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THE FOUR HORSEMEN OF THE APOCALYPSE have been let loose upon the Vietnamese people by American imperialism, pretenders to leadership of Christian civilisation.

To indescribable mass slaughter, in which civilian dead exceed soldiers by ten to one, are now added the gaunt spectres of famine and pestilence. Dreaded plague is reported among both Vietnamese and Americans; tuberculosis and venereal disease are spreading like wildfire. The Australian Broadcasting Commission’s *News from Asia* (March 12, 1967) reported that “South Vietnam’s economy is tottering on the edge of disaster.” Inflation is such that a kilo of low-grade rice, 10 piastres only six months ago now costs 28 piastres; rice reserves are down to 80,000 tons, due to late arrival of promised US rice shipments and to decreasing supplies from the Mekong Delta. This report did not mention the cumulative effects of the deliberate US policy of laying waste huge areas of arable land by a particularly vicious form of chemical warfare.

This orgy of death, American-inspired and American-executed, is to receive new impetus from the Guam meeting of the President and his pro-consuls in Vietnam, Westmoreland and Lodge.

Death, whether on purpose or by accident comes by remote, cold, impersonal and ruthless decisions of civilised politicians and brasshats, thousands of miles away. It comes through napalm and high-explosive delivered by B52’s from Guam and by Seventh Fleet. Character and cause of the accidents are better understood when one hears how a cluster of huts was deliberately napalmed by U.S. pilots in response to a casual request from a photographer for film of a napalm raid (as reported in the ABC TV session “People” on March 2). The monstrous US war is debasing many of the Americans who just ‘obey orders.’ How else can it be, when the war is an unjust aggression justified by foul racialism and pathological political lying?

GENOCIDE is the only word to describe such crimes against humanity. Every day that passes compounds the monstrous horror, not least the increasing overt callousness of the American
rulers and their Australian supporters who daily indulge in their shame-faced exercises of proving 'the end justifies the means.'

Mr. Fairhall, outstanding even in the Holt Cabinet of hawks (or is the Australian equivalent 'butcher birds'?), assumed more the shape of a vulture in justifying bombing of the North. He said . . .

Hanoi has been engaged in a high-powered campaign all over the world, mustering public opinion, with the aid of communist world forces, to try to produce an end to bombing; we are not fools; we understand that an end to bombing would be the finest kind of military victory for the communists . . (Hansard, p. 562).

Mr. Fairhall clearly implies that the distinguished men who advocate cessation of bombing—including U Thant and Pope Paul—are either fools, or dupes of Hanoi.

THE CREDIBILITY GAP is sometimes used to describe the position of the White House, in relation to world and American opinion. This jargon-term means that world opinion considers Johnson a miserable and deliberate liar, on small things as well as big. The lies and evasions are so numerous and contradictory, without even the saving guidance of a good memory, that America's few remaining allies are most confused of all.

The essence of the US war is revealed in the booklet *Children of Vietnam*, endorsed by the American Dr. Benjamin Spock, which shows the most horrifying pictures of child victims of napalm bombing, by its nature and purpose indiscriminate. No wonder Dr. Spock is moved to compare US acts with the nazi atrocities at Lidice and Guernica.

HORROR IS NOT WINNING the war, any more than nazi bombings could defeat the British. American casualties are growing every week, as they push aside Ky's puppet troops and try to destroy the National Liberation Front forces. Da Nang, oldest US base, is still subject to guerrilla attacks, which inflict heavy losses. The longer the war goes, the more frightful the American methods, the more the Vietnamese people are steeled in determination to fight on, the deeper goes the bitterness against the foreign forces which wage total war against a people fighting only for the rights of self-determination, freedom from aggression and peace. The longer the war goes, the more ridiculous as well as barbaric the Americans and their allies appear to world opinion, since the odds, so clearly weighted on their side, in numbers, technology and horror, though not courage, are still not bringing even victory, let alone glory.
OPPORTUNITIES FOR PEACE in Vietnam also expose the American policy-makers. While increasing US aggression in 1966, Johnson hypocritically spoke about 'unconditional negotiations.' Put to the test by the Democratic Republic of Vietnam, with the offer that talks could follow immediately upon an end to bombing and other aggressive acts against the North, Johnson hastily ordered resumption and extension of bombing, ordered artillery and naval bombardment of the DRV, and mined the river and irrigation systems so vital to agriculture and food supplies. He thus flew in the face of world public opinion, and slammed the door on a very positive approach by the Democratic Republic, endorsed by South Vietnam's National Liberation Front.

This criminal American rejection of an opportunity for peace talks presents before all opposed to or disturbed by the Vietnam war the opportunity and the responsibility to demand an immediate end to the bombings. This demand can be endorsed alike by pacifist and religious opinion, by all shades of political thought, as well as by committed opponents of the Vietnam war and those, like the Communists, who support the just struggle of the National Liberation Front and their compatriots in the North.

The peace initiatives from the Democratic Republic of Vietnam, and supported by the NLF, in no way depart from their determination to carry on the struggle for their just demands conceded at Geneva in 1954 and subsequently withdrawn by unilateral US action in breach of international laws and its own solemn pledge.

The exchange of letters between Johnson and Ho Chi Minh just now revealed serves to emphasise these facts, and the further US escalation shows that Johnson still pursues the illusory aim of enforcing a 'Pax Americana' in the whole area. While this aim remains, indications are for a longer, dirtier and bloodier war.

AUSTRALIA'S CONSCIENCE was recently represented by a few Australian seamen in Boonaroo and Jeparit, overwhelmingly supported by their union mates in stopwork meetings, and by many other unions and workers. Subject to violent press misrepresentation and abuse by Bury and other Government spokesmen, the seamen and their union stood firm. They were denied the support and protection of the Australian Council of Trade Unions leadership, which instead collaborated with the Government in what can only be interpreted as a hastily-planned provocation. While the ACTU leaders were able to sell their line that naval ratings should take the ships, and get all the other sea-going unions except the shipwrights to go along with this, if unwillingly, all
the honor and dignity remain with the seamen and shipwrights who upheld union principles and their conscience in face of weighted odds. There is reason for speculation that the shipments were also a try-out for an unworthy bargain to get lucrative contracts for Australian capitalists to supply the US aggression, but it seems clear that Government-ACTU collaboration was also designed to exert pressure on the Parliamentary Labor Party.

THE PRESSURE IS APPLIED first on the Vietnam policy, which constitutes such a danger to Holt's efforts to secure national unity in support of the dirty war, but it also has wider aims.

A serious dilemma confronts Mr. Whitlam, newly-elected parliamentary leader. He has far-reaching plans for sweeping changes, to begin in the sensitive area of foreign policy. However, there is a clear enough policy already laid down, which constitutionally cannot be changed except by the elected bodies charged with deciding policy.

Opening the foreign affairs debate on February 28, he correctly criticises bombing of the North, the barrier to negotiations and an affront to world opinion.

... The Australian Government... pours scorn on all those who protest against the bombing and who seek negotiations. Of all the peacemakers... Pope Paul alone has escaped the Government's anathema... Every day... more than 300 civilians and armed personnel, including Australian soldiers, are killed and thousands maimed... to quote Tacitus: "They make a desert and call is peace." (Hansard, p. 206)

Mr. Whitlam then advanced the thesis that the Australian Government is seeking only "to embroil America as much as possible militarily in Asia." Thus, he says, "far from helping the United States off the hook, the Government wants to embarrass it even further... Because of Australia's stand, the extremists can say to President Johnson: 'You can't leave Australia out on a limb by entering into negotiations'.” (Ibid, p. 207)

This flight of fancy, that Johnson is unwillingly continuing the bombing and stepping up aggression, is the height of absurdity. Mr. Whitlam has to say this, because he believes in the US alliance, only seeking to exercise "moderation." For this, it is necessary to believe, or pretend to believe, that Holt and Hasluck are playing the hawk to Johnson's dove. Mr. Whitlam is basically at one with the Government.

"The need for a strong and continuing American presence in this area is the common ground of all parties and all members of this House." The trouble is, by its slaughter of civilians "The world sees only the worst face of the United States. Thus the bombing seriously detracts from the constructive and beneficent role which the United States can, should and so often does, play in this region." (Ibid, p. 207)
VIETNAM POLICY is only first of a series of contentious issues in the struggle over policy within the ALP. There has been a widespread tendency to concentrate on personalities, perhaps because this is news according to the mass media and also this is the superficial estimate of how history is made. No doubt personalities do influence political struggles, perhaps particularly in the Labor Party; nevertheless personalities express policies and reflect trends and groupings. Thus, while Whitlam's victory in caucus was undoubtedly due to a combination of differing views, hopes and fears, it represented essentially a victory for the right.

THE RIGHTWING GROUP controlling the ALP machine in NSW certainly saw it this way. They believe the time is now ripe to launch an offensive against the left, and commenced the campaign by a return to the undignified witch-hunting against the peace movement which marked the early fifties. Whether or not Mr. Whitlam endorsed this small-minded intrigue, it is the seamy side of the over-careful effort to project the new image of progressive and vigorous new ideas and intellectualism. The NSW Executive majority, whatever else it may be—perhaps efficient in the numbers game, tough, even ruthless, and dedicated in its anti-communism—it is certainly rich neither in intellectuals nor interest in ideas, old or new. It is a fact of political life that the path to winning the non-industrial employee for the Labor Party lies first through winning active support of its growing radical strata; these are committed to peace action and especially repelled by bans on ideas and the McCarthyite tactics so typical of the majority threequarters of the NSW ALP executive. The ban will undoubtedly win the plaudits of the National Civic Council—there are strong Trades Hall rumors that it was worked out between two ALP notables and an NCC grouping in Sydney—but this is no way to unify the Party. Nor will the ban and its implications win any support from the militant industrial unions or active ALP members who take the socialist objective and radical policies seriously. And these make up the Party's main core of activists.

Whitlam's dilemma centres here, and his efforts to resolve it will prove much more difficult than securing a Caucus majority made up of a mixture of ideological rightwingers, politicians without ideology who were easily persuaded that Whitlam is Labor's only electoral hope by the manipulators of public opinion, and others who genuinely believe that a profiled image will restore electoral fortunes.
The new leader at least recognises the problem. He has adopted several radical postures; public enterprises in competition with some monopolies, nationalised stevedoring, and clear enunciation of the word socialism—even if followed by a very vague and pale explanation of it as meaning planning, slightly more public ownership and a moral attitude. He has impressively attacked certain social policies of the government, particularly the growing public scandals of health and education.

These are the positive side of the Whitlam position, and will certainly receive support from all opposed to monopoly capitalism, whether ALP members or not. However, they are far from enough to make a socialist or even a radical policy, since what is needed is a clearcut and integral policy which challenges monopoly and the government on every vital issue. Such a policy has an even more essential ingredient, the will and ability to bring people into action to fight for the policy, co-ordinating widespread mass actions with parliamentary opposition. We may never know whether Whitlam has the ability, since it seems he lacks the will, to a greater degree than any of his predecessors.

Indeed, one serious weakness of his position is a real ignorance of trade unionism, a lack of feeling for its traditions and, even worse, disdain for its demands and methods of action. This attitude to unionism carries with it the danger of a new intervention in union affairs, disruptive of unity and tending to strengthen the do-nothing blight of rightwing bureaucracy at the head of Australian unionism. This is all the more serious in that all employees, industrial and white collar, are feeling the pinch and their unions have united to claim a $7.30 increase in the basic wage. This substantial claim has no chance of being met by the Commission unless backed by rising pressure of industrial campaigning and action and the rightwing forces oppose and try to hinder this at every opportunity.

WHITLAM’S CONCEPTS OF FOREIGN POLICY remain the main obstacle to a radical challenging opposition to the Holt Government. This is not only because he identifies completely with Holt’s basic position, accepting a bi-partisan stance on what is becoming the decisive issue in Australian politics (and bi-partisan-ship here voluntarily abandons decisive ground for challenging the Government). The Vietnam war and the whole ‘defence policy’ is already eating its way into essential social expenditure. This is
seen most dramatically in the slashing cuts imposed in government finance for universities. While education has always been starved of necessary money, from primary to tertiary levels, this is the first time that there has been an outright cutback of such magnitude, enforced by the Holt Government. Comment referred to this last issue; the consequences are seen now to be even more extreme. These affect post-graduate research, teaching staff and, in NSW, preparations for the first year of the higher-trained science students under the Wyndham plan. As the Vietnam commitment grows, reduced spending will invade new fields on top of the already inadequate spending in vital areas of social necessity—education, health, housing, pensions and social services, and national development except for direct subsidies to a few favored home and overseas monopoly consortiums. Money for scientific research is now tighter than ever, as American grants are harder to obtain—because of the Vietnam war. Even in the United States, important research is cut because of Vietnam. If the US must slash its scientific research to pay for the Vietnam aggression, how much worse will Australia fare?

The Government is not altogether averse to making the cuts, thus using its financial control to warn and discipline the universities because of academic and student criticism of its Vietnam and other policies. It is an additional lever to reinforce secret police spying in the universities, amply evidenced in recent disclosures from all over Australia.

This organic connection of foreign policy with home demands is at the centre of the agonising reappraisal Whitlam is trying to force through. Over the Australian Labor Party looms the shadow of the British; Wilson in opposition was more radical than Whitlam, but in office he has been even more conservative than Macmillan. This arises from similar acceptance of a reactionary foreign policy, predicated upon the bi-partisan acceptance of a special relationship with the United States.

All the issues of the Labor Party's path will clarify in coming months. However unclear the reflection in the debates and struggles, or apparently remote the connection between manoeuvre and counter manoeuvre, the underlying issue will be the working class policies and methods of action needed in today's conditions.

THESE ARE PRECISELY THE ISSUES now being debated in the discussion leading up to the Communist Party's 21st Congress, to be held in June. This debate, vigorous and uninhibited, nevertheless is concerned openly and clearly with policy, almost entirely,
though not perhaps completely, free of side issues, personal or group considerations, and petty "politics." This places it on a considerably higher political and theoretical level, while not less interesting, than the Labor Party debates. Though the outcome in the ALP will influence Australian politics much more directly, the Communist Party's discussions introduce a new dimension into Australian political life both in the type of internal democracy in deciding policy, and the long-range effect of the decisions finally made by the coming Congress. These will be helped by study of some important political developments in Europe and Asia.

IMPORTANT GAINS FOR THE LEFT were made in elections in two important countries, France and India. Conditions differ greatly between these two nations, yet there are certain similarities. In both, complacent and apparently impregnable governments suffered big declines in popular support and received a crushing no-confidence verdict. In both, very diverse left forces combined in effective coalitions around immediate issues.

In India, where there is the only really serious internal split within a national Communist Party—and this is not caused by the Chinese attack on international unity, though undoubtedly influenced by it—the two Communist parties were still able to improve their position in the Lokh Sabha and to take part together in multi-party governments in Kerala and West Bengal. While the special conditions of Indian Communist divisions may make co-operation difficult, it is fervently to be hoped that this experience, and the burning needs of the Indian masses, will lead to new advances for the left.

