of the future town plan are worked out. A transport network is then planned to cater for the calculated volumes of travel. Theoretically the most efficient system is planned; however, this is open to question because the measure of efficiency is rarely stated clearly. In practice what happens is that empirical decisions are made, particularly in relation to public transport (trains, trams or buses) and one network is proposed for development.

Several aspects of these studies are open to debate and in particular the validity of the sampling and projection techniques especially as applied to outer urban areas, could be regarded as contentious.

It is interesting to ask whether the "packaged programs" for the computers of the particular study technique applied actually do what we are told they do. Often we have little way of checking because the cities for which studies have been done do not have people experienced enough in computer operation to dissect the programs to see what they do. It would be appropriate if the consulting firm engaged in the study actually went through the steps of constructing the computer programs with a local man, or is it that they themselves do not know how to, and are just applying the packaged programs without question?

It is also interesting to speculate whether the fact that the "studies" have been done usually by an American firm as the major partner in association with an Australian firm, or by an Australian firm blindly applying American techniques, has meant that value judgments have been made on the basis of American experi-cations.
ence which may not be valid in Australia—for example decisions on the relative significance of public and private transport.

The studies are not cheap—the Melbourne study is costing upwards of 800,000 dollars—yet cost is not the main issue here, because a proper study process would cost the same. The point is that the money is not well spent. The transport engineers, often fascinated by the complexity of their calculations, usually forget that they are building on the assumption of a town plan which, as we have shown, is a shaky one to say the least.

The town planners are accepting too much, taking too much for granted. At no point has the form of the city been examined. Twentieth century techniques and equipment are applied to examine a twentieth century problem occurring in cities and towns which have a B.C. form.

One would be entitled to ask why none of the studies have questioned the existing city form and tried to study each city to see the most economical form of development for it to follow.

There is ample evidence from Australian experience that the city with one centre is a thing of the past. The flight from the city centres of retailing and wholesaling, the phenomenon of industrial re-location in the suburbs, removal of professional offices and some commercial offices from the city centre, indeed even the suburban development of tertiary education institutions, are all evidence of decentralisation pressures within the metropolitan frame.

Why, then, try to further centralisation by developing transport networks which force it, as most of the studies so far undertaken do?

If there were instead the aims of achieving maximum accessibility, convenience and mobility, minimising capital investment in transport networks and minimising operational costs, including time costs, while retaining the desired residential densities, very different transportation studies would be undertaken and very different results would emerge.

For too long in Australia we have toyed with “city beautiful” concepts of town planning without realising that the city is a living operational organisation.

The current technique of forecasting on the basis of existing trends is hardly planning. It is time we were more rigorously analytical, employing sociological and economic
measures as well as operational characteristics to examine our cities.

The technical skills are available, and more informed community debate is needed on the way our cities should develop in order to encourage the undertaking of the proper studies.

The problem is, however, that any proposals for change in the existing patterns of development or growth generate almost insurmountable opposition from landowners. It is almost impossible to contemplate construction of even moderate transport networks because of the resumption and legal costs involved. For example, it will cost approximately $22 million for one and a half miles of freeway being built in Sydney, and half will be for the land.

The money currently being spent on studies producing transportation network designs, should be spent to undertake more fundamental studies in city forms and growth patterns. Not only would these produce plans which would minimise travel while maximising accessibility, but it would provide the city government with guide lines as to how they could buy all the land, or at least the key sections, to accommodate the growth. Provision of services such as transport, water and sewerage, would then be used as tools to economically shape the city.

The areas required for expansion could be acquired by raising rate revenues to realistic higher levels than those existing, or, preferably, by government loans—after all Canberra has successfully shown that a town planned on a large scale pays handsomely. Here the government is making a large profit from re-sale at new, higher values, of land previously undeveloped for residential and other city purposes.

Neither the old property forms based on capitalist ownership, nor the existing form of centralised cities can provide the basis for development of our towns to meet modern conditions.
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ART AND THE
BATTLE OF IDEAS

Leading member, and author of “My Years in the Communist Party”, discusses the complex problems of art and ideology.

HOW to win the majority of the Australian people to their ideas is a problem always confronting communists. In facing it, the influence of art and literature on people’s thoughts and feelings has to be borne in mind.

On the one hand care is needed not to apply marxist standards narrowly, to recognise that there will always be many trends in art, and that art can only flourish in a free atmosphere. On the other hand, if the “battle of ideas” is to be waged seriously, it must be recognised that the arts, through their appeal to people’s minds and emotions, do affect how they will look upon life and how they will tackle life’s problems.

Think to what extent most people are influenced—for the most part badly—by all that comes over TV and radio and through cheap magazines in the form of stories, pictures or music of one kind or another! Any party or any people setting out to build socialism or communism is bound to take a keen interest in how the arts develop and help guide their course.