The French elections resulted in a near-majority for the left. The Communist Party scored an outstanding success, gaining one million more votes and increasing its parliamentary representation by 75 per cent (to 73 seats). This increase was made with the Communist Party adhering strictly to its electoral agreement, and even making additional concessions by withdrawing some candidates, though they had led the left ticket in the first ballot. The Gaullists' majority of two is not enough to govern effectively. The new situation marks a dramatic change in rigid political patterns and presages a new advance for the left in a nation with a glorious revolutionary tradition playing a vital and even decisive role in contemporary Western Europe.
In today's "affluent society" the Australian worker gets a smaller share of the national wealth—exploitation has increased.

BECAUSE OF THE RISE in the standard of living of the working class in Australia during the last two decades, the view is widely held, and actively propagated, that with rising living standards exploitation is diminishing.

In popular usage, the term 'exploitation' has a variety of meanings ranging from extreme cruelty or inhumanity, arduous working conditions, sweat shops and grinding poverty, to declining living standards. It rests on subjective attitudes.

Bourgeois economic theory, insofar as it recognises exploitation at all, rests also on subjective attitudes. In orthodox marginal economic analysis, exploitation occurs when labor receives less than its marginal output.

The representatives of so-called welfare economics (founded by A. C. Pigou) define exploitation as a deviation of the actual division of the social income from what it would be in conditions of free competitive capitalism. Monopolistic exploitation is said to consist in the appropriation by monopoly capital of more than is its 'due' according to the norms of profit in free competition. According to this theory the workers may even 'exploit' the capitalists if they obtain more than their labor power is 'worth' according to the norms of free competition.

The marxist analysis places exploitation on an objective basis. Marx discovered the solution to the problem with which the classical bourgeois economist had been grappling: the problem of how to explain the origin and persistence of that value-difference between input and output upon which the economic development of society depends. (See e.g. The Economics of Welfare by A. C. Pigou, pp. 556-571, 813-814.)
By giving the concept of value as embodied labor a sociological content (of which Ricardo was only dimly aware) Marx found the secret of the wealth of the ruling class—surplus value. The concept of the value of labor power as being distinct (in magnitude) from the value which this labor power creates in the process of production, provided a basis for analysis of the main lines of development of the capitalist system as a whole.

The classical assumption that scientific analysis must start from the relations between men in production in the given historical conditions once applied to the working class, led Marx to elaborate the theory of the peculiarity of labor power as a commodity able to produce more commodities than its own upkeep and replacement requires.

This difference between what it creates and its own value provides the surplus, the difference between input and output, the total surplus value. (Examination of Marx's development of the concept of price of production, a modified form of value applying under conditions of developed capitalism, is beyond the scope of this article.) Exploitation is the appropriation of this difference by the class which owns the means of production and which by virtue of its position in society is able to impose the acceptance of this appropriation on the working class.

Exploitation with Marx is not a vague, subjective concept. It has a scientific meaning and the rate of exploitation can be measured. From this it follows that with the growth of technology the rate of exploitation will grow if (1) the standard of living of the working class remains static or (2) rises more slowly than the increase of production due to technological advance.

Historically Marx's economic theory had two opposite effects. It made a rapid and far-reaching impact on the working class movement. It provided the workers with a ready explanation of their status in society. The concept of exploitation in particular had an immediate mass appeal.

Bourgeois economic science on the other hand could not accept the political implications which flowed from Marx's economic analysis, and, unable to cope with problems on this ground, vacated it. In place of the study of relations between people, it made man's relation to goods the basis of its economic analysis. In so doing it restricted the whole scope of analysis. There was no longer any problem of exploitation, as this arises only out of relations between people, between classes. It was simply defined out of existence.

Economic problems were considered apart from production relations, apart from social conditions. Boehm-Bawerk for in-
stance begins his analysis with “a man sits by a spring of drinkable water” and goes on to give examples like “a traveller in the desert”, “a farmer cut off from the world”, “a colonist whose cabin is situated in a virgin forest”, etc.

Subjective approaches and theories took the place of an objective examination of economic processes in capitalist society... the introduction of a subjectivism... absolved economists from concerning themselves with a particular social order. Theorems which had been developed on a basis of equal individuals undertaking abstinence and toil and trouble could have nothing to say about the real differentiation of these individuals. But more often they were excellently suited for defending an existing reality far removed from the abstract assumptions. (A History of Economic Thought by Eric Roll, p. 373.)

This inevitably led bourgeois economic theory away from the large problems of economic life to the smaller problems. Attention was restricted to matters of detailed adjustment between smaller units of economic activity, individual firms, price phenomena, etc.

With Keynes came a significant change in bourgeois economics. The crisis of 1929-33 had shattered the complacent view that it was sufficient to have theories which would whitewash the capitalist system. It was no longer enough to ignore the defects in the system—it became necessary to prevent it from destruction.

Capitalism needed, and needs, economists who can devise practical methods to make the system work more efficiently. This forced a return to the real world and to the problems of macroeconomics (inter-relations of large aggregates: national income as a whole, consumption, investment, export and import, etc.). Problems of crises and unemployment could no longer be ignored. Practical needs, increased state intervention in the economy, the problems of economic growth (stimulated by the competition of the socialist world), the problem of the underdeveloped countries, the professionalisation of economic science—these are some of the forces which compelled bourgeois economics to a consideration of new problems.

This led to a significant development of bourgeois economics in certain fields. But it remains restricted because of the absence of a scientific framework; in fact, the need for such a framework is rejected by current bourgeois economic theory. Keynes states openly that he regards the social structure to be merely “a given factor” in the total situation (General Theory, p. 245). He deliberately ignores or plays down the economic and social significance of monopoly and oligopoly.

This inevitably confines Keynes’ field of application. He is not really concerned with a theoretical framework. He does not
want to explain what underlies the system, he wants to stop it from destroying itself. He and his followers have in fact developed a number of objectively valid techniques to enable the capitalist system (in the advanced countries) to reduce some of the most serious effects of its in-built contradictions. It is an attempt to use modern techniques to prolong the life of an outdated and over-ripe social system.

Bourgeois economics has not been able to provide an alternative theoretical framework to the one established by Marx. Neither has it been able, despite all efforts, to theoretically destroy this framework. Such marxist concepts as value, surplus value, exploitation, have retained their relevance to present day conditions.

Perhaps more serious for the development of marxist economic theory has been a doctrinaire interpretation of it. Attempts to defend every conclusion reached by Marx, rather than to treat marxist economics as a developing theory (as Lenin did) which is continuously enriched by the absorption of new data, including some positive achievements of bourgeois theories and techniques, by new generalisations flowing from changes in economic life—have a negative effect on development of marxist economic theory. This has led to a slowness to examine new phenomena, and to onesidedness in estimating them. There have also been tendencies to vulgarise marxist economic theories, to make exaggerated claims for their application which Marx himself did not make.

Nevertheless, marxist economic theory provides the only consistent framework to explain present economic realities in the current vogue of sweeping assertions, arbitrary selection of facts and even outright distortions.

**Exploitation in Australia**

A large part of the public case for the maintenance of the capitalist system in Australia rests on the claim that post-war developments have led to constant rise in the standard of living and that this will continue, leading to growing prosperity for all. It is claimed that there is a trend towards equalisation of income, that the old class differences are being steadily reduced, and that our system is able to provide a large and expanding measure of security of employment to the people.

Based on the spectacular growth of our economy in the post-war years—our industrial production today is more than 400% of pre-war—these claims have had a considerable public effect even in the labor movement itself, and unfortunately, they have not come under adequate challenge.
It is certainly true that there has been a rise in the absolute standard of living of the majority of the Australian people. It is expressed in a greater variety and increased quantity of consumer goods that go into most homes, as compared to pre-war. With modern technological development and rapid industrial growth many new types of consumer goods have come into general use (TV, long playing records, synthetic fibres, plastics, etc.), which were unknown a generation or two ago. There have also been improvements in housing. This must be coupled with the absence of widespread, mass unemployment which was the blight of a whole generation before the Second World War.

These developments which have made a big mark in the experience of most people are the basis for claims that the glaring inequalities of earlier capitalism are diminishing and the capitalist system is gradually solving the remaining problems of our day.

The truth is, however, that the class differential of income in Australia has actually increased in the post-war years, that income inequality has grown. But, because of the general rise in the standard of living this is not so obvious to many people. It is certainly not illuminated by the propaganda media.

In 1938-39 the total value of production* in the manufacturing industry was £203 million, of which the wage and salary earner received £107 million (52%) and the employers £96 million (48%). In 1963-64 the total value of production in manufacturing was £2,635 million, of which wages and salaries amounted to £1,326 million (50%). (References: Commonwealth Year Book.) In accordance with the practice of the Commonwealth Statistician no allowance has been made for depreciation in either case.

The crucial difference is that in 1938-39 the wages and salaries were shared by 565,000 workers, in 1963-64 by 1,172,000 workers, i.e., more than double. The number of employers has not increased likewise; in fact, the concentration at the top has grown. Comparable figures from census returns show that the number of employers in manufacturing industry was 19,144 in 1933 and 33,507 in 1961, a 75% increase. As a percentage of the workforce in manufacturing, employers have decreased as follows:

1933, 5.1%; 1961, 2.9%.

To all this should be added that the means of concealing profits have been perfected considerably since 1939. A favored method used these days is by means of capital gains which is tax free. The extensive use of expense accounts to provide an untaxed income is widely known, yet not recorded in statistics. It

* by ‘value of production’ is meant the new value added in the course of production after all costs of production except salaries and wages and depreciation are deducted.
finances expensive trips, entertainment (of varying kinds) and a multitude of other things.

Similarly, an analysis of Australian distribution of personal income and wealth in 1962-63 shows that the top 5% of all taxpayers receive 42.2% of all property incomes (profit, interest and rent), i.e., income not derived from employment. If expense accounts, capital gains and other means of concealing income and evading taxation are included it would certainly amount to over 50%.

Neither is the trend towards any levelling out. A comparison of the distribution of total taxable income shows that in 1944-45 the top 30% of taxpayers had 53.0% of all taxable incomes. In 1962-63 this was 52.4%. This minute decline really reveals an increase when the abovementioned increased perfection in concealing taxable income is taken into account. (Reference: 28th Report of the Commonwealth Commissioner of Taxation, pp. 23-25.)

The inescapable conclusion is that the Australian worker today, despite his higher real income, gets a smaller share of the total wealth of the nation—his exploitation has grown—he is relatively worse off. Today when moral issues are increasing in importance, economic problems are certainly not losing their significance. In fact, the growth of exploitation in our society is also a prime moral issue.

How much of the four-fold increase in industrial production and the doubling of productivity since the end of the war has gone to the working people? Australian official statistics generally ignore class divisions in our society. They do show however that personal consumer spending in the years from 1949 to 1965 has risen by twenty per cent. It is certainly not relatively higher than this for working people. This means that allowing for the growth in population, about eighty per cent of the extra wealth produced has gone to the wealthy employers.

It is one of the features of our political life that the labor movement has done nowhere near enough to bring home to the workers that even where they achieve gains these fall far short of what they ought to gain, of what society could or should provide for them.

Karl Marx’s observation on this matter remains valid in a period of rapidly rising productivity of labor:

A house may be large or small; as long as the surrounding houses are equally small it satisfies all social demands for a dwelling. But if a palace arises beside the little house, the little house shrinks into a hut. The little house shows now that its owner has only very slight or no demands to make, and however high it may shoot up in the course of civilisation, if the neigh-
If current Australian reality seems to throw some doubt on the truth this is a testimony for the effectiveness of the propaganda machine of the Australian wealthy, and on the lack of effective challenge. For there is little doubt that vast numbers feel 'uncomfortable, dissatisfied and cramped', even if they don't know the cause. Once people understand that they are 'being had', they will fight for their rights.

In addition to the absolute rise but relative decline for the majority, there are pockets of real poverty in our community. They cover a significant minority segment of our people. They too tend to get ignored within the framework of the intense propaganda drive about our 'affluent society'. That they continue to exist in an economy which has expanded to the degree ours has, puts a different complexion on our society from that which the ideologists of the establishment would have us believe.

Any serious consideration about trends in standards of living has to take account of the process whereby with changing technique the luxuries of yesterday become the necessities of today, where what appeared as frills a generation ago, is now part of the socially necessary standard of life. This process goes on, being accelerated by the faster growth of the productive forces and the consequent greater speed of change in the pattern of life.

It is this which makes the lag in public and social services—education, health, transport, etc., such a growing source of tension and discontent. The burden of their increasing inadequacy falls exclusively on the ordinary people. It continuously widens the gap between the 'small hut and the neighboring palace', between what society could provide and what it does provide, between growing aspirations increasingly widely shared and opportunities which remain restricted and unequally distributed.

Once we go beyond the surface appearances and the propaganda picture fed by the mass media, the economic picture of Australia reveals a highly socialised productive apparatus restricted and distorted by private property relations. Society pays an increasingly high price for keeping it this way.
THE DEVELOPMENT of the oral contraceptives has been a major scientific achievement which can become a significant step towards man’s mastery of nature.

While much is still unclear about the exact mode of action of oral contraceptives, as much is still unknown about basic reproductive physiology, the experience of their use by many millions of women over periods of up to a decade proves their almost complete efficiency, indicates that they can be used by most women without undue side effects, and that long-term use dangers remain only hypothetical.

The oral contraceptives resulted from deliberate research as shown in the following quotations from contributions to the "Symposium on the Long-term Effects of Progestational Steroids", held in New Jersey in May, 1964:

Due to an increasing awareness of world society of uncontrolled population growth and also to the recognition of the need for effective methods of birth spacing to protect the health of mothers and children, the search for harmless and low-priced contraceptives is gaining momentum.

In recent years there has been a tremendous upsurge in the study of reproductive physiology directed towards the control of ovulation.

Increasing awareness of world population growth has stimulated the development and study of many oral contraceptive agents.

There have been three main motives. Besides the social one of individual family planning and health, and the political motive of population control, particularly in the under-developed countries, there is the driving force of profit for the drug combines which are aware of huge potential markets for their production of oral contraceptives.

The symposium quoted from above was one of several held recently in USA and Britain, usually with help from the drug
firms. In the aggregate hundreds of workers in the various fields—biochemistry, physiology, pathology, clinical medicine, demography, social science and statistics, among others—have presented and discussed a great volume of materials on the relevant problems. In particular, the actual and potential effect of these preparations, both short and long term, have been given wide, searching scrutiny.

In Britain the Council for the Investigation of Fertility Control co-ordinates the study of the clinical effects of oral contraceptives; no such co-ordination exists in U.S.A., and the drug firms dominate the field.

Public awareness of possible dangers in the use of new drugs and the collective conscience of the large body of scientists in the many fields concerned, provide a sound basis for policing the safety of the oral contraceptives. Consequently the drug firms have to pay specially thorough attention to the safety as well as the efficacy of their products in this field.

Ovulation normally occurs in the course of changes in the ovaries which are regulated by hormones secreted by the pituitary gland situated in the base of the skull. These pituitary secretions are regulated by stimuli from the hypothalamus, a basal part of the brain. The hypothalamic centres are regulated mainly by the levels of the ovarian hormones circulating in the blood. It is this complex, delicately balanced system which controls the normal cycles of ovulation and menstruation, and, after fertilisation of the ovum, the other changes which lead to the development of the foetus, the birth of the baby and to lactation.

The contraceptive pill consists of a combination of an oestrogen and a progestin (synthetic analogues of the natural ovarian hormones), which act as contraceptives mainly, but not wholly, by preventing the growth and shedding of the egg cells of the ovaries. At the same time they produce cyclic changes in the lining membrane of the uterus which result in regular, artificial "menstruation".

The actual substances used and their amounts vary from one make of pill to another, but they are all synthetics, basically, and more or less closely related to the natural oestrogen and progestin (progesterone) of the ovary.

The pill became possible only after 1952 when progestins which were effective when taken by mouth were first synthesised. The natural substance, progesterone, besides being expensive to extract, can be used effectively only by injection.

The synthetic progestins are easily and relatively cheaply made and are active in quite small doses by mouth. The synthetic
Oestrogens are cheaply produced and are effective in quite minute
doses. From the large number of these artificial hormones that
have been prepared, only a few are used in the pill—those that
have survived rigorous biological assays in a variety of animals,
and are also most economic to produce.

The oral method of contraception has the very great advantage,
particularly for women, that as well as being quite reliable, the
individual acts of intercourse are freed from any separate manipu-
lations such as must be made in the chemical or mechanical
methods. This freedom is also a feature of the use of plastic
intra-uterine coils which are now becoming accepted as an effective,
cheap and relatively safe contraceptive method for women who
have already borne children.

Much attention, understandably, has been focussed on side-
effects and possible dangers of long-term "pill" taking. Study
of these in more or less large groups of women in many centres
provides information allowing for objective study and conclusions.
Of the side effects, nausea and various symptoms of ill-ease
affect a minority of women, usually only during the first few
cycles. Headache may occur and last for a longer period. A small
proportion of women put on weight, usually only a few pounds
and usually only during the first few months until a steady level is
reached. "Break-through" bleeding seldom calls for more than a
search for a make of pill more suited to the particular person.
Rarely, a reversible skin pigmentation may develop. Side-effects
account for a proportion of women rejecting the "pill", but it has
proved acceptable to the great majority of women offered it,
including women in the under-developed countries.

The artificial menstruation produced by the pill does not always
make its appearance, but, apart from possible anxiety that preg-
nancy may have occurred, no harm results. In fact, the question
arises as to whether any menstruation, natural or artificial, is
routinely necessary. This opens up the way to freeing women of
one of their specific disabilities.

Earlier fears that prolonged interference with ovulation by the
pill might lead to atrophy of the ovaries and thus produce sterility
have not materialised. The ovaries of pill takers, examined dur-
ing abdominal operations for example, have much the same ap-
ppearance as those of menopausal women. But they have not
atrophied as, within a short time (usually two to six weeks) of
stopping the pill, the ovaries resume their normal cyclical func-
tioning. Far from decreasing their fertility, it appears quite likely
that women who stop taking the pill are more likely to become
pregnant than others of similar ages. Whereas formerly it was
thought necessary to cease taking the pill at intervals in order to
restore normal ovarian and uterine functions, today there are some specialists who think such precautions are not needed.

Formerly there was widespread concern that the pill, through its oestrogen content, might prove cancer producing. Much carefully analysed data from many thousands of examinations shows no evidence of uterine cancer increase in pill takers, but rather the reverse. Breast cancer appears to be less in pill taking women than in others of comparable age groups. However, uterine fibroids (non malignant tumors) may increase in size if present in pill takers. Systematic study of various body systems and organs has so far shown no significant effects in normal women. In women with pre-existing liver disease there may be harmful effects.

In the course of intensive research following reports and much press publicity about the occurrence of venous thrombosis in pill takers, some small changes have been noted in some of the many complex processes that make up normal blood clotting. These changes are similar to those noted to occur in the course of normal pregnancy, and, as in pregnancy, their significance is not yet understood. Statistical analysis of the occurrence of thrombosis in pill takers and comparable groups of other women have shown no significant difference in rates.

While continued vigilance and research is necessary and will no doubt be practised, it appears unlikely that any serious long-term effects of oral contraceptives will be found. On the other hand, they have proved of great benefit to many women and to many families, facilitating marital relationships, allowing for family planning, decreasing abortion and its possible after-effects, and decreasing the many problems, economic, social and psychological, associated with unwanted children.

The oral contraceptives and the 'sequential' type therapeutic modifications are proving very useful in the management of hormonal upsets of the female reproductive system, notably in menstrual and menopausal disorders, thus saving many wombs and ovaries from surgical removal—a truly major advance.

Yet another result of the research in the field of fertility control was the discovery that the drug, chlomiphene, while acting to prevent fertility in rats, induced ovulation in women. Its clinical use is still being investigated, the main problem being how to limit its stimulating effect, as women hitherto infertile tend to produce multiple foetuses when treated.

In these days the principle of contraception has been accepted as morally sound by most people, particularly as it applies to married couples. Even the Roman Catholic hierarchy is having to accept the actual position of many, if not most, of its own fol-
lowers, and it has been said that the pill is proving more powerful than the pontiff.

Some people are concerned that if the pill were readily available its use would seriously increase promiscuity particularly among young people. Promiscuity implies irresponsibility but by no means are all extra and pre-marital sex relationships irresponsible. Today pre-marital sex relations are probably the rule rather than the exception and it is desirable, surely, that they should not result in unwanted pregnancies with their toll of emotional stress, abortion and unsatisfactory premature marriages.

Undoubtedly there would be, and even already are, sexual abuses to which the pill contributes. However, despite the commercialisation, distorted overemphasis and vulgarisation of sex to which they are subjected, young people today have, by and large, a far franker, more honest and informed attitude to sexual relations than had most people in preceding generations. Despite the increasing pressures of decadent capitalist culture, we can confidently expect this healthy trend to develop further, particularly as sex education in the schools and elsewhere is expanded, using specially trained teachers to conduct classes and discussions on sex, not as a separate subject, but as part of general human relationships.

Probably the major obstacle to the wider use of the pill is its high price—in Australia nearly two dollars a month. The prices are fixed by the big drug firms, mainly in USA, Britain and West Germany, that monopolise production and distribution. Here there is added the twenty-five per cent sales tax exacted by the Federal Government even when the pill is used primarily for therapeutic purposes. It should not carry sales tax and should be available as a pharmaceutical benefit.

The drug firms spend large sums on research in their own laboratories and in subsidising others in research. They take part in extensive field trials in many countries, including Mexico, Haiti, Puerto Rico, Pakistan, India, Ceylon, Taiwan and the United Arab Republic, whereby they hope to lay the basis for an enormous expansion of their markets.

All these costs are included in the prices which, being much the same for the various makes of pill, indicate cartel agreements similar to those of the oil companies. Certainly the elegant packaging and advertising, the salaries and expense accounts of the high pressure salesmen who do the rounds of the doctors’ rooms leaving generous sample supplies, all add to the price to the public. It is safe to assume that the actual cost of production of the pill is a relatively small fraction of the price charged.
Although the competition between the drug producers does not appear to lower the prices it may have some positive effect, for in striving to improve their particular brand so as to win a greater share of the market, advances do take place in composition and in dosage schedules which provide a variety of products from which the most suitable can be chosen for individual needs.

The special interest of the drug monopolies in the "over-populated, under-developed" countries fit in with capitalist hopes that birth control can play a major part in solving the economic and political problems in these countries so as to discourage movement towards non-capitalist solutions. Capitalism has no other solution to the population problem except for the 'hawks' who would use nuclear weapons to wipe out the 'surplus' people.

Population problems exist. On present trends the world's population will double in the next thirty-five to forty years, presenting enormous problems of food, shelter, education and occupation for the great majority of peoples. Hitherto, marxists have tended to discount the possibility of world over-population as a malthusian delusion, unreal in view of the unlimited production potential of advancing technology in a socialist-communist society. The production potential is certainly enormous; but for the major part of the world socialism does not yet exist, whereas the population problems grow at an increasingly rapid rate.

In the Soviet Union, as in most of the socialist world, no over-population problems exist and standards of living are rising rapidly with increasing overall production. This is not the position in many of the newly liberated countries, where overall production tends to fall behind population growth and standards tend to decline. In these countries measures to slow up population growth can help attain higher standards of living sooner, although they cannot solve the basic problems of economic and political organisation.

An interesting public discussion is proceeding in the Soviet Union between the protagonists of the theory that world over-population is a myth, and those who, like the demographer E. Arab-Ogly, call for a balanced attitude which recognises the need for "a scientific population policy, encouraging in some cases a growth of the birth rate, or promoting, in others, substantiated birth control which may serve as an auxiliary means for considerably enhancing social progress".

For those readers who may wish to look into the literature about oral contraceptives, and for those who may feel that some of the statements made are over-dogmatic or even premature, the following references are appended:  
A leading official of the Waterside Workers' Federation and a member of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Australia takes up some points in Doug White's article in a previous issue on the relationship of workers and intellectuals.

IT IS AS IMPORTANT for the socialist intelligentsia as it is for the socialist industrial workers to consider the main question posed by Doug White (ALR No. 1, 1967), namely, what are the respective relationships of the industrial worker and the intelligentsia to the socialist movement in Australia?

At the outset let me indicate my standpoint:

1. The industrial working-class has been, is and will for a long time to come remain the main base and most decisive force of the movement for a socialist Australia.

2. To succeed, that movement must include other democratic and progressive forces including significant sections of the intelligentsia—both those within and those outside the ranks of the working class.

3. The role of the socialist intelligentsia is a tremendously important one—it has supplied and will undoubtedly supply in the future, many of the leaders, theorists and activists of the socialist movement.

4. There is a welcome and important growth of progressive and democratic activity among many sections of the intelligentsia and increasing numbers are approaching or entering and thereby enriching the socialist movement.

5. There is a need to further examine the effects of the new industrial revolution on the work force and in particular on the industrial worker and intellectual sections of it. One effect appears to be a growing merger between the two.
6 In the strict sense, there is no such thing as a class of intelligentsia, nor is there a distinctive ideology of the intelligentsia as a whole.

It is good that socialists should continue to search, as Doug White is doing, for more effective ways of ensuring that socialist theory and practice accord with the ever-changing reality and needs.

This means rejecting dogmatic approaches and being prepared to re-examine basic concepts of socialist theory where there is objective evidence to suggest that they are no longer appropriate. In doing so, of course, a scientific approach is essential if error is to be avoided. From this point of view, the article under discussion presents conclusions for which it does not appear to present the justifications. The article states:

... that in the recent Federal elections the ALP vote declined in some industrial working-class districts, and

... that "many actively interested in politics" observed "a swing away from labor... in the factories and on the building jobs."

From this evidence, and without further argument, it then takes a magnificent leap to the following conclusions:

... there has been a "weakening of the old class consciousness of the industrial workers;"

... there has been "a corrosion of the old working-class ideology" and its "destruction is theoretically inevitable, and in practice is occurring;"

... "to build one's hopes for socialism on expectations of the industrial working-class acting according to some classical statement is... utopian..."

Doug White does not go so far as to suggest that the old working-class will play no part—at least I don't think he does! He concedes that it will play a part "even on the score of numbers." But he then discounts even this because "arguments based on the numbers of trade unionists have... little significance...!"

The electoral trends referred to must surely be considered as altogether insufficient to support the conclusions drawn. Since federation, Commonwealth elections have returned non-Labor Governments in the proportion of about 3 to 1. In many of these elections the Labor vote declined and there were undoubtedly reductions in Labor voters in some working-class districts. These facts alone were never regarded as establishing the destruction
of working-class ideology, or as calling for the abandonment of the industrial working-class as the main base of the socialist movement. Over that period the industrial workers grew in numbers, strengthened in organisation and matured in ideology.

Of his own analysis of the election results Doug White rightly says, “Of course these are trends only. The old industrial suburbs are still predominantly Labor-voting, the non-industrial and most new suburbs Liberal.” He agrees that “Voting trends may be of little significance, often being influenced by quite temporary factors...” If this was where the matter rested, it could be said that he has disposed of his own argument. But the matter does not end there. Doug White suggests that the electoral trend is significant in this case because “it supports what would be expected from a marxist analysis.”

He argues that the “leisure-time relationships” of the industrial workers “at present do not reinforce the ideology which could be expected to arise from work-relationships.” He refers to a “shift in emphasis from production to salesmanship” and a “growth of the mass media.” These are the main factors making the destruction of the “old class-consciousness” of the industrial workers “theoretically inevitable.” We are left with an impression that “leisure-time relationships” are now the main factor in the social being of the working-class and therefore the main determinant of its consciousness.

I suggest this is inconsistent with the essence of the marxist formulation quoted, namely, “social being determines consciousness.” Allowing that “social being” for the industrial worker includes more than the work relationships, does it, on a mass scale, include anything as significant? Are production relationships outweighed by leisure-time relationships? In other words, is class ideology in the long run determined not so much by production relations, but more by leisure-time relations and the mass media? It seems to me that this challenges the foundations of materialist philosophy.

What is distinctive about the leisure-time relationships of different classes which does not arise from the class positions themselves, and what is there distinctive in the leisure-time activity or relationships of the intelligentsia which fits them to lead the socialist movement other than in alliance with the industrial workers?

In the search for a better understanding of modern reality, for a theory and practice which agrees more with current objective needs, it is easy to be carried away by transient and occasional characteristics of our capitalist society or by changes in aspects of
the superstructure which may even be of a permanent character. Fundamentally, it is still capitalism with the same essential features from the marxian point of view.

Specific features of our society or national development there certainly are. Specific features of our socialist revolution there certainly will be. But care is necessary to avoid confusing these specific features with the fundamental and universal features of socialist revolution which include the leading role of the working class and its allies.

Similarly, there are specific features of socialism in other countries which may not be appropriate here. But the fundamental features of socialism—socialist ownership and production relations, and state power firmly in the hands of the people—cannot be excluded.

Doug White speaks of the "ideology of the intelligentsia," "the ideology of this class." In the strict sense, is the intelligentsia a class? Does it consist of a number of people having a common and distinctive relationship to the means of production? The term 'intelligentsia' is usually taken to mean "the educated" and I assume this to be the sense in which Doug White uses it—"a group where decisions are made on the basis of knowledge," "the highly and flexibly skilled person," "university trained workers."

These people stand in many different relationships with the means of production. Some would work as employees, even industrial workers; some would be self-employed and others would be capitalist employers of labor. They range over the whole social and political spectrum. If there has been a recent change in this "group" I would say it consists of those now being more of the whole in the ranks of the working-class and more of the rest gravitating towards the political position of the working-class.

One of the effects of the growing application of science and technology to industry is to change, not only the composition of the workforce as a whole, but also the composition of the industrial worker section of it. The factory floor begins to accommodate more engineers, planners, technicians and other people of higher skills who are there, nevertheless, as wage or salary earners. In other words, a higher proportion of the working-class—and a higher proportion of the industrial worker section of it, qualify for the description of "intelligentsia." But what, in the economic or political sense, do such people have in common with the highly-educated or highly-skilled monopoly capitalists.

... with all-round utilisation of science and technology, labor tends towards more complex functions requiring the higher qualifi-
cations of skilled workers, technicians, engineers, economists, organisers of production, researchers, etc."

"It is sometimes assumed, mistakenly in our view, that this trend contradicts the marxist thesis on the historical role of the working class. At the root of this misconception is the fairly widespread belief that the working class consists solely of manual workers. For Marx the engineers and technicians were part of the aggregate worker. And if under capitalism economic factors separate men with education from the bulk of the labor force, under socialism this is not the case. Researchers and technicians are an indivisible part of the working class, which, while growing in numbers, changes in character. Marxists, incidentally, point to analogous trends in the technologically developed capitalist countries as well (witness class differentiation among the intelligentsia)."