This matter was discussed at the recent congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. The Communist Party of Australia disagreed—rightly, I believe—with the penal measures taken at that time against the writers Sinyavsky and Daniel. But on two matters the CPSU was unquestionably right: its great aim of the winning of communism depends above all on the battle between capitalist and communist ideas; and that the world of art deeply affects people’s outlook (especially with the Soviet people who are such very keen book readers, concert and theatre goers.)

What are the capitalist ideas which the Soviet people have to overcome? Capitalism breeds in people the ideas of shoving others around, enlarging one’s own power, feathering one’s own nest. It
is a dog-eat-dog, devil-take-the-hindmost system, the most war-making system of history, a system that treats human life very cheaply. That is true despite all the fine thoughts and feelings of people within the capitalist society who do not accept the prevailing ideas and morals.

The Russian Revolution struck a blow at old ideas and habits. It helped to make millions of very fine men and women. The socialist system, aided by Soviet education, encouraged co-operative instead of selfish qualities. The Soviet people, inspired by their revolution, have faced incredible difficulties and dangers, built socialism, transformed their country, and smashed Hitler’s armies, showing their great moral fibre.

But it takes time for old ideas and habits to die out among a whole people—ideas and habits that came, in this case, not only from the “bourgeois” profit-making system but from tsarism and feudalism also—ideas and habits that gained a certain new lease of life from the cult of Stalin which involved the mass hero-worship—and therefore the emulation by many—of a leader who was wrongfully using power in many directions.

As Marx said in 1865: “What we have to deal with here is a communist society, not as it has developed on its own foundations but, on the contrary, as it emerges from capitalist society; which is thus in every respect, economically, morally and intellectually, still stamped with the birthmarks of the old society from the womb of which it came.” (Critique of the Gotha Program.)

In 1960, when I was last in the Soviet Union, there was already a deep absorption in the whole question of the development of human beings so that the nation would be fitted to operate a fully-developed communist society. In such a society all will work according to their ability and receive according to their needs. Income will not vary according to work done. In place of the present combination of material and moral incentives to work, there will be only the moral incentive—love of work and one’s sense of duty to one’s fellow-citizens. To build a nation of socially-minded, cultured men and women who will give of their best for that moral incentive—that is an even bigger task than the building of an economy that will provide in abundance the many-sided needs of all citizens.

Wherever we went in the Soviet Union in 1960—to universities and boarding schools, to factories with their advanced “communist
labor" teams and automated workshops with their special problems—this human question seemed already uppermost in the minds of leading Soviet citizens.

It may at first sight seem disappointing, in reading the Soviet Congress reports, to see, along with the pride taken in the "moulding of the new Soviet man," the emphasis still laid on combating "alien ideology," on more attention to the upbringing of youth, on the existence of a certain minority of young people who "want to keep aloof from a busy life" and "tend to remain the dependants of others," on the existence of communists who "think that Party membership gives them certain privileges" and so on. But human beings change on the whole more slowly than their economic surroundings—a fact many of us did not previously realise fully enough. The battle for people's minds takes a long time, and it is good to see a frank statement of the difficulties and of the determination to overcome them.

Let us now turn to the question: how have capitalist ideas expressed themselves in the arts? The early period of capitalism when it took the field as a liberating force against the old feudal order, saw a wealth of great art—Renaissance painting, the great English classical novelists, the great classical schools of music, etc.

But this art got more and more crushed out in the ruthless profit-making scramble of the modern factory. Capitalism more and more "drowned all fervor and sentiment in the icy waters of egotistical calculation" (Marx and Engels, Communist Manifesto): Of all social systems in history it became the most hostile to art. It made man the appendage of a machine, sucked up his vital energies in soulless production, and then offered easy gratification of his starved instincts in cheap thrillers and love stories, films of sex and violence, yellow press sensationalism, etc. Despite this there has been a great output of serious art in this century, some of it of high quality, because capitalism has never fully conquered the minds of the artist or of the people.

Some of the art of the later capitalist period has been marked by retreat from the world and from the problems of real life. Some of it has been of interest only to a small coterie and not to the people. Some of it is marked by pessimism and lack of faith in the future.

Where such art dominates it will help to win acceptance for the world as it is. It will serve the purposes of the rich. What
is needed is an art and literature that will serve the people, rouse their finer human feelings, their interest in life's problems and love of their fellow human beings, and give them faith in themselves and in the future of humanity.

There has been a great wealth of art during this century carrying a militant working class message or waging battle against war, fascism, race discrimination and other social evils. Hundreds of examples come to mind, from Mayakovsky poems to the recent wave of American folk songs, from Power Without Glory and Counihan paintings to plays of Bernard Shaw and films of Chaplin. But there has also been much very fine "uncommitted art," or even art of other ideologies such as that of Graham Greene, of the kind that gives some strong image of life and so heightens interest in life, stirs the imagination and deepens human feelings. All these varieties of art can help humanity on its path forward.