In suggesting the intelligentsia as the new leading class for the socialist movement Doug White alleges that it has already "as a group shown its opposition to the ruling class policies on more than one issue." (emphasis added)

It would undoubtedly be true that increasing numbers of the intelligentsia have associated themselves actively with progressive causes and have also found common cause with the politically conscious industrial workers on many issues. But it is also true that probably as many, or more, have been active in support of the capitalist establishment and its policy.

The significant thing, from the point of view of the socialist movement, is that there is a process of differentiation going on and that more of the intelligentsia are becoming active in progressive causes. There has been a remarkable development of organisation and industrial militancy among those increasing numbers who find themselves in the ranks of the working class and many among the rest have engaged in democratic political activity. The intellectuals who have already moved firmly to a socialist position can be the most effective force in winning other intellectuals to a similar position.

In the political process, from time to time, one section or class is more active than another, depending upon a variety of objective and subjective factors. But this is not a new concept, this is classical marxism.
DISCUSSION:

THE NATURE OF MARXISM

MR. CARR makes five main points of criticism:

1. He denies that marxists have been slow to analyse changes in post-war capitalism and that there has been "a certain stagnation in marxist thinking in the forties and fifties" as I had claimed, and goes on to say that "people who leave out of their calculation the subject of change can be discounted as marxists . . . (on them) argument would be wasted."

Unfortunately it is one thing to talk about the need to take changes into account and to recite the relevant law of dialectics; it is quite another thing to actually do this in analysing different aspects of social life. This is not so easy, even for marxists who try to take changes into account.

The facts are that during the first quarter of the present century, marxist economic theory was developed (by Lenin and others) in various new directions, taking into account the changes in economic life since Marx's analysis was made (e.g. Lenin's Imperialism), while bourgeois economic theory stood virtually still.

During the second quarter of the century, however, bourgeois economic theory has developed in various new ways (Keynes and others) whilst marxist economic theory has tended to stagnate.

Only in the last few years have there been any serious attempts by some marxist economists to try and analyse the new phenomena in economic life, which have developed particularly in the post-war years.

2. Mr. Carr's chief criticism is directed against my statement that marxists should "examine new phenomena free from dogma and pre-conceived ideas". This, Mr. Carr claims, is to demand that the "investigation is to be made with entire neglect of the marxian dialectical reasoning . . . is to use the metaphysical approach . . ."

This is a strange way of 'defending' marxism. Marx and Engels spent a lifetime struggling to establish a method of investigation which was free from dogma and pre-conceived ideas.

"Our teaching is not a dogma, but a guide to action, Marx and Engels always used to say."


They held that "the materialist standpoint means . . . to comprehend the real world—nature and history—just as it presents itself to anyone who approaches it free from any pre-conceived idealist fancies." Engels, Feuerbach. Chap. 4, emphasis added.

To be free from dogma and pre-conceived ideas is not to be "free from everything" as Mr. Carr claims. Quite the contrary. It is only when we are free from pre-conceived ideas and prejudices only by "conceiving nature just as it exists without any foreign admixture" can we make a correct scientific examination and draw valid conclusions. Such conclusions led Marx and Engels to a strong partisan position in favor of the working class. But this was—as it should be with us today—the result of an objective examination of the world "as it exists without any foreign admixture", i.e. free from dogma and pre-conceived ideas.
Evidently Mr. Carr is confusing partisanship and a firm commitment, which marxists embrace, with dogma and pre-conceived ideas which marxists reject.

3 Mr. Carr challenges the view that "Marx placed economics on scientific foundations and was characterized by a challenging attitude free from pre-conceived ideas and blinding class prejudices". He comments "As though Marx would waste his great intellect to make a science of bourgeois economics!"

The facts are that Marx did place economics on a scientific foundation. Without attempting to argue this here, this was certainly how Marx, Engels and Lenin viewed it.

"Classical political economy, before Marx, evolved in England, the most developed of the capitalist countries. Adam Smith and David Ricardo, by their investigations of the economic system, laid the foundations of the labor theory of value. Marx continued their work. He rigidly proved and consistently developed this theory."

(Engels, Three Sources and Three Component Parts of Marxism, emphasis added.)

Engels stated: "Classical economics had got into a blind alley. The man who found the way out of this blind alley was Karl Marx."

(Introduction to Wage, Labour and Capital.)

4 Mr. Carr states: "Mr. Taft is also in error when he says 'periodic crises occurred every eight to twelve years' ... He goes on, "Marx made no assumption regarding the appearance of crises every eight to twelve years. The fact that they appeared to repeat themselves in this way was purely an exterior fact, a matter of chance. Crises may repeat themselves every five, ten or twenty years in accordance with the formula presented by Marx in his three volumes of Capital and also presented by Engels in Anti-Duhring . . .""

In the very Anti-Duhring mentioned by Mr. Carr, Engels says the opposite. "And in fact, since 1825, when the first general crisis broke out, the whole industrial and commercial world, the production and exchange of all civilised peoples and their more or less barbarian dependent people have been dislocated practically once in every ten years."

(Engels' Anti-Duhring, part III, Section II, emphasis added.)

5 As for Mr. Carr's claim that "Marx . . . viewed capitalism as a class society absolutely incapable of providing anything for the solution of human problems," it is difficult to make out where Mr. Carr derived this view. Certainly not from Marx' writings. He surely must know that Marx and Engels had an entirely different view about the dynamic role that capitalism played in man's history.

It may be that Mr. Carr's view of "Capitalism, absolutely incapable of providing anything . . ." throws some light on his curiously negative attitude to day-to-day struggles whilst the capitalist system still exists.

He seems to suggest that the working class movement should not elaborate positive policies in the interests of the working people under capitalism, but should stand by and watch the system collapse so that the masses will wake up and revolt. If indeed this is what Mr. Carr has in mind, such a policy, despite his undoubtedly sincere intentions would condemn socialists to sterility, would isolate them from the people. It would provide the opponents of the working class with a first-rate weapon to prevent genuine socialists from making any headway towards our aim of establishing a socialist society.

B. TAFT.
WHAT IS A MARXIST APPROACH?

MR KEN CARR (ALR No. 1, 1967) puts heavy obligations on such as B. Taft who aspire to draw attention to changes in capitalist development. He requires them to strongly condemn, even to disqualify from the marxist fraternity, those economists deemed deficient in their observation of change and to refrain from wasteful argument with them.

Taft's proposal to "examine new phenomena, free from dogma and preconceived ideas" is firmly rejected. Instead the approach to a scientific task is to be partisan rather than objective; in the manner of Marx, according to Mr. Carr. The factor of change is to be given great weight in the calculations but should not appear in the conclusions. These impressions of Mr. Carr's arguments may not correspond with what he intended to convey, but several readings of his letter strengthen them.

His position is consistently absolute. It is an attitude that for all its invocation of "the marxist dialectic" recognises nothing of shades, stages or degrees.

B. Taft and Alf Watt, despite their differences on economic theory, are both consigned to outer darkness since both propose that contradictions within capitalism can be the grounds for valuable agitation and organisation that, in the event, probably will fall short of decisive social change.

Taft spoke of the gap between what capitalism could provide and what it does provide, Watt of a workers' policy to counteract the effects of capitalist instability and crisis.

Elsewhere in the Review in which Mr. Carr's letter appears, and again in the documents and preparatory discussion for the Communist Party Congress, proposals are made for a transitional policy to include such issues.

Your correspondent pursues his undeviating line into the international arena.

He would persuade the Soviet Union to issue an ultimatum to the United States on Vietnam: "Not a step further—or else!"

Altogether, it seems to me that an ultimatum fixing the two super powers in belligerent stances and then setting them on collision courses would be the worst possible method of helping Vietnam or world peace. If the Vietnamese ask for more help it would be best given unannounced.

The most valuable development would be for China to join with other countries of the socialist bloc in a declaration of joint support and assistance.

K. DONOVAN.

COUNTER-ESCALATION?

SOCIALISTS everywhere, and all friends of Vietnam, are profoundly moved by the savagery of the onslaught upon this small people by the barbarous forces of aggression, led by the US militarists and supported by the Australian Government. The extent and depth of the political opposition movement throughout the world bears witness to this.

But is enough being done? Does not socialist, and even ordinary human solidarity demand that in some way, more direct assistance be rendered to this small nation struggling so gallantly against fantastic odds to preserve its right to exist as an independent nation and to determine its own future free from foreign dictation?
Various proposals have been made ranging from the Cuban proposition for an international brigade, to demands that the socialist countries, and in particular the USSR, should 'counter-escalate' the war, to the point of direct military confrontation between the USA and Soviet armed forces in Vietnam. The latter view sponsored by Jean-Paul Sartre and others finds expression in the article by Ken Carr and the former in that of Nicholas Origlass (ALR Feb.-March 1967). Such views are widespread, both in west and east. In France hundreds of people and in the Soviet Union hundreds of thousands have volunteered to fight in Vietnam.

However, in the complex situation that prevails around Vietnam these simple solutions need critical scrutiny. There is, first of all, the position of the Vietnamese themselves. The writer can testify from personal participation in discussions with the leaders of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam that they firmly reject proposals for the entry of foreign units (Soviet or Chinese) into the combat. What they ask for and are receiving is the material and equipment that will give them some measure of military parity with the foreign invaders. The provision of food and small arms by the Chinese and of massive aerial defence by the Soviet Union is not in dispute. All the equipment that has been asked for has been supplied, including the most modern aircraft; the only limitation being the supply of trained personnel to fly them. What, then, is involved in further 'counter-escalation'? Does it mean pressure upon Vietnam to accept military forces from the Soviet Union or China? And would China, with its present violent anti-Soviet orientation, permit the transit of Soviet or other military forces across its territory? There are persistent and well authenticated reports of considerable Chinese obstruction to passage of equipment at present.

The only other means by which direct intervention could be carried out by the USSR would be by sea from Vladivostok to Haiphong, across oceans dominated by United States naval power. It is difficult to envisage any responsible military leadership committing large forces to such a project, with an unfriendly China holding all of the land supply routes, and the United States the sea routes of forces fighting thousands of miles from their home bases.

The political key to the problem is the basic question of unity of action amongst the socialist countries. The USSR, backed by most of the world socialist movement, has proposed time after time joint action by all of the forces supporting the people of Vietnam; and the Chinese leadership has sharply rebuffed all such proposals. The fact of the matter is that the Chinese leadership will not co-operate willingly in any project which includes the Soviet Union, and they justify their refusal on the grounds of alleged Soviet collusion with the USA, to betray the Vietnamese people, a view firmly rebutted by the Vietnamese leadership itself.

The Chinese leadership sees the conflict in Vietnam as a verification of their basic concept of direct struggle between the forces of imperialism on the one side and of national liberation on the other, from which the forces of national liberation must emerge victorious. Any intervention by European 'revisionist' forces on the side of national liberation is a contradiction of their basic political position.

While they continue to hold this view any talk of counter-escalation by the socialist forces can have only one meaning—unilateral action by the Soviet Union involving the threat, and should that fail the use, of nuclear armaments; a Soviet-US and most likely a world nuclear conflict.
Those whose thinking on ‘counter-escalation’ tends in this direction have, it seems, a one-sided, over-simplified view of the role of the Soviet Union in world politics. It is a fact that as the most developed industrial socialist power the Soviet Union has the responsibility, which it accepts, to give every form of assistance possible to peoples attempting to win their independence or to establish or safeguard a socialist regime.

As Castro said, the Soviet Union risked its very existence to guarantee the continuance of the socialist regime in Cuba. But the Soviet Union is also one of the two great nuclear powers, and the only significant socialist nuclear power. It has the heavy responsibility to play the leading part in ensuring that the provocation and aggression of imperialism do not force nuclear destruction upon the world. Is it entitled to engage in a nuclear confrontation with the USA in the existing circumstances, with all the terrible consequences that could ensue?

The alternative and, in fact, the only real policy is the continued and expanding supply by the socialist countries to Vietnam of the most modern and efficient means of defence, and simultaneously the ‘escalation’ of the efforts of the peace forces throughout the world to increase the isolation of the aggressors, and mobilise the growing sentiment of opposition to the dirty war. This ‘escalation’ too should not be thought of solely or even mainly in terms of more militant actions by small groups, valuable though these are, but activity aimed at changing the views of the large numbers misled by the official propaganda of prejudice and fear. This is the only form of ‘escalation’ that has any validity for Australia.

To substitute for our own efforts one-sided demands on the Soviet Union for military escalation is a form of adventurism whose consequences could well be not the salvation of the Vietnamese people but the extension of the present conflict into the disaster of world nuclear devastation.

BILL GOLLAN.

THE PIPES OF PAN

WRITE A BOOK in this country, or make a film, and someone is bound to review it. Create a musical instrument of comparable quality, and what happens? Dead silence. It’s not fair. It’s doubly unfair when the new instrument is as good as the new ‘Pan’ recorders.

These recorders have nothing to do with tape; they are the instruments that Hamlet called for; instruments of the flageolet family, played by thousands of children and adults today. Being considered a ‘school’ instrument, and often being badly played by children, the recorders are rather sniffed-at by many professional musicians. The ‘sniffy’ attitude is unjustifiable. There is as much difference between good and bad recorders (and recorder-players) as between good and bad violins (and violinists).

I do not claim that Mr. Pan of Melbourne—whom I visualise as wearing goat-skin plus-fours—is actually Stradivarius reborn. But I do claim that he has now produced recorders that are superior to most of the imported brands. So far I have seen soprano, descant, treble and tenor recorders of his making, and have actually played the soprano and the tenor.

All the new Pan recorders are beautifully shaped from a pinkish, fine-grained timber which I take to be a gum of some kind. The shape is more streamlined than usual, and very easy on the eye: a modernised-18th-century, not a Renaissance design.
The tone of the Pan tenor is extremely pleasing: full, broad and clear as the best of the English makes, with none of the effeminacy of the German tenor. We paired a Pan with a pre-war English tenor, one by Robert Goble, and found that balance was almost perfect over the whole two-octave range.

The sopranino survived comparisons that were still rigorous at the Armidale summer school of music held by the University of New England. In the actual recorder-class it balanced and blended admirably with really good English and German recorders, and with harpsichord. Outside the recorder-class, playing in groups of mixed instruments, it compelled the respect even of people who had previously inclined to be 'sniffy'.

One extremely critical moment occurs in Haydn's *March for the Prince of Wales* as arranged for small band by Rodney Hall. At the climax, while clarinets, horns and trumpets are shouting out the melody, the sopranino recorder enters on a high, sustained trill three octaves above middle C. The effect is perfectly simple, but perfectly electric! Crystal-clear, without being shrill or harsh, the little Pan rode the melodic wave like a surfer. Even the ranks of Tuscany—even the horns and the trumpet—could scarce forbear to cheer!

Given a sufficiency of such fine instruments, at the present very reasonable price, young Australians will have a decent chance to show that we are not an unmusical nation.

JOHN MANIFOLD.

ARTISTIC FREEDOM

DISCUSSION in your magazine has revealed an awareness of the significance of the best contemporary marxist thought about art. Leading lights in the formulation of this attitude have been the well-known critics John Berger and Ernst Fischer, who believe implicitly in the worth of art and instinctively distrust and condemn dogmatic formulae and bureaucratic unimaginitiveness. Here are some of the ideas put forward by them, that must form the basis of any discussion on art and marxism: that,

1 art can enrich each individual's experience, provide nourishment for the whole man, stimulate;
2 the withdrawal of artists and writers from society has made it easier for increasing quantities of barbaric trash to be unloaded on the public by the entertainment industry;
3 the content (significance rather than subject matter) of a work of art is more important than the form;
4 it is necessary for an artist to adopt the historical viewpoint of the working class, and accept a socialist state as a matter of principle;
5 the artist has a social responsibility to improve society.

It is the last of these points—coupled with the question of State domination of the artist's outlook—that I wish to discuss in further detail.

If the artist's role is to improve society, it goes without saying—or rather, should—that this improvement means change. Any advance heralded by artists, or new intellectual climate fermented by artists, or vision of society prophesied by artists, must mean a desire for a change in the status quo. Consequently, artists must be free to measure this change in terms that they understand—that is, in terms of art.

They must be free to make technical and aesthetic discoveries, advances or statements, such as are made in other spheres—town-planning, space research, biology, mathematics.
for instance. This does not necessarily mean that an artist abandons social realism, but it might well mean this. In such instances this new vision — new intellectual socialism it is called by non-artists — may be as optimistic about the socialist future as any conventional social realist.

In other words, a mathematician working with abstract formulae and an 'abstract' artist may be equally socialist in outlook although neither works with symbols nor produces final statements which can be automatically recognised and understood by everyone.

This is an unfortunate situation, perhaps. It is the legacy of inadequate educational facilities, planning and opportunities for the many, and the consequence of the specialisation of modern times. But sometimes, too, this lack of communication is a lack of trust on the part of the observer who dogmatically refuses to share in any experience which on the face of it appears to be outside his own immediate experience.

It is the responsibility of members of a socialist society to see that everyone has the opportunity to reach his educational capacity — not to see that intellectuals are forced to seek the lowest common denominator. This, of course, is as true of art as any other sphere of knowledge. And it is my belief that until marxists accept this important fact then there is little chance of artists, either as dissatisfied liberals or critical intellectuals, forming a part of the new base which is so obviously the need of socialism in this country, and towards which the ALR appears to be moving.

GRAHAM CANTIENI.

TALENT OR TREASON?

K.L.’S SUGGESTION (ALR No. 1, 1967) that Sinyavsky and Daniel were jailed because they had talent is fantastically inaccurate. Whether one agrees or disagrees with the criticisms of their sentence, one should at least have a due regard for the truth. And the truth is that they were jailed for collaborating with a force that would like to have reduced socialism to a heap of radioactive ashes before now, and would do so tomorrow if it could.

Sinyavsky and Daniel’s writings were smuggled out to a ‘Literary Institute’ in a Paris suburb, which handed them to Radio Liberty for broadcasting over its 16 stations. Radio Liberty, says the New York Times, is a CIA enterprise. The Literary Institute also handled the output of three Polish writers who stood trial at about the same time as Sinyavsky and Daniel. The Polish writings were handed to Radio Free Europe, another CIA enterprise, whose counter-revolutionary stuff is beamed to the socialist countries of Eastern Europe.

Two brothers, Giedroyc, run the Literary Institute. One of them held a high position under the notorious pre-war Polish Government of the colonels. The Polish press expressed the opinion that their outfit was backed by foreign intelligence, and the brothers Giedroyc themselves, in an interview with Time magazine, spoke of the “intricate network of couriers” operating between their Paris chateau and the socialist countries. They said they had been smuggling ‘explosive’ literature out of the socialist lands for 20 years, and had also been smuggling writers out.

Only a very naive person would believe that collaboration with such an outfit was an emanation of ‘talent’. But perhaps the revelations of CIA subsidies to various student bodies will lead K.L. to question his belief that all that glitters in the world of the intellectuals is golden.

ALF WATT.
MORE ON ART

WHILE WELCOMING and agreeing with a great amount in the article by Ralph Gibson, the points regarding criticism are dangerous ground. Until very recently much avant-garde art has been almost forced towards the "pessimism that becomes cynical and inhuman" by a surfeit of continued ill-informed criticism. This, unhappily, is one platform where communists and bourgeoisie have danced a too-long and energetic pas-de-deux. Passionate ideals cannot be expressed via glorified posters — the classical idiom can rarely interpret adequately the 20th century. The attacks on the great Picasso — from both sides — is sufficient witness. Here is an artist who has worked in many media, accepting the challenges and problems of each — and proving himself invincible. Combined with this, he has been for many years a committed communist. Yet, this was insufficient protection from myopic, bureaucratic, destructive criticism.

However, unlike correspondent K.L. I feel that circles in the Soviet Union have moved away, very far away, from the truly ludicrous positions of several decades ago with reference to artistic and literary matters. 'L'homme revolte' is now openly applauded — particularly by sections of the youth who are seeing the discrepancy between the ideals of communism and the unappetising bureaucratic hierarchy which had proliferated during the Stalin era. Certainly, we must regret the Pasternak affair — but not only the attitude within — the 'capital' greedily seized by outside reactionary cliques was definitely not in the best interests of either the author or literature. With reference to the poets mentioned I can only say that I have gathered, mainly from Esperanto journals, that these and others such as Yesenin are now widely read and enjoyed in the Soviet Union.

Experiment is necessary — to press ideas and media to the ultimate. All that is worthwhile in a trend will continue, constantly adapting to new conditions and influencing future trends. Those which become rigid will remain academic interests for posterity if they are worthy — forgotten if not. Artists themselves are usually their own severest critics!

It is because of the wider-context agreement between Ralph Gibson and myself that I feel able — and also view it as important — to comment on the few sentences which are disturbing to the artist.

Firstly, 'retreat from the world' is sometimes necessary for periods of not always predeterminable lengths — a form of reappraisal of subjective/objective positions. While being aware that this may not be necessary for the more effervescent extrovert beings, it is vital for the very people the party wishes most to attract. The section least likely to need 'retreat' of any kind most likely will be found as the devotees of the capitalist charade.

Secondly, the rather unsatisfactory vagueness in the remarks that some art has been of interest 'only to a small coterie'. As one who has at various periods explored many possibilities in the gamut between representation and complete abstraction, I would suggest that valid comments on life and problems can be made in all. Obviously, as humanity is composed of diverse degrees of understanding, the comprehension of very varied — and admittedly sometimes obscure — artistic statements must also vary. Originally, the appeal and understanding of Picasso, Cezanne, Van Gogh, Chagall and Klee were of interest to "a very small coterie".

Artistic comments at given periods, taken out of context, could also be labelled 'pessimistic'. Dalí's premonition of civil war, Chagall's gate of the cemetery, Tavoularis' new leader.
Miro’s *nightbird*, to mention but a few, all interpret aspects of the inarticulate apprehensions and distress which plague millions of people. But, to me, these are quite justifiable, ‘pessimistic’ comments. Cannot optimism, per se, *more* likely win acceptance for the world as it is? Both Goya and Matisse are needed.

No—not *more* criticism! A little more encouragement is overdue—especially towards those who have harm’d themselves professionally through their ‘unpopular’ views on serious matters. Let artists *not* be ‘skeletons in the cupboard’ about which leftist members feel they have to apologise. As artist and militant I have felt this attitude perhaps more keenly in Australia than elsewhere. Therefore, I feel extremely happy about all the newest developments, and at last am able to express views which I know are shared by many. That only gain will ensue from broad discussion I feel confident.

LEJEUNE.

UNION AMALGAMATIONS

ONE CAN AGREE with much that Arthur E. Wilson says (ALR No. 1, 1967) about re-organisation of the trade unions. Amalgamations of unions is not a new idea. Far-sighted unionists of the last century called for industrial unionism and it has been the aim of the Australian Council of Trade Unions for more than a quarter of a century.

Today, more and *more* people are being forced to think about it because of the growing monopolisation of industry and the great technological changes that have occurred and are yet to come.

Some amalgamations have already taken place such as the Boilermakers and Blacksmiths in the metal trades, the two Printing Trades Unions and an amalgamation of the Building Workers’ Industrial Union with the Painters’ and Plasterers’ Unions is proposed. These amalgamations are not to be seen as ends in themselves, but as steps towards the eventual formation of industrial unions.

It would be idealistic to think that the unions would agree on the instant to their dismemberment or dissolution so that industry unions could be formed. Obviously the process of forming such unions will be long drawn out. However, where the formation of an industry union becomes a practical possibility, craft unions will have to face up to releasing some members to the new union. In my opinion, there are many unions, including my own, which would not stand in the way of such development and would encourage their members to join the industry union.

The National Working Committee for the amalgamation of the BWIU and the Painters’ and Plasterers’ Unions has stated that: “Reasons why these Unions are willing to work for their amalgamation include:

“In this modern technical age, craft unionism is unable to adequately cope with the problems of defending and advancing the rights and interests of their members.

“With the development of automation, increasing mechanisation, new materials, methods and trends in the building industry, some old skills are going out and new skills are being developed. Lines of demarcation, once very clear-cut, are now becoming blurred. An amalgamated Union will be better able to cope with these new problems.

“With the increased productivity of the workers there has not been a relative increase in the size of the work force and again, an amalgamated Union would be better able to deal with this problem.
"To attain workers' just demands, their demands for full employment, for social and economic advancement—to defend and advance their interests, the unity of the workers is indispensable.

"With the formation of an amalgamated Union, campaigns in support of workers' needs and interests can be more effectively co-ordinated and developed. Such campaigns as, for example: safety in the building industry, long service leave for building workers, a 35-hour week, higher wages, etc., are more sure of success when the workers act in a firm, united way.

"With the formation of an amalgamated Union, much can be done to eliminate unnecessary duplication of work and equipment which is so wasteful. Union officials would organise among the workers and represent them without distinction. No longer would it be necessary for upwards of six union officials to turn up for a job that one could do. This would enable more attention to be paid to the enrolment of non-unionists and develop 100 per cent financial unionism. There are thousands of workers eligible to be enrolled in the Building Unions, thus adding to their strength. Most important of all, the amalgamation would unite the workers, irrespective of craft or calling, in support of their common demands."

The above quote is, in my opinion, based on the reality and current-day needs for the building unions and with modification could be applied to other industries.

FRANK PURSE.

WORKERS AND INTELLECTUALS

MR. WHITE, in his article (ALR No. 1), has rightly drawn attention to the very changed conditions of today and the need to re-think our attitudes. The struggle to destroy capitalism and replace it with a just social order will be a complicated and difficult one. We must welcome the new forces for social reform that are emerging and work to unite all the progressive forces in a powerful movement which can accomplish this momentous task.

But there are a number of aspects of the article with which I do not agree. One of these is his method of stating a fact and then making an assertion which does not follow from it. This makes a logical analysis difficult, so I shall take only a few points.

Mr. White says that an era begun in 1890 is at an end. He does not define the characteristics of this 'era' or indicate in what respect it is ended. Is he simply joining the chorus of anti-labor newspaper stories which tell us periodically that the days for a militant Labor Party are finished, or has his statement some deeper significance?

Then Mr. White declares that the election result discredits the 'old argument' that "the swinging vote can be won when the labor movement is united and actively and vigorously campaigning on a policy which constitutes a clear challenge to the Liberals". (Quoted from L. Aarons, Labor Movement at the Crossroads.) Does he really think the labor movement was united with their divisions and disunity a main feature of the anti-Labor press campaigns? Or that the labor movement fought vigorously for the left platform? Even if it had been campaigning in a united way, it could hardly expect to make basic changes in the attitude of the electorate overnight. As Mr. Aarons points out in the pamphlet quoted, it is necessary for the ALP to campaign boldly over a period for its platform. I think the election result is an argument for Mr. Aarons' assessment, not against it.
Another point in Mr. White's argument that workers are swinging away from labor is that the Liberal Reform group polled better in 'middle class electorates' than in 'more working class areas'. Does Mr. White regard the Liberal Reform group as part of the labor movement? The new left? While this group is progressive in its attitude to the war in Vietnam, it is still essentially anti-socialist. Perhaps in the anti-war struggle many of its members and supporters will come closer to the progressive forces and become involved in the wider struggle. But at present it only offers a limited opportunity for Government supporters to protest about one aspect of Government policy.

It seems to me that Mr. White tends to identify any opposition to any aspect of Government policy with a readiness to seek a changed social system.

I wish I could share Mr. White's rosy view of the intelligentsia 'as a group'. There are many recent examples of fine militant activity for salaries, conditions, for an increased say in control. But these are still minority trends. They will grow. Monopoly capitalism, by constantly expanding the sphere of wage and salary labor, brings growing numbers of intellectuals closer in status to the industrial workers. At the same time the scientific and technological revolution is bringing about very deep changes in the working class.

Many intellectuals will be brought into action on questions of educational opportunities, morals, culture, etc., and they will make a great contribution to the struggle. But to suggest that the ideology of these 'modern individualistic rebels' (Mr. White's term) is adequate for the powerful, self-conscious movement needed to wrest power from the strongly entrenched monopoly capitalists and to build a new society seems to be entirely unreal.

Mr. White to me underlines the unreality of his argument by quoting 'as typical of the viewpoints and actions of this social group' the anti-conscription hero, Bill White. I have the greatest admiration for the stand Bill White took, and feel diffident about taking it upon myself to discuss his beliefs, but the subject has been introduced.

Bill White is not a protagonist of social change. He has always accepted the decisions of his superior officers in the Department of Education. He is entirely uninterested in politics. He has no quarrel with our social system. He simply believes that it is wrong to kill, and therefore he personally will not be coerced into taking any part in killing. And this stand is very much in advance of that taken by most young teachers who have been conscripted.

Mr. White raises important points in his article, but it seems to me his exaggerations negate the value of some of his propositions.

JOYCE CLARKE

INDIVIDUALISM AND COLLECTIVE ACTION

IN HIS ARTICLE (ALR No 1, 1967) Doug White writes: "The issue of conscription and aggression against a small and freedom-seeking nation were primarily issues of individualism . . ." and raises the commendable stand of Bill White as sufficient proof that such individual actions are "... typical of the views of members of the social group which is now the government's main concern . . ."

Experience has shown conclusively how concerned a government can become when groups of people united in their purpose, upset or challenge the established order of things — e.g. demonstrations against Johnson; Mt. Isa strike; French elections, to mention a few recent events.
Would Doug White place the actions of seamen in refusing to transport bombs to Vietnam in his 'utopian' category? These seamen are industrial workers and as an ex-seaman I can also vouch for their working-class internationalism which is, of course, proven in their actions.

What is important is that working people as a whole whether industrial or white-collar, the rebellious individual or the organised unionist, must act in unison for the fulfilment of common aspirations—and foremost for a change in or defeat of government policies. This, I believe, will be of the greatest concern to the government.

D. Dawson

'EMERGENCY SITUATIONS' DISPUTED

IN HIS ARTICLE 'Socialism: Only One Party', Eric Aarons refers to 'emergency situations' as moments justifying the use of socialist-state coercion. To my mind, this opens Pandora's box.

Examples


2 Chinese People's Republic—present so-called cultural revolution and criticism directed at Chinese Party by Waldeck Rochet at French Communist Party Congress.