Art does influence the political struggle from the very fact that it influences people's thoughts and feelings. But we should not over-simplify the question as we have often done. The bearing of art on politics, while sometimes direct, is often roundabout or remote. Furthermore the best creative art can only develop in conditions of freedom. We should therefore give careful thought to the question how to influence art and literature.

We should not seek to establish a single trend in art as was attempted in the days of Stalin (The Soviet Union has since moved away from this idea). Co-existence of different schools of art, music and literature is healthy and is needed for them to flourish. As a general rule it should be our aim to help art workers to become good communists, or at any rate to become humane and progressive people, then help them to follow their own artistic courses.

Take the modernist trends for example. Judah Waten has commented that the communists in Europe, by adopting a more understanding attitude to these trends, have largely broken down the barriers dividing them from many younger artists and writers. He urges study of these modern artists and writers who, whatever their weaknesses, have captured some essential features of modern life and can talk to modern audiences.

Or take the creators of the "art of beauty", those who portray beauty for its own sake and rejoice in it. Years ago Upton Sinclair,
in the nobly intended but far too rigid analysis made in his book *Mammonart* (in which he wiped out such artists as Shakespeare and Raphael by a stroke of the pen) condemned the “art of beauty” as offering an escape from real problems. He called it “the gas barrage of the Haves against the Have-nots.” But the best of such art can ennable man by evoking his finest feelings. It may even sometimes have a strong political bearing. The best of Australian landscape painting, for example, by inspiring a love of our country, can help in the struggle to preserve it from alien domination which is one of the main struggles of our time.

“Socialist realism”, understood in its broad sense as a concern with real human life and problems reflecting the socialist outlook of a writer or artist, represents a high ideal of art. But we should not expect it to be the sole trend in art. Still less should we interpret it narrowly as we often used to do. There is need for wider discussion of the idea of “socialist realism”, its true meaning and implications.

Symbolism, stylist, even sometimes abstract art, may convey the essence of reality and therefore help people to grapple better with reality. Should we condemn the symbolism of Eisenstein or the ballet? Or the stylist of the ever-popular Peking Opera? Or the element of abstractness in Picasso?

We can even go too far in our call for optimistic art,—for the “positive Hero”. For the victorious finish. Some bitterly tragic works help to unmask conventional morality—Hardy’s *Tess of the Durbevilles* or Ibsen’s *Ghosts* for example. Others, despite their almost continuous tragedy, show how love of life persists despite all, are an affirmation of faith in life, like Mulk Raj Anand’s *Coolie*. Some tragic works make one feel more intimately, and therefore perceive more truly, the inevitable calamities of history, like Cino Alegri’s *Broad and Alien is the World*. Humanism will always inspire. The pessimism to be abhorred is the pessimism that becomes cynical and inhuman.

Even where we judge art to have harmful social effects, we should not seek to suppress or censor it. Public opinion—which in a socialist society is in the main healthily developed, without the degrading influences from the commercial controllers of mass media—should be allowed its free play in art and literary matters. A healthy public opinion is the real answer to bad literature and bad art. (Curbs may be essential, of course, in times of revolution-
ary crisis or when the working majority, having taken power, is facing conspiracy or violence from the dispossessed millionaires and their backers in the first years of socialist rule).

Certainly artists need criticism — free criticism from many standpoints—and communists should be the first to encourage criticism, from a marxist standpoint, of the subject matter, form and style of art and literature. Experience suggests that the State or leading party in a socialist society should itself be sparing in art and literary criticism, or it may savor of dictation, and will then tend to cramp and frustrate the artist and discourage his initiative. In general, artists and writers and their organisations and journals, along with the general public, should be the critics.

We should remember, too, that artists who are not themselves revolutionaries may have a great enlightening and uplifting effect on society and play an important part in creating revolutionaries. Witness the great work of the conservative Balzac and the unpractical pacifist Tolstoy (highly praised by Engels and Lenin respectively). Sweeping attacks on past culture, as by the Chinese "Red Guards," are certainly no part of marxism-leninism.

In general it is true, as Plekhanov put it, that "an artist of proven talent will increase considerably the forcefulness of his work by steeping himself in the great emancipatory ideas of our time." A socialist society has the finest soil for creative art—a very high standard of art performance, an unrivalled art public, the door wide open for all with artistic talents, and a widespread understanding of marxism to serve as the foundation both of creative work and for sound critical judgments. It has the inspiration of great deeds done and a new world in the making. There is no doubting the abundance of fine and great creative art which will finally pour forth from all socialist societies as the difficulties of the pioneering years are overcome.

But art and literature play a big part also in our own social struggle. There is the art which helps the struggle and the art which hinders it, the art that ennobles and the art that degrades, the art that is effective and the art that is ineffective.

By the right kind of criticism, and above all, by encouragement to creative art generally, the fight against monopoly and imperialism and war can be strengthened in no small measure, and the ground prepared for the building of socialism and finally communism in our own country.