3 What a capitalist state does, does not justify coercion under a socialist state. The violations of socialist legality under Stalin and currently under Mao-Tse-Tung stand in stark contrast with the temporary measures adopted in the USSR during the Civil War and Intervention period under Lenin (1917-21). The argument that 'every state, capitalist or socialist' does such and such a thing by implication would justify the Holt Government applying the recent amendments to the Commonwealth Crimes Act to the Communist Party of Australia for its opposition to the war in Vietnam. The section 'Comment' at pp. 4 and 5 of ALR No. 4 justifiably points to this danger.

Where the author discusses the Popular Front in France (pp. 36-37) I feel he should have discussed the Popular Front years of 1945-47, the socialist-communist coalition following the liberation of France. It would have been useful to see a discussion of the successes and failures and the nature of the Popular Front at this time. He also fails to discuss the moves towards a broad coalition of the forces of the Left during 1966 and the agreement reached on a common platform and the agreement that socialists and communists will not oppose each other in selected areas in the 1967 elections. There is also the matter of the current theoretical discussions going on in the Socialist Party in France.

In connection with Italy, I would have liked to see a discussion of the Italian experience as that of one of the first countries to suffer fascism (putsch of 1922) the lessons of which were drawn by Gramsci and Togliatti. See an article by Lelio Bosso in the *Socialist Register*, 1966, written from a left-socialist viewpoint.

I do not believe the Finnish example is a good one because of this country's proximity to the USSR both geographically and from the viewpoint of working-class history.

MICHAEL H.
Woman  
Pyroxilene, private collection, Mexico.
TOP: For a Total Security for all Mexicans

BOTTOM: Cuauhtemoc Revived
ON RETURNING HOME to Mexico from Paris in 1922, Siqueiros took the road of public art, the art of vast walls and public places. It soon became apparent, however, that his revolutionary visions demanded dynamic rather than static sculptural solutions. He was attracted irresistibly to concepts of design fired by intense internal movement and energy, concepts which related him to the baroque stream within West European humanism.

IN SOME MURALS Siqueiros has used curved wallboard to do away with the division between ceiling and walls. This innovation enables him to fuse the two and carry the violent movement of his excessively foreshortened figures across both, giving him far greater play with pictorial space for fantastic effect.

All French concepts of the dominance of the surface or picture plane are violated by these products of the restless Mexican’s imagination.

His vast mural on the external west wall of the Rectory of the National University of Mexico (above) executed in mosaic with sculptural and polychromed elements was designed according to the artist himself “to be seen by motorists travelling at sixty miles an hour.”

Siqueiros has consistently proclaimed that modern art demands modern methods. The artist must be innovator and courageously expand the technology of art in an age when the industrial chemist has revolutionised the paint and building industries.
This year the seventieth birthday of the famous Mexican painter and revolutionary David Alfaro Siqueiros will be celebrated throughout the world.

Tom Morris, editor of the Canadian Communist youth journal SCAN, taped this interview with him last July.

Morris: What are your ideas about the mural?

Siqueiros: I am now working on three murals at the same time. The mural you saw in Cuernavaca, another in the Chapultepec Castle and one in the centre of the old section of the city. The mural in Cuernavaca shows the march of humanity, especially in Mexico and Latin America, the misery in our countries. In Chapultepec it is about patriots and the enemies of the motherland. It is the history of the Mexican Revolution from 1906 to 1913. This was the most bloody period of Mexico's fight. It was at the same time the period of the best direction of the Revolution, with anarchists, anarcho-syndicalists and communists leading the strike. Many Americans were with us. Americans who worked in the mines joined together with the Mexican workers and fought against the American and Mexican armies together when the Americans crossed the border to aid the dictatorship of Diaz.

Another thing is important: there are now sixteen young artists working with me in a collective effort from different parts of the world—from Israel, Paris and Italy. The Italian artist was nominated by the Italian communists who helped in a financial way.

The mural being painted in Cuernavaca is the largest mural ever painted. It covers more than 4,500 square metres.*

M: Will the theme of the mural The March of Humanity begin from early man?

S: It will begin from the primitive tribal life in Latin America up to the time of the first industrialisation. That is the first part of the mural. The second part is the real revolution that is

* It will take about 60,000 man-hours of work, use up about three tons of paint and 12,600 quarts of solvent.—Ed.
coming now — that is in the process now. This is divided into
two periods: from the beginning of the Mexican Revolution to the
present and then to the new social era of humanity.

It will be in the hotel Casino de la Selva in a room used for
conventions. There are sixty-four large panels each weighing
550 pounds, made from asbestos cement. We are working with
acrylics produced by ourselves. I began to paint with this new
modern medium in my workshop in New York in 1934. This
mural technically is following the process that we began in the
United States.

M: Are the young artists working with you learning this
process?
S: The young artists are helping in complementary things,
because one man must have the general direction. This is tremen­
dously different from easel painting. In easel painting each
painting has its own isolated problems. In mural painting all
the problems blend together and can be directed like an orchestra.

M: What are the main problems in a mural of this size?
S: They are optical problems. In easel painting, the viewer
is ‘static’. That means he looks at the work from the front and
doesn’t have to look from one side to the other. In mural paint­
ing this is impossible. The paintings you saw this morning in
Cuernavaca should be viewed from a distance of seventy yards.

M: And the ceiling?
S: You can imagine! The ceiling is more than 1,700 square
yards. It is tremendous!

M: What about the floor?
S: The floor will also be decorated. People will be able to
walk on it because of a new medium, a type of glass that needs
resurfacing each two years.

M: What groups of artists have influenced you most in your
lifetime?
S: Well, you know that I have painted in the United States. I
have painted murals in Mexico from 1922. Then in Argentina
and Chile. I’ve painted small murals in Cuba. I have painted in
many countries. That means the artists of each country have
helped me. Our Mexican movement of mural painting grew and
first went to the United States. Diego Rivera painted in the States*
as did many others.

* Rivera painted murals in San Francisco, Detroit and New York between 1930
and 1934. Those in New York were later destroyed because they were said
to contain communist ideas.—Ed.
There is something very important for the American artists and the American people to understand. The Mexican movement of mural painting is a tremendous revolution against the historical position of art in Europe and the United States. Because mural painting is a collective form, a social form of art and has disappeared from the last periods of renaissance to today. Today painting is only easel painting, to be placed on the walls of the rich apartments and homes. Little by little this social reality determined the form of art.

Mural painting as developed in Mexico for the first time in our era must be close to the human problems. We cannot go to abstraction like the abstractionist himself. The centre of our painting needs to be Man and the problems of Man.

M: Is this the reason that murals are painted on public buildings in Mexico?

S: For that reason! Do you know that most of the artists who started the mural painting in Mexico were soldiers in the revolutionary army? In my mural at Chapultepec is the story of the Revolution. I met most of the people painted there. In three months I will reach seventy years of age. I was an officer in that army as were most of the people in the mural. The Mexican movement of art is the only movement linked with the people. It is a revolutionary movement not only because its theme is revolutionary, but because it uses the walls—large murals—that is art of masses. These are not paintings that a rich man can take to his apartment to show only to his beautiful lady friends.

M: Are there a new group of Mexican mural painters growing?

S: There are many young artists, yes. In the last period for political reasons the Mexican government hasn’t helped mural production the way they helped before. And when they do help they force the artist to paint ‘dark’, subjective works. But, in my workshop at Cuernavaca we are going to bring the young people again to the murals; to explain directly with physical arguments that mural painting is in reality the most powerful form in art for the future of the world.

M: Do you find an interest developing in mural painting in other countries?

S: Very little. Under our influence it developed earlier in the States. But after the Roosevelt period the government stopped helping the mural. Many of the artists who worked with myself and with Rivera were forced to go to easel painting as their only means of livelihood.

M: How do you connect your work with your political ideas?
S: You know that I was an officer in the revolutionary army. Before that I was involved in the art students' strike in 1910 and 1913 and made my first connection with art and with political ideas. The art students' strike was a student strike with labor demands—not only demands for ourselves as artists, but demands for Mexico. We spoke for the first time about the nationalisation of railways. They laughed. This was in our program and many things of this kind. That means in reality my life in the revolution comes from the strike in 1910. That means in the period of the dictatorship of Diaz. And after, in 1913, in the period of the tremendous repression I escaped from the school of art, as did most of the students, to become soldiers and then officers in the revolutionary army of this time.

After, I was sent to Europe as Military Attache in 1919-20-21 where I met socialists and anarchists in Catalonia because I lived in Barcelona. There I helped the workers with money.

When we began the movement of painters in Mexico in 1922 we had ideas. Not complete ideas, mind you. In 1924 I joined the Communist Party. The Communist Party was founded in 1922 but was then only a small theoretical group. The first real newspaper of the Party was founded by the painters—*El Machette*. That means I have been a communist for 42 years.

M: Were you in Spain during the Civil War?

S: I was a brigade chief there. I was there during most of the war and commanded various brigades and a division. My brigade was the 74th Motorized Brigade, and we fought all over Spain.

M: Do you have any advice for young artists who are beginning?

S: My advice is this: If you stay in the land of easel painting little by little you are going to become ideologically and aesthetically a part of the bourgeois class. Your mind is going to be the mind in aesthetics of the bourgeois class, even if you have some political and human conscience. I think that you need to fight in the future for mural painting because it is the only form to socialise art, that means to produce art for everybody.

You know, when you paint for the rich, whether you wish it or not, little by little you will take the aesthetic road of the rich.

M: We would assume that all the possibilities exist in the socialist countries for a social form of art. Has mural painting caught on in these countries?

S: I can give you a copy of a letter I wrote to the Soviet artists seven years ago. I also pronounced my theme in Leningrad
in which I made a comradely criticism, not a negative criticism, but very strong. I asked why they have not developed mural painting.

To understand this problem it is not enough to be a communist. It is necessary to be a great artist. That is to say, their artists who started to paint large panels in my opinion, were not artists with a great emotion. They supposed the only problem was one of theme—that is to paint workers, or rich people, a beautiful lady or a peasant. That is not the problem, you know. The problem is one of style, of conception and monumentality. In painting we can apply dialectics like we do in politics.

When the Soviet revolution started most of the good artists were in Paris. They were interested in abstractionism and the Paris currents. The Soviet government was forced to put the academic artists to work. That was one reason. The other is this: any society, as deep and profound as is the socialist society, cannot create its aspiration of art in ten days. Culture is the cream of a society.

In the USSR it is coming. It isn’t possible to produce art by decree, by passing a law. Instead of painting bourgeois themes you paint working class themes and have a good painting—that is not enough, not enough. I want to say that not all socialist paintings are bad. No. There are very important and interesting works. My criticism is of the current altogether, the idea they have. That means their present opinions of what realism is. I think their artists have taken a very academic and rigid conception of what realism is.

Realism is not simply to reproduce something seen through the eyes. It is something more complicated than that. It is not only to take a model and to copy it. The first thing is to relate current realism with the tradition of realism, to be more realistic than were past realists. That means to discover the elements of a new realism that belongs to a new society.

There is also the problem of the connection between the man who commands a painting and the artist. A man can be a wonderful leader, member of the Soviet government; at the same time have a poor idea of art. And if he applies his ideas he will destroy the possibilities for art and the artist himself. In saying this I don’t want to suggest that formalists have the right to protest against the Soviet government because they don’t accept formalism. The art that is going to be in the USSR is not the ‘academics’ nor is it the formalism of today’s Europe. Both sides are bad. There will be a new development. This cannot appear in a few days. Look how the different styles and periods of art have been developed. The Italian renaissance took ten centuries to develop—
to arrive. At the beginning they copied the Roman painting and sculpture.

It is not possible to ask of a revolutionary artist to immediately find the forms. We need to fall down and walk and fall down and walk again. It is not a question of two, five or even forty years.

M: Why were you imprisoned?

S: I was in jail four years because I defended the line of my party, the Communist Party, and the Mexican political prisoners. I attacked the Mexican Government during a large meeting for these repressions. Also because I attacked the position of the Mexican Government concerning the Mexican revolution and its present policies in lectures at Caracas, Venezuela and Havana, Cuba.

When I returned they mounted a tremendous campaign and put me in jail. After, the Government was forced to apply a law which says that a man who has served his country could be freed. They condemned me to eight years in prison, but by this law we forced them to cut the sentence in half. Because I was an army officer and a well-known artist they could not deny me liberty. I want to make clear that this was a legal victory for us and not a concession they gave.

M: Did you paint in jail?

S: Yes, I painted many little paintings. I built my new studio in Cuernavaca with money earned from these paintings. Many were bought in Canada, the States and Europe. I painted two hundred small canvasses. These small paintings were at the same time studies for my mural.

M: While in jail did you hear about the activity of people for your release?

S: Oh yes! The activity of my party was tremendous. And the people of Mexico tremendous. All over the world, too. I visited Europe last year to thank the French and Italians. I haven’t visited the USSR, Germany and the USA because I must spend time working.

I received thousands of letters. The international movement in favour of my liberty and that of my comrades was one of the most tremendous movements that has been carried out. The Sacco and Vanzetti campaign was the same. But perhaps today due to the modern methods of communications we were able to involve even more people. It was incredible!
A waterside worker in Port Adelaide discusses the challenge posed by the imminent introduction of containerised shipping.

THE SHIPPING INDUSTRY of Australia in the next few years will experience changes greater in magnitude than any others in all the years since Captain Cook landed and the first settlement was established at Botany Bay in 1788. There will be a veritable technical revolution and it will come fairly quickly. New methods of cargo handling already in operation overseas will be adopted in Australia.

Containerisation means the packing of goods in large standard size metal containers. Many cargoes will be packed in containers at the factory and not opened until they reach the factory or store of their destination. It is estimated that 80% of all cargoes (including livestock) can be transported this way. Containers will measure 20' x 8' x 8' and carry about 20 tons. Some may be 40' long. On the waterfront ship's cranes or shore-based cranes will automatically hook and unhook both on shore and in the ship's hold. No men are required except to drive the crane. The ship's hold will be constructed something like a honeycomb. The containers will slide down into the cells where they will be fully secure.

It is believed that only 29 container vessels will be needed to lift 82% of all Australian imports and exports other than refrigerated cargoes. This ease of handling will also affect the amount of labor involved in road and rail transport.

No one will seriously consider hanging on to the old methods. It would be futile! At the most these changes could be delayed only for a time. The proposed changes and their social implications are so far-reaching that they demand serious thought and investigation.

In May 1966 the Commonwealth Government convened a Conference in Canberra of the various interests involved and concerned
with the technical changes. Shipowners, importers and exporters, harbor authorities, railways, road transport, government departments, trade unionists and others were represented.

The Conference divided up into groups for study of particular aspects and each group issued a report. The most significant report was given by Mr. W. R. Russell representing Shaw, Savill and Albion, who was Chairman of the shipping company group. His report, on behalf of shipowners, foreshadowed ideas and a point of view which calls for the closest analysis. Mr. Russell said:*

“The shipping companies as a group consider that the choice of number and location of terminals should be left to the container operators to determine.” He went on to indicate that Sydney and Melbourne (possibly Fremantle) would be terminal ports.

Although there were differing views as to methods of operating terminals there was unanimous agreement among shipping companies as a group that control (Mr. Russell’s emphasis) of operations throughout the container movement must be in the hands of the container operator and complete control must extend to container ship berths as well as to other facilities. Ownership of shore equipment by container operators should not be excluded. (Page 9.)