THIS is a welcome paper-back edition of the original published in 1962. Many will find particular joy in Russell Drysdale's drawings, although these and the text fully complement each other.

Innumerable books have been written of the heat, aridity and grandeur of Australia's inland and the ways of its inhabitants, human and animal, but not since Joseph Furphy's *Such Is Life* have the interminable miles between camp and camp been traversed in so lively a compendium of yarns, scientific observations, sensitive description, scraps of history, provocative opinions and laughter as in *Journey Among Men*.

The "journey" is a zoological expedition of some 10,000 miles around Australia, west coast and inland, by two teams of hard-working scientists. Of the "men" encountered, inevitably few, Marshall and Drysdale make human oases in an empty land. An eminent Professor of Zoology somewhat noted for irascible sallies against human ignorance and folly, Marshall here indulges a genial tolerance for these men of the outback fashioned into oddities or sages by the pressures of endurance and isolation.

Several pages devoted to the "mystique" of the bush pub, to the ceremonial ecstasy of the first beer after "days of dusty trails," are lyrical enough to shatter the convictions of the most rigid teetotaller. These tiny pubs which "verandahed about, stand on the plains like ships at sea" are the "real social centres . . . disseminators of news and mail . . . where affairs of the district are decided . . . and bargains sealed with a drink."

Along with his lusty humor, Marshall is blessed with rare appreciation of nature's ways, her forms, colors and movement, that inspire him at times to notable writing.

On the track to Marble Bar is Gallery Hill, "an extraordinary granite outcrop . . . whose great boulders are engraved with hundreds of petroglyphs by long-gone generations of Aboriginal artists . . . The granite weathered and butchered by nature maintains a curious order and delicacy and rises like architecture out of the plain. The carvings appear almost golden in color for they are hammered into and beneath the age-old patina of red brown that covers the boulders . . . One can picture them (the brown men) squatting or standing high on the pinnacles, pounding and hammering into the granite, the sweat running down the ochre of their foreheads, grunting in time to the rhythm of the blows, or with voices lifted in an age-old chant. Men of the stone age, creating a great gallery of art. It is conceivable that while the builders of Chartres were raising their sublime creation to the glory of God, these children of the dawn were engraving their vision of the creation of mankind on a cathedral wrought by the elements from the face of the earth, a vision open to the wide light of the sky, to the singing winds of the desert and the sparse and cooling rain."

Parts of the book, Marshall says, were written as articles for the Lon-
don Observer. If many of the geological, zoological and historical facts, the debunking of fantasies — and the caustic comments—were for the benefit of the benighted Britisher, most of them are illuminating to us ignorant Australians. Journey Among Men is not just another “away-from-it-all” book. It brings home once again how little we know of our continent.

Though the future of our nation is decided among the masses of men in cities and towns, the vast, harsh land at our back doors still presents its challenge to be known and understood and put expertly to human use.

That challenge will some day be met, confidently, by the Australian people in a world at peace.

J.T.


“THIS book gives an introductory analysis of the influences affecting the level of national production, income and employment with particular reference to Australia . . . the ideas here discussed are those stemming from J. M. Keynes’ The General Theory of Employment, Interest and Money.” (p. ix.)

Both Keynes and Marx were on common ground in assessing that “historical experience indicates that there is no inherent tendency for a capitalist economy to settle in a position of full employment equilibrium” (p. 12), although there is only formal similarity between their explanations for this phenomenon, both in the long run and over the shorter trade cycle.

It is a pity that Prof. Cameron does not examine the longer run implications of Keynes’ theory in the Australian context. Keynes suggested that the marginal efficiency of capital (roughly, the anticipated rate of profit) fell in the long run due to the progressive exhaustion of the opportunities for the utilisation of capital goods. Moreover, because of the “fundamental psychological law” that only part of an increase in income is spent on consumption, the increasing non-consumed income (savings) does not find sufficiently attractive investment possibilities because of the decline in the marginal efficiency of capital, leading to a lower level of income and employment.

In a formal sense, this is similar to the long-term marxian tendency, although Marx did not recognise a community propensity to consume but a class propensity: the working class consumed all their income whereas the capitalist class accumulated, and the rising organic composition of capital (ratio of expenditure on means of production to that on wages) implied a falling rate of profit. In the Keynesian case, the decline in the rate of profit proceeded from a purely technological base; in the marxian, from the relations of production.

Professor Cameron might usefully have examined the Keynesian proposition since there is debate in Keynesian and marxian circles about the conformity of these theories with experience. An exhaustive study by the marxist J. Gillman, The Falling Rate of Profit, suggests that it has not fallen historically; in this century the
counteracting tendencies pointed to by Marx have proved the stronger force.

Over the shorter period trade cycle, Keynes' explanation did not approach the logical consistency of Marx's. Keynes' fluctuations were due to erratic movements in prospective yields on investments (expectations), an explanation which offered little scope for development by post-Keynesians.