The overseas shipping companies who have now amalgamated to form two giant container groups, believe that they should determine which ports are to be terminal and which should be secondary or feeder ports. They suggest negotiations on this matter with port authorities. Other major Australian ports (other than Sydney and Melbourne) would be by-passed and regarded as feeder ports. While it is not a matter of looking at narrow State interests it is obvious that the economic consequences for the by-passed ports could be serious in lost harbor dues, etc.

In addition to this, a number of other consequences arise. Industry looking to overseas markets would tend to concentrate around the terminal ports and cargoes would tend to flow to the overseas port by the shortest route, i.e. in South Australia, Renmark fruits going straight to Melbourne. Mr. Russell, no doubt, had this in mind when he said:

The group thought . . . there was an urgent need for Australian State transport authorities to work out a uniform system of regulations that would allow the free movement of international containers both within states and across state borders. (Page 9.)

As a shipowner representative he wishes to see removed any State or Federal laws and regulations which might hinder the plans of the shipping companies. It may be argued that we should be satisfied to see Sydney and Melbourne developed first—other ports could follow later. There is some logic in this. Everything

* All quotations are from the report of the Containerisation Shipping Conference (May 1966), issued by the Department of Trade and Industry.
cannot be done at once. However, in this early period the lines of development are going to be firmly laid and if there is no real plan for the development of port facilities, if there is no time-table, we will find that the early lines of development will become consolidated and very hard to alter later. Therefore, the question arises, should South Australia and Queensland accept the status of “feeder ports” for their major ports simply because it may suit the interests of overseas shipping companies? Have these shipowners’ propositions been seriously examined by State and Federal Governments to see whether this is desirable? Are there other alternatives?

Another Side to our Independence

The trade union movement, particularly the Waterside Workers’ Federation and the Seamen’s Union, have waged a long campaign aimed at loosening the grip of overseas shipping companies on our trade. They have specifically called for the entry of the Australian National Line of ships into the overseas trade. Mr. McEwen has protested at the sale, piece by piece, of the Australian heritage, yet the proposals of the shipping companies, far from acknowledging Australia’s rights in this direction, would substantially strengthen their absolute stranglehold on our overseas trade.

On behalf of shipping companies, Mr. Russell lays claim to “control operations throughout the container movement”, and to “complete control” of container berths and other facilities. These facilities, berths, handling equipment and marshalling yards, are to be provided at taxpayers’ expense—no one has suggested otherwise. They are going to cost many millions. Should they be handed over to the “complete control” by way of ownership or lease, to a particular container company representing the big shipowners?

What will be the position of smaller independent shipping companies or ANL ships wishing to adopt the container technique? What berthing facilities will they have? What about the ships from the socialist countries which now lift quantities of wool and grain, or of ships from India and Pakistan which are not members of the Conference Shipping Lines? Are they to be squeezed out or put at a disadvantage by the two container companies’ “complete control” of the most modern port facilities? If this is allowed to happen we may well be placing serious obstacles in the way of trade development with a number of countries.

Voices for Independence

The Fremantle Port Authority was the only Port Authority to oppose these shipowner plans at the container conference. They are reported to have “strenuously opposed the policy of exclusive
control”. A note of independence was also struck at the conference by the spokesman of the shipper group, Mr. W. P. Nicholas. He repeatedly complained of the lack of information provided by shipowners. He said:

It would appear that in the case of some shipping company interests firm plans for the introduction of container services in one form or another have already been made. It would also appear that, so far, shipper interests have not been consulted on any of the details that vitally affect them. (Page 14.)

Shippers wish to independently evaluate what they are told and to see whether they cannot themselves suggest some better ways to attack mutual problems. (Page 16.)

“Special Privileges”

Mr. McEwen, in opening the Conference, did not repeat his plea for the protection of the Australian heritage or refer to the rather tentative steps taken towards an Australian Line of ships. He did say at the Conference, however:

We make it plain that in return for the special privileges that conferences will be offered, we expect them to perform so that the benefits of that system will be shared. (Page 6.)

Has the Federal Government already accepted the demands of the overseas shipping companies and granted them the “special privileges” which the demands for “complete control” indicate? Has the Australian Government assured the overseas shipping companies that they will not be embarrassed by the entry of ANL ships into the lucrative general cargo trade?

Extending Monopoly

The shipping companies also see themselves extending into the field of road transport. Mr. V. G. Swanson, Chairman of the Facilities Group, had this to say:

The role of road transport is also very much dependent upon the plans of the shipping operators, just as is that of the rail carriers. The short haul carriers will almost certainly be unable to continue their present pattern of operations without at least some changes. The fact that container operators are intending to offer at least door-to-door rates, if not actually door-to-door service, inevitably means some change. In some cases a container operator will engage in collection and distribution himself, and in other cases he will quote on a door-to-door basis, in which case the road carrier will function under contract to the container operator, and not to the shipper and consignee as at present. (Page 13.)

It is not without significance, therefore, that precisely at this time, the P. & O. Shipping Company has bought into the road transport firm of Mayne Nickless & Co. Ltd. Mr. Swanson says
the short haul carriers will have to change. Is this a polite way of saying that they will either be out of business or be absorbed? The picture is clear—a complete monopoly from door-to-door!

**Freight Rates**

Mr. McEwen expressed the Government's concern at the very high freight rates paid on imports and exports now costing something like $720 million a year, and that if there were not some dramatic increase in the rate of cargo handling this cost would increase by some hundreds of dollars in years ahead. "The Government," he said, "recognises its responsibility to encourage and further new methods which can reduce costs and further mutual prosperity." (page 6).

There is the hope, what is the substance? Mr. Russell was very coy on freight rates at the conference. He said:

All members of the shipping companies group were agreed that it is impossible to tell at this stage how the introduction of container or similar transportation methods will affect the present system of freight rates. (Page 9.)

In the past the approach of overseas shipping companies has been to charge freight on the principle of "what the traffic will bear", and if this same policy is maintained by shipping companies with the introduction of containerisation, savings to Australian traders may not be what they would like to see.

*What It Means for Workers*

Containerisation does away with manpower almost completely. Employment of waterside workers, tally clerks, foremen, shipwrights, transport workers, harbor workers, Customs clerks, watchmen, tugmen, ship repair workers, small businessmen, etc., will all be affected, some drastically.

Winning benefits from mechanisation in terms of higher wages, shorter hours, pension schemes, mechanisation funds, etc., is an urgent need, but the over-riding demand is for security. The struggle for the right to work and a shorter working week may well become the most important issues as the effects of mechanisation spread on the waterfront and in other industries.

Some progress has been made, particularly in negotiations conducted by the WWF, but socialism is needed to pass on the full benefits, guarantee job security and give the workers a voice in management.
Conclusion

It is clear that the overseas shipping companies hope to use technical change to strengthen the position of the overseas shipping companies in Australian trade. They will, at the same time, extend and streamline their monopoly organisation; streamline it by rolling numerous shipping lines into two giant container companies and extend it by seizing direct control of Australian port facilities and buying into Australian road transport.

How can we preserve our economic independence and political control of our own facilities and resources? How can we beat these plans of the big foreign shipowners? How can the workers benefit from this vast technical revolution?

1 There is an urgent need for Australian Governments to act and plan together to decide the needs of Australian trade, and with due regard to the international nature of trade, advise the overseas shipping companies what ports and what facilities will be available to handle container ships, and to make them available to the ships of all nations. Part of this planning should be the provision of alternative employment for waterfront workers made redundant.

2 Recognition by employers and the Government of the workers' right to work. This means no dismissal of workers unless and until alternative employment is found.

3 The nationalisation of the stevedoring industry with full participation of the trade unions in management and administration.

4 Control of all facilities to be firmly in the hands of various Port authorities.

5 Urgent steps to be taken to extend the existing Australian National Shipping Line to overseas service.

6 Any extension of the overseas shipping companies' monopoly into the field of road transport to be prevented by drafting anti-monopoly laws for this purpose.

To achieve such a program there needs to be appropriate co-operation among all people—government, trading, trade union and political—interested in maintaining and strengthening our economic and political independence.
Australian novelist Judah Waten tells the story of the Rev. Frank Hartley, the Melbourne Methodist clergyman who is one of the world’s foremost workers for peace.

IN THE MELBOURNE SUBURB of Prahran, in the heart of the Chapel Street shopping centre, wedged in between delicatessens and frock shops is the building which houses the Prahran Methodist Mission with its cafe, rest room and child-minding creche established to meet some of the needs of the underprivileged people of the district. For the last 13 years Rev. Frank Hartley has been the superintendent of this Mission which has grown to such an extent that it has now under its control and administration a 75 acre farm for boys, flats for elderly citizens who pay only one-fifth of their pension in rent, a meals-on-wheels scheme for aged unable to leave their homes, and many other social services.

Frank Hartley is personally involved in all the activities of the Mission. He is not only the superintendent, but he takes a full part in all its work, even cultivating vegetable plots on the farm, picking plums for jam and chopping wood to keep pensioners in free firewood during the winter. Every week he sees dozens of needy people, pensioners, deserted wives, boys convicted by the courts and for all of them he tries to do something. He is tireless; there would seem to be not enough hours in the day for him.

Yet all the time his mind is on the struggle for peace, the urgent need to bring the war to an end in Vietnam lest it should escalate into a far bigger conflagration engulfing mankind. He is thinking of new and wider peace activities in which, as always, he will take a personal part, even handing out leaflets and carrying posters in a street parade.

Rev. Frank Hartley is without doubt one of the foremost peace workers of the post-war epoch, his fame extending to most countries of the world, as testified by the Joliot-Curie gold medal for Peace which was awarded to him by the World Council for Peace in December, 1965.
At Frank Hartley's home in a suburban house in Malvern, in the lounge, on the walls of which hang his own water colors of Shaggy Ridge painted during the war in New Guinea, he spoke to me about himself, his past and present activities. He quickly revealed himself to be not only a dedicated worker for important causes, but also a homely man, essentially plebian and compassionate, concerned with individual human beings. He is the very opposite of the stereotyped stuffy clergyman of literature; his language is racy and he has an almost boyish sense of humor. There is a sincerity, an innocence about him that evokes an instant response. I did not wonder that standing as an independent for the Prahran Municipal Council last year, without any strong local organisation behind him, he came within two votes of being elected a councillor for a district which has long been represented by conservative-minded businessmen, topping the poll in the first count at every booth.

Frank Hartley is middle-aged, short and stocky, his hair is thinning and he wears glasses. Although he suffered a heart attack some years ago — he gives an account of his restoration to health in a Soviet hospital in his booklet, *Quest for Health*— he has not lost his youthful gay, confident expression and his eyes are unclouded.

He was born in Rutherglen, Victoria, in 1909. When he was an infant his parents settled in Wonthaggi, where he grew up. His father was a tailor by trade, but drove a winch when the first shaft was put down in the Wonthaggi coalfield and later returned to tailoring. Frank went to state school in Wonthaggi and then to technical school where he learned to paint. He has retained his love of painting to this day and in fact his booklet about his stay in a Soviet hospital is illustrated by his own water colors. While still at school he worked at night with his father as a presser and when he finished school his father set him up as a mercer in a shop next to the tailor's shop.
In those Wonthaggi days he often talked with the miners' leader, the late Idris Williams, a brave, cheerful communist who had lost a leg in France in the First World War. He had migrated from Wales and had quickly become deeply involved in the miners' struggles and in the social life of Wonthaggi. Like a true Welshman, he regularly led community singing and sang in the Methodist choir on Sunday. He was later to become the national president of the Miners' Federation.

Frank Hartley made his decision to enter the Church determined to help humanity and prepared to make sacrifices in this cause. He had lived 20 years in Wonthaggi when he went to the Otira Mission College to train for the Methodist ministry. Some time later he went to Queen's College, Melbourne University, from which he graduated Bachelor of Arts and Bachelor of Divinity.

In 1939 at Easter he married his wife, Marion, who was also to become famous for her work for peace. She was born in Glasgow of devout, working-class parents who came to Australia in 1912. At the age of 20 she had gone to India as a missioner, thinking that India was indeed 'a bright jewel in the crown of the Empire', believing in all the conventional tales about British Imperialism's 'civilising role among the heathens'. But she saw the terrible poverty of the Indian people, and she saw the British military and police in action against the Indian National movement led by Gandhi. She returned to Australia with new ideas, with a sympathy for the Indian people struggling to free themselves from colonial bondage.

Six months after she and Frank married, the Second World War broke out and Frank Hartley was among the first group of chaplains to join the Australian forces. He went to the Middle East and joined the Second 7th Australian Division Cavalry Regiment in Palestine, and after Pearl Harbor sailed for Sumatra but, with the fall of Singapore was diverted to Ceylon. Still with the same Division he went to New Guinea in 1942. He described that experience in his book, *Sanananda Interlude*, which he dedicated to the men who fell on the Sanananda road: "To those who in their death taught me the meaning of life".

From the age of 16 he became absorbed in the Methodist Church to which his parents devotedly adhered. "The issue before me was whether to become hard-hearted and go for success which meant wealth, or to follow a life of hardship but service for humanity. This struggle went on inside me for six months".

This was at the time when the coal miners in Wonthaggi were fighting for fundamental trade union rights and for a living wage and there were frequent strikes lasting as long as six weeks. "I
was very moved by the capacity of the miners and their wives to make sacrifices for what they believed in, by their suffering in the cause of a principle and I recalled this during the war in New Guinea when we were cut off and did not expect to get out”.

That road earned the name of ‘The Track of Dead Men’s Bones’.

“The horror and reality of war burnt itself into my brain,” Frank Hartley wrote in Sanananda Interlude. During the Christmas of 1942 on that terrible track he and several others dedicated themselves to work for peace if they survived, which was certainly a matter of doubt then. For out of the 420 men he was with, only 47 walked out, the rest being dead or wounded. Frank Hartley was mentioned in despatches for his service in that battle, and Captain A. H. McCulloch wrote that his “selfless devotion to duty made him a hero in the eyes of the troops in New Guinea”.

True to his vow, as soon as the war ended, his quest for peace began. It was during a deputation in 1949 to the Lord Mayor of Melbourne, protesting against the denial of the hall for a democratic citizens' meeting that he met Rev. Alf Dickie and together with him and several other clergymen took part in the formation of the Victorian Peace Council. At different times he has held the offices of president and secretary and in November, 1950, he was elected a member of the World Peace Council. In 1951 he went abroad for the first time to attend the second meeting of the World Council of Peace in Vienna. There he was invited by the Soviet Peace Committee to visit the Soviet Union. On that visit he preached three times in the Baptist Church in Moscow.

In that same year, in 1951, he became President of the Democratic Rights Council and he took a prominent part in the Referendum campaign that defeated Menzies’ attempt to suppress the Communist Party. He was convinced that this proposed measure would hinder the struggle for peace and he personally took a letter to Canberra to give to Prime Minister Menzies.

Later when the Australian and New Zealand Congress for International Co-operation and Disarmament was formed he became one of its executive officers. His prestige had grown enormously, not least in the churches all over Australia. When he left for the extraordinary meeting of the World Peace Council in Stockholm he had with him a letter from the President of his own Church introducing him to church leaders all over the world.

Throughout Europe he met with many church leaders and he noted the great changes that had come about in the climate of opinion in the churches, an increased readiness to co-operate with communists and all men of goodwill, regardless of religious and
political opinions, in an effort to prevent the outbreak of a new world war.