On the basis of the Keynesian concepts, however, an alternative theory has been developed in terms of the interaction of the multiplier and the accelerator. In this, a multiplied income increase derives from a constant or increasing level of autonomous investment, and the increased consumer demand created by the income increments induces further investment (the acceleration principle). The boom continues until the full employment ceiling is reached where the accelerator operates in reverse, causing the downturn.

While Prof. Cameron cites this as "among the more important of the special theories of industrial fluctuations" (p. 86), he notes that it too has proved theoretically deficient; the explanation of the upturn is unclear, as is the explanation of the level of "autonomous" investment from which it derives. Moreover, the statistically calculated acceleration coefficient of 5 for advanced capitalist countries would have caused fluctuations of greater magnitude than have been experienced in Australia.

A key role is assigned in the model to the rate of interest, for Keynes assumed that investment proceeds up to the point where the marginal efficiency of capital equals the rate of interest. (pp. 71-3.) Historically, however, it seems that the rate of interest has had little effect on the level of investment because companies increasingly are financing investment from internal sources. Prof. Cameron does note these objections to the Keynesian proposition but seems to discount them; "... a firm which finances its investment by an equity issue may not think the interest rate is important, but ... its future equity issues will not be successful if those profits fail to match prevailing interest rates." (p. 74.) Nor will they if profits fail to match the prevailing average rate of profit.

In Australia, given the preponderant importance of non-interest bearing sources for investment this would seem the more general statement, so that the opportunity cost of an investment project (p. 72) becomes not the rate of interest but the average rate of profit. This deduction proceeds from a different understanding of interest from the Keynesian. Keynes had to assume for his interest model that all investment is financed by borrowed funds so that interest becomes the reward for not hoarding. In the Marxian definition, which seems to accord more with experience, interest is the reward for lending and determines the division of surplus value into interest and profits, a purely quantitative distinction which has become institutionalised into a qualitative one.

From a Marxist point of view, the strength of the book lies in the manner in which it reveals the forces undermining the drive for economic rationality in capitalist society. In different ways the main concern of both Keynes and Marx was to reveal the anarchic and chaotic nature of the workings of capitalist society. Keynes, of course, thought these maladjust-
ments could be remedied within the framework of the capitalist system, and to some extent the application of his theories has modified its workings. Despite the growing role of the state, the separation and contradictions between savings and investment plans have not been overcome, and many of Keynes' suggested palliatives (e.g., higher taxation on the rich to lower their propensity to save) have not been effected.

Marxists will argue that it is because of the very nature of capitalist society that such measures cannot be introduced, and therefore that the triumph of economic rationality will be postponed till the advent of socialism.

HENRY CARROLL.

HISTORY JOURNALS,
Some comments by W. A. Wood.

In the June issue of the journal of the Royal Australian Historical Society, John Cobley analyses for the first time the real crimes of the first fleet convicts.

Examining the sentences passed on 646 of them, Mr. Cobley finds nothing sensational. The convicts weren't village Hampdens or desperate murderers. The biggest total was scored by "simple theft" (247), "highway robbery" (48) and the stealing of various animals (61). All but 24 of the 646 were thieves of some kind—a small kind, As Mr. Cobley says, "highway robbery" could mean stealing a silk handkerchief worth a shilling. A hundred and ninety of the thieves were lucky to escape being hanged. Their death sentences had been commuted to transportation. Two of these were guilty of "sacrilege" as well as theft, having stolen the silver from Magdalen College chapel, Oxford. The silver was a good deal more sacred than the lives of the poor to the ruling classes of those days.

So Australia it turns out, was founded by small thieves. The big operators, like Macarthur, came soon afterward to steal the country itself, and get their photos onto today's two-dollar bills.

One of these thieves (of labor power as well as land) was the Rev. Samuel Marsden, and Michael Saclier in another article draws attention to a little-known manuscript in the Mitchell Library, Sydney, till recently uncatalogued but now, says Mr. Saclier, known to be Marsden's work.

The MS confirms that Marsden was opposed to Macarthur—he was in England during the Rum Rebellion—but he would have backed Bligh. Marsden notes how deeply entrenched were the Rum profiteers, saying that any Governor who took them on would find himself up against the "private interests" of men whose "active minds would suggest a thousand ways to make him feel the weight of their resentment."

Why Sydney's Archbishop Loane, newly enthroned, should have singled out such an unsavoury character as Marsden for praise is a puzzle. The "flogging parson" stands out as a truly hateful character even in the rugged times he lived in. He had a particular hatred for the Irish, from whom the Archbishop is descended and Mr. Saclier offers us a specimen of the "bilious outpourings of hatred and fear which drop from the gentle parson."
Marsden refers to . . . "the Irish Nation, who are the most wild, ignorant and savage race that were ever favored with the Light of Civilisation" and demands a continued ban on the Catholic religion. If Dr. Loane is really proud to count such a man among the church's founding fathers in N.S.W., the rest of us can only say he is welcome to him.

MOST important of the new research articles in May, 1966, Labor History, bulletin of the Australian Society for the Study of Labor History, is the overdue re-telling by West Australian historian, B. K. de Garis of the story of "West Australia's Eureka."

On May 4, 1919, the Wharf Lumpers' Union of Fremantle defeated attempts by the Government, and an armed body of police, to unload a "black" ship with scab labor. They did this with the loss of Thomas Edwards, a waterside worker killed in the struggle. But they forced the resignation of the Premier (Sir) Hal. Colebatch.

Unskilled workers were able to score a clear-cut win over an anti-Labor Government and get rid of it. Such incidents are too rare in our history, and much too rarely talked about. As de Garis says, "Thomas Edwards was soon forgotten." One of Labor History's tasks is to see that such workers are not forgotten.

FIVE JOURNEYS FROM JAKARTA, by Maslyn Williams. Collins, 382 pp. $4.50.

INDONESIA, comprising 3000 islands, inhabited by some 100 million people, is our nearest neighbor in South East Asia. Most Australians knew nothing of these people until 20-25 years ago. Particularly since the mid 1950's, due to the Federal Liberal Government's foreign and domestic policies, we have been fed on a crude fare of "threats from the colored north" and the "civilised white outpost" concept.

Unfortunately there have been too few books, good, indifferent or even bad, to cast more than a glimmer of light on the subject. Certainly not enough to try and bridge more than a century of neglect.

Maslyn Williams gives us the opportunity to gain some understanding of the Indonesian people. Using Jakarta as a base, he travelled (in early 1965) off the by-ways to Sulawesi, Bali, Sumatra, Java, Irian Barat.

Written in a very frank first person, the author reveals a sincere affection for the people; "I felt a great love . . . and sense of oneness with this old man and all the people round about." He enjoys everyday conversation with the coolie, the vendor, the peasant, the new settler, their pride in living free from Dutch oppression; is amazed at the long standing and highly skilled culture. Comparing a performance of the classical Balinese Legong Dance, he ponders that, having recently seen high class western ballet (in New York) "I was vaguely ashamed that I had thought the others (western) graceful." The Balinese dancers were 12 years old!

The writer vividly brings to life the people's everyday activities—at the markets, on the streets, "gotong royong" (communal efforts), cockfighting, a vicious bloodsport at the fair; the perseverance to overcome illiteracy, to build a widespread medical service, develop new industries.
What were Mr. Williams' reasons for such a trip? "I am going to look for a truth which will satisfy me" and "I do not wish to accept any more ready-made judgments thrust upon me by professional politicians and glib commentators."

Does he succeed? Find his truth? Shed the "ready-made judgments?" Nearly half way through the book (p. 166) he admits he still "becomes confused" and even on the last page bar one (p. 381) "I could see, miserably, only long bleak vistas of my own ignorance."

But one cannot completely agree with Mr. Williams' pessimistic appraisal of himself. His objectivity and humanity seem to be much stronger than this negative self-appraisal warrants. His journeys are not superficial but deep and probing, though, of course, correct, or clear and simple results do not always easily come even from such a basically sound approach. But come they do.

While he faithfully records, recognises and, I believe, condemns the retarding and oppressive 350 years of Dutch colonial rule, he either does not recognise or understand the advent of the newer, somewhat more subtle post-war colonialism that has developed from the very forces that spawned the now disintegrated colonial empires.

In *Five Journeys* a few communists are met, and a fair bit of anti-communism unveiled. Maybe some things have been even prophetic. For example, the surprise of the author, noting the strength and influence of the PKI, learning first hand accounts of the wrecking (by Islamic students) of the Communist Youth Organisation's building in Malang. And the communists were defeated in labor union elections (by well-organised Islamic groups) in Sourabaya's largest iron foundry.

A skin buyer comments: "The communists have some good ideas and they work hard, but they should not shame the rest of the Indonesian people with their childish demonstrations." (p. 261.)

General Nasution was then organisational head of the National Front, in charge of all the regular and volunteer fighting forces, police, organised work force and amateur spying systems. He thus became a symbol of strength, and well placed for the anti-communist forces. General Nasution is "a nice man, a religious man, generous and fair in all his dealings." The author meets Lukman, second top communist, who came from the Dutch hell camp in New Guinea during the war, to Australia with his mother, now buried in N.S.W. He revisited her grave in 1963. "A simple, decent man, more heart than mind." Now executed by Nasution's forces.

Are the communists crushed completely? For a movement that was primarily responsible for Sukarno proclaiming the 1945 Independence, that organised peasants for land reform and developed the largest national trade union organisations, there is still a base to begin anew. But there are bitter lessons to be learned.