He is one of those clergymen who have been responsible for this change; today his belief in the desirability of co-operation with communists, non-believers and people of all religious denominations finds its confirmation in Pope John's famous encyclical, which he regards as a revolutionary document, and in the views of such Anglican thinkers as the Bishop of Woolwich.

For more than 14 years he had preached this doctrine on the Yarra Bank as well as in his church. Moves were made in the church to muzzle him and he once offered to resign but the Methodist Conference supported him, only three delegates voting against him. More than once he has met attempts to silence him, but he has resolutely fought for his beliefs and in the end has won through. To Frank Hartley, the Churches, in being prepared to work with the people's movements of the day in solving social questions and maintaining peace, are being true to the actual teachings of Christ and are assuring the future of Christianity. "In the modern world if the Church relies on institutions and dogma it will die", he said.

When we had finished our talk I had afternoon tea with Frank and Marion, and met two of their children. They have three sons and one daughter. Their youngest son, Wesley, is in the church in Western Australia and Frank told proudly of how he had recently founded a peace group in Perth.

Frank Hartley is filled with confidence in the youth. Mankind will ultimately banish all wars and bloodshed; the youth will have made a substantial contribution towards that great end.

In the words of the poet C. Day Lewis, for Frank Hartley

"... there is no dismay
Though ills enough impend ...
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A private research student on New Guinea details how Australia is failing in its Trust obligation to develop education in the Territory.

AUSTRALIA, under Article 8 of the New Guinea Trusteeship Agreement, which it has signed, is committed to the development of education in New Guinea. The record suggests, however, that Australia so far has fallen short of its Trust obligations in this field. This is so, even conceding that educating the New Guineans poses many complexities and difficulties.

After more than 50 years of neglect, the Education Ordinance 1952 gave a basis for real advancement in this field. Amended in 1963, it provided for:

1. The establishment by the Administrator of schools, pre-school and other educational institutions and facilities
2. Compulsory registration, recognition or exemption of all schools conducted by educational agencies other than the Administration
3. The making of grants by the Administration to missions and other educational agencies
4. The conduct of schools by native authorities subject to the approval of the Director of Education
5. The declaration of compulsory attendance of children at schools in specified areas
6. The determination of language or languages of instruction to be used in schools

Provision was made for an Advisory Board and district education committees, to advise the Administration at top and district levels.
The broad objectives of the educational policy were stated to include: the political, economic, social and educational advancement of the peoples of the Territory; a blending of the cultures, and the voluntary acceptance of Christianity in the absence of any indigenous body of religious faith founded on teaching and ritual. The measure of volition in the latter may be assessed from the fact that the overwhelming majority attend mission schools.

There are two types of primary schools, T. and A. schools. The former follows a syllabus specially designed for Territory pupils and the second follows the primary syllabus of NSW. It is claimed that the T. schools reach a standard comparable with the A. schools. The problem of the pupils in absorbing knowledge is greatly accentuated by the fact that all instruction is given in English—to them a foreign language.

The attendance in primary schools (South Pacific Post 10.6.66), was given at 65,000 in Administration schools and 147,000 in mission schools, a total of 212,000 or 46.3 per cent of children of school age. Mr. Ralph, Chief of Division, Primary Education in New Guinea, claimed this to be "a remarkable achievement by any standards." It is only remarkable taking into consideration the attitude of the Department of Territories and the paucity of funds for education.

Despite Mr. Ralph's laudatory remarks the evidence to date shows that the New Guinea people have not been "sold" on education. The World Bank Report contains a graph which they call the Education Pyramid of Primary School Pupils 1963. The base is the preparatory school pupils 45,064 strong and the apex is the VI standard with 4,975 pupils. The "drop out" in the Administrations schools (calculated from World Bank Report table, page 291) is about 50 per cent, and in the mission schools it is approximately 95 per cent.

The former Minister for Territories, Mr. Hasluck, in a plan he brought down in 1962, sought to have 67 per cent of the children of school age attending school by 1967, and to his credit he organised vigorously to achieve this target.

He was replaced at the end of 1963 by the present holder of the office, Mr. C. E. Barnes. In his first budget, the social service grant (education, health, welfare), which was expanding rapidly, was cut. A statement was issued indicating that any areas desiring schools would have to provide the buildings and equipment, and the Administration would then allocate teachers.
Apparently this decision is based on the *World Bank Report* which stated that the primary schools program was out of balance with the pace of development in other sectors. Then suggesting that the indigenes be induced to provide their own schools, they delivered themselves of this remarkable statement: "If the indigenes are not prepared to construct and maintain a primary school, which is an essential without which they can have little hope of progress, the prospects of fitting or persuading them to assume other responsibilities of a modern society are dim."

Most other observers would have reasoned that the provision of schools was the first and basic requirement to widen their outlook to the point where other responsibilities came within their purview.

Partly arising from the disastrous 'drop out' and partly arising from the hostility of the 'planter lobby' who oppose the education of the New Guineans, the secondary schools were trailing behind the primary schools. Steps were taken in 1964-65 to correct this and there has been a rapid rise in enrolments. In 1963 there were 3,800 students in secondary schools and in 1966 this rose to 8,591. This is far from a satisfactory state of affairs, and will continue until it is realised that education in New Guinea has to be approached from a different angle.

When the Europeans settled in New Guinea 80 years ago this was the first contact with the outside world. Each village was an entity of its own and trading was insignificant. In the Euro-Asian-African continents, the introduction of domestic animals and a wide variety of grains and plants provided the basis of the first great division of society from which trade and development arose. The absence of these factors was the reason why New Guinea lagged behind these countries.

The basic essential for New Guinea is the introduction of commercial agriculture and animal husbandry. But this is useless unless the New Guinean knows what it is all about. He must be introduced to new plants and animals, modern methods of agriculture, and the preparation of the products for market. This means education, as a rapid change over from the present society cannot be made, unless the majority knows what it is all about. Further, when the New Guinean sees the value of education in gaining mastery over the means of production there will no longer be the present 'drop out'.

Education on the cheap is not paying off in the Territory. South Australia which has a comparable school attendance spent
$25 million in 1962-63. The 1964-65 figures given by the Department for Territories for New Guinea was $12.4 million. The special conditions in the Territory require this ratio to be reversed.

In 1963 a Commission on Higher Education in Papua and New Guinea was established under the distinguished leadership of Sir George Currie. This Commission, after a wide examination of education in the Territory, brought down a comprehensive report recommending a university at Port Moresby to be functioning by 1966. The report was delivered to the Minister, Mr. Barnes, on March 26, 1964. The Minister showed his appreciation by delaying its tabling in parliament to August and then left its establishment in the air. Only widespread protest caused him to make a decision in March 1965. One valuable year was lost. Further, no funds were earmarked for the construction of the buildings, the cost of which had to compete with other capital works in the education vote.

The university opened a preliminary course in 1966 and the first courses will start in 1967. The students, about 80, are temporarily housed in the showground buildings, the Administration College and the Medical School. The Minister states that the first university buildings will be available in 1969.

Apart from a few classes teaching English little is done for the education of adults. The urgency of this is underlined by the importance of making the New Guineans aware of the trends in agriculture, an essential condition for the development of the economy. While it is true that much of this knowledge can be made available over the radio network, the radio should also be used to develop the incentive to achieve literacy in the written word.

It is vital for the success of adult education that it be made available in the mother tongue or, as Dr. Wurm, Professorial Fellow in Linguistics at the Australian National University advises, in a tongue close to their own. Once literacy is gained there would be a general desire to learn English, as English is the language of commerce and communication and therefore will be accepted on that basis.

The problems of education in a social background other than one's own can be observed from a press interview given by Mr. N. Donnison, Senior Lecturer in Education at Balmain Teachers' College and a teacher with long experience in New Guinea. He said: "I have seen native head-masters and teachers. They are quite adequate to hold the fort but that is all."
He goes on to point out that this arises from their social background.

This means that the New Guinean has to learn as an adult all the knowledge that is gained by Europeans by association with their form of society from childhood to maturity. It is this lack of background that makes the New Guinean unsure of himself in our society and the failure of the education system to take this into account is indeed a serious underestimation of the task.

This problem would be greatly lessened if the early primary instruction was given in the vernacular or an associated language with English as a second language. This would tend towards a blending of the cultures giving the student a deeper understanding of the language which is the focal point of the culture.

The key to development of New Guinea is the knowledge and understanding of modern commercial agriculture by the New Guineans. This is an asset which requires education to release it. In modern society large capital expenditure must be made to develop assets. So it is essential that the Government recognises education as a capital cost to New Guinea, and invests large sums to develop this asset.

Pleas of "where is the money to be found?" are hardly convincing. The social priorities in Australia itself are pushed in the wrong direction by capitalist values, as the crisis in education in Australia itself shows.

The vast and growing expenditure on a disastrously wrong Vietnam policy compounds this problem, as well as arousing grave misgivings in New Guinea and elsewhere in South East Asia about the real motives and intentions of the Australian establishment.

SMALL BOUQUETS

COMMENDATION for those responsible for the publication of such an excellent left review.

Jim Cocks, Canada.

Thank you very much for sending your valuable journal, Australian Left Review. This is a great help in our work, furnishing a lot of information to increase our knowledge about Australia.

Julio R. Enriquez, Havana, Cuba.

The Queensland State Committee of the Communist Party yesterday unanimously resolved to congratulate all associated with the production of ALR on the high quality and reader-interest of the publication.

It was felt that the Review is destined to play a most important part in developing unity and understanding among the progressive forces in Australia.

E. A. Bacon, Secretary.

"The Vietnamese Nation", the very title of Professor Chesneaux's work is an affirmation of historical truth and at the same time a denial of the current politically inspired fiction of "North and South Vietnam" as two, alien, distinct and hostile nations, separated by long tradition and mutual dislike.

In the first six chapters Prof. Chesneaux covers the history of Vietnam from the prehistoric, through the period of Chinese colonisation and rule, to the wars of liberation against China, and the expansion of the now independent kingdom into the southern part of the country, which was then sparsely inhabited by two different peoples, the Chams and the Cambodians. Until the French intrusion and conquest in the second half of the 19th century Vietnam had been a single kingdom since the expulsion of the Chinese in the early tenth century A.D. It is of course true that this kingdom was not so coherently organised as a modern state—any more than France herself, or England either, were in the Middle Ages. From 1558 A.D. the southern part of Vietnam was put under a very powerful viceroy, ruling from Hue. It was he and his successors, who made their post hereditary, who largely carried out the March to the South, the process part military, part infiltration, which expelled the Chams and the small Cambodian population of the Mekong Delta and settled this region with Vietnamese.

French Colonial policy was aimed at the old plan of "Divide and Rule". The extreme southern part of Vietnam was now called Cochin China, and annexed as a colony. Then came the middle region, the "waist" of the country, left under the nominal rule of the Vietnamese Emperor, actually closely controlled by French Residents. Tonkin, the northern province, and the old centre of Vietnamese royal power was first detached under a "viceroy" who was then soon displaced by a French Resident Superieur. But Tonkin was never formally separated from the nominal rule of the Emperor in Hue. Thus, by any conceivable line of division, there has never been until 1954 a "North" and "South" Vietnam. There has always been, as in every other large area, a distinctive character both in climate and in local patterns of settlement, between one region and another.

In his chapters on the French occupation, and on the war of independence against France
after the conclusion of the Second World War, Professor Chesneaux shows with a wealth of factual cited evidence that the attempt to sustain the policy of artificial divisions in the country was the real obstacle to pacification under the colonial regime and the failure to secure an agreed settlement after the Second World War. It is as clear to any reader of the daily news at the present time that this determination to prevent the reunion of the country is still the major obstacle to peace. If the history of Vietnam is any guide it also clearly shows that although superior military power, as was exercised by the French in the 19th century or by the Americans today, can for a while force the country apart, the influences making for unity, race, language, culture and national tradition, are so strong that a new movement to achieve reunion will arise the moment the foreign occupier relaxes his grip whether from outside pressures, or reluctance to continue the thankless task.

Professor Chesneaux writes from the point of view of a marxist, and in consequence also demonstrates (with a great profusion of quotations from mainly non-communist observers) the degree to which the former monarchy and the French colonial rule equally, if in different ways, exploited the peasantry and stunted the economic growth of the country. The old Monarchy, patterned on that of China, exercised power in very similar ways; it was an essentially landlord-bureaucratic state, a term which non-communists will prefer to the ambiguous "feudal" which can mean very different things in different ages and countries. Professor Chesneaux himself (page 21) says that the term feudal cannot be applied to Far Eastern societies in the narrow sense in which it is used in the history of Western Europe. This being so, a historian may be forgiven, perhaps, for suggesting that it would be better not to use it at all for societies where the institutions of West European feudalism did not exist.

There remains a very important question, still unanswered for Vietnam as for China itself. Why was it that these advanced and civilised countries remained technologically backward from the sixteenth century onward; why did they not make the same break through to new forms of production and also of government and social organisation, as Europe achieved in these three centuries? Many possible answers, or combinations of these answers, have been put forward: the current, too popular one, that it was due to the intrusion of foreign imperialism, is not adequate. The serious incursions of western power did not affect either the economy or the state power of the Far Eastern empires until the second half of the 19th century, and were only made
possible by the fact that Europe had got ahead in the race, and the Far Eastern nations had lagged.

Nor is it really evident that the nature of the old Far Eastern monarchies was in itself a sufficient cause of this retardation. It is clear enough that in the latter part of the period it was a strong residual handicap, but the Western nations, to a date as late as the end of the 18th century had also been under (with the exception of England) the authority of absolute monarchs and their aristocratic Courts, a system more closed to outside talent than those of China or Vietnam. It is rather in further research into the origins of Western capitalism, and the reasons why this form of production did not make the same progress in the east—reasons one may suspect to be more geographic and economic than political—that the real explanation may be found.

There are few points of criticism which can be made of this clear and objective history of the Vietnamese nation. Peking was not the capital of China until the 13th century A.D. In T'ang and earlier times the capital was at Ch'angan or Loyang. The book has been updated by a final chapter written in 1962. Unfortunately much that has happened since then has modified the optimism with which Professor Chesneaux could then look to the future. It would be very desirable that in further editions, of which it is to be hoped there will be many, this last chapter could be brought down to the period of full-scale American involvement.

C. P. FitzGerald


WHAT TYPE of Communist Party? What relations with other parties? What policies in the present situation?

Such questions, now being discussed in the preparations for the coming Congress of the Communist Party of Australia, were being keenly debated in the days of the October Revolution.

The often fierce ideological struggle around them between 'Lefts' and 'Rights' (and all the trends between!) forms the major part of E. H. Carr's history of The Bolshevik Revolution.

It is at once impressive evidence of the status of the USSR in today's world and of the continuing, nay still growing, interest in the circumstances of its founding, that the Penguin publishers have issued three volumes of Carr's monumental work on the eve of the 50th anniversary of the revolution.

One never ceases to marvel and thrill at the epic story, here re-told, of how a handful of Marxists, on the collapse of
Russia’s bourgeois government, led the working class to power; pulled together the 200-odd diverse ‘nationalities’—ranging in condition from barbarism to capitalism—overcame incredible difficulties, political, military and economic, to consolidate the world’s first socialist state; and laid