Whatever the politics, the dreams and tensions, Maslyn Williams reveals the people of Indonesia. Getting to know them through his book can be a thoroughly enjoyable experience for everyone and stimulate desire for further knowledge and contact.

Mannie Burnham.

THIS book poses, and attempts to answer, some questions about the origin and purpose of the International Brigades, how they fared, how today's survivors view their participation in the fight of the Spanish people.

The author pays tribute to the motives of the thousands of mostly young men who flocked to Spain from many countries of the world to help defend the democratically elected Government. He acknowledges the heroic fight they waged in all the major battles—from the crucial defence of Madrid in November 1936 to the final struggle on the Ebro River almost three years later. Their numbers were small, their losses in dead and wounded in proportion huge.

Much is made all through the book of the difficulties and differences that existed between the various nationalities composing the Brigades, and between the Brigades and the Spanish Government and command.

It is certainly true there were differences, there was grumbling, there were opposing policies and ideologies. For the early months there was no unified command, no single strategy. In addition to that part of the old army which remained loyal, the Socialists organised and commanded their own militia forces; so did the Anarchists and the Communists, and it was only the urgent needs of the war that eventually brought a unified army and unified command. Had this existed at the beginning, the outcome could well have been different. As the war dragged on disillusionment grew, the weak and the weary found continuing defeats unbearable, division and distrust grew. It was naive to think, as so many of us did, that the fine international outlook inspiring the Brigades automatically made for smooth and efficient running of armies. In spite of these handicaps, discipline remained high and fighting spirit good.

Much of what Brome records is obviously colored by his own beliefs. Perhaps the outstanding example is found in Chapter 2, “Origin of the Brigades”. He quotes from a book, I was a Spy for Stalin, written by one Krivitsky (alias Ginsberg), allegedly Chief of Soviet Military Intelligence in Western Europe. According to this, Moscow decided that movements of volunteers to Spain must be secretly policed by the OGPU, informers planted to weed out suspected spies, members whose opinions were not strictly orthodox eliminated, and reading matter and conversation supervised.

That any meetings made such decisions is extremely doubtful, but certainly the alleged decisions were not carried out, as can be vouched for by any Australian who saw service in the Brigade.

There are many similar unauthenticitated tales. One mentions Charlotte Haldane, who worked in a Paris recruitment centre, and this abounds with tales of secret addresses, passwords, cross-examinations, police shadowings, and other ingredients of TV secret service stories.

My personal experience was very different. I walked into Mrs. Haldane's office, told her my name and...
that I wanted to go to Spain. I had no credentials, was asked no questions except whether I was a good walker, and told to come back in two days, when I set out with some English lads for our common destination—via the summit of the Pyrenees. No questions, no pass-words, either then or when we reached Spain.

La Pasionaria, the name of a heroine of Spain admired by millions throughout the world, is victim of an attack, foul even if true, about her private life which is dragged in without any reason other than besmirching her.

The last chapter "The Return Home," carries vignettes on the lives of some who got back safely to the United States and Britain. Most of those quoted were, but are no longer, communists, now rejecting their past associations and actions.

There are a very few notable exceptions. One of these is Alvah Bessie, one of the imprisoned Hollywood Ten. He told the author: "I have not changed my opinions, despite all attempts to debunk that cause, to slander the Spanish Republic Government and the USSR’s involvement in that fight."

For myself, I am 100 per cent, with him and am confident that the other Australians who participated in what the book calls "the last of the great crusades" are too.

As for Vincent Brome, his effort seems to be part of today's not so sophisticated anti-communism, rather than an attempt at historical reporting.

SAM AARONS.

PENAL COLONY TO PENAL POWERS,
by J. Hutson. Amalgamated Engineering Union, 229 pp. $1.50.

This publication by the Amalgamated Engineering Union is a new departure in union activity.

The need for a study and analysis of the peculiar and complicated arbitration system, from the point of view of militant trade unionism, is well met by the author, who is a research officer of the AEU. The study covers the early period of settlement, briefly touches on the beginnings and the first activities of the trade unions, shows clearly the forces which led to the establishment of the arbitration system and critically analyses some of the practices of arbitration over the years.

This book is more for the converted, that is, for the active militant worker who takes more than a passing interest in the never-ending struggle under capitalism for a greater share of the enormous wealth produced.

This is not to deny the strength of the arguments presented, for example, against the theory that wage increases are the cause of price increases, or that the best way to raise wages is by a well argued and documented case before the court.

The author convincingly shows that the decisions of the court are influenced by the extent of mass agitation and activity outside the court.

He refers to the classic example of the court's attitude to the claim for three weeks' annual leave. In 1961 it was recognised in principle but refused because of over-full employment; in 1962 it was again recognised in
principle but refused because of increased unemployment; in 1963 it was granted following the biggest trade union campaign since the metal trades dispute of 1947, over-employment or under-employment notwithstanding.

The National Civic Council arguments for a wage adjusted according to a national productivity index are set out, analysed and annihilated in a fashion this reader has never before seen, and the positive alternative of a living wage very ably presented.

However, the most topical and indeed the most important section of the book is the latter part dealing with the penal powers and other repressive legislation.

Here the author sets out the truly massive legal apparatus established to ensure "maximum exploitation and that the big investment in modern plant does not lie idle, that the labor employed must present itself for work when required."

Such an assessment of the real nature of the penal powers is not the academic approach, a mere statement of the position, but a class approach to the problem and a militant demand for their removal.

"The first protest against penal powers took place in 1840 when public meetings in Sydney and a petition signed by 2,856 was instrumental in modifying the harshest features of a new Masters and Servants Act." So penal powers go back a long way in the history of the Australian labor movement and the struggle against their application, as the author shows, is a continuing one reaching high spots at particular periods of history.

Active opposition over recent years has been hampered by ineffective leadership from the right wing in control of the Australian Council of Trade Unions, but the author warns against seeking short cuts, or theories of the militants "going it alone."

Penal powers have been used to hold back the struggles of wide sections, and their removal, the author argues, is therefore a problem for the whole of the trade union movement including those sections which have not, as yet, felt the "legal lash."

In the present era of rapid technological change and automation, the need for removal of penal powers becomes still more pressing, as new demands for a union say in the control of industry and in the introduction of new processes are added to the traditional ones.

In such a serious, and at times involved discussion on these issues, the author's saving grace of a sense of humor makes the book extremely readable.

This is not a book to have on the bookshelf. It is more a tool of trade for the trade union activist. But that is not its limit. It is indeed a scholarly contribution to the small but growing literature about the history, traditions and perspectives of the Australian labor movement.

The author's scientific method of investigating the reality he is concerned with, and presentation of facts rather than declamatory opinions, makes this book an important one for marxist theoreticians to study.

The Commonwealth Council of the AEU, in authorising its publication, has set a precedent that could well be followed by many other unions concerned with the solution of some of the major problems with which history has confronted them.

RAY CLARKE.
comment

—The Federal Elections.

The sweeping Liberal-Country Party victory is at once setback, threat and challenge to the Australian labor and democratic movement.

The massive government majority, a Liberal Party with nearly half the seats, and increased strength for the Liberal extreme right, will threaten suppression of all opposition and even more extremist foreign policies. But any attempt along these line will create a powerful counter-movement.

The most significant thing, so far obscured by establishment jubilation, is that 42 per cent of Australians have voted against the Vietnam war and against conscription of youth for this war, and implicitly for a new Australian foreign policy of peace and friendship with Asia. The Government's electoral tactics made it inevitable that a vote for Labor, Liberal Reform or Communist could mean only this.

The Government mounted a massive campaign to scare electors with false visions of encroaching Asian hordes. The Liberals claimed to have placed Australia behind the American shield by cunningly providing soldiers for Vietnam and an open go for American capital in acquiring Australian resources.

The Labor Party was presented as criminally irresponsible or even treasonable. And a sustained, skilful campaign was mounted against Mr. Calwell, helped by the impatient ambitions of Mr. Whitlam for the Party Leadership.

The election result will stimulate the contention of policies in the ALP. One will seek the seductive path to power by favor of capitalist opinion makers; the other will seek a new way to develop a genuine alternative foreign and domestic policy, expressing the growing desire for a radical change.

A deeper cause for the Liberal victory lies in a certain spread, among sections of the younger generation, of conformism and accommodation to the empty values of modern monopoly capitalist Australia.

This conformism, only partly offset by the growing youthful radicalism, challenges every ideological trend in the labor and democratic movement to present its concepts and proposals for the completely new direction for Australia, in social structure, national development and relations with Asia. The Communist Party has already released its views, in the documents for its Twenty-first Congress, proposing the path of working towards a coalition of all Australian left and democratic forces.
COMMUNIST PARTY OF AUSTRALIA
DOCUMENTS FOR DISCUSSION AT 21st NATIONAL CONGRESS JUNE, 1967

This pamphlet, free to members of the Communist Party and on public sale at 20 cents, attempts a basic analysis of modern Australian society and advances proposals to build the Communist Party and further the cause of socialism in Australia.

Available at 168 Day St., Sydney and all Communist Party offices.

THE JIMBERI TRACK
by Max Brown
Australasian Book Society, 186 pp., $2.75

The trouble began when the white boss threatened to shoot his two young Aboriginal assistants. Suddenly Tawala was shanghaied and Ralph found the police of ten towns after him.

A well written and fascinating book by the author of Australian Son and Wild Turkey.

THE VIETNAMESE NATION:
Contribution to a History
by Jean Chesneaux
English translation by Malcolm Salmon.
Current Book Distributors. Approximate price: $3.25. About 300 pp. Publication date: Jan., 1967

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 purpose of the English translation, which has been approved by the author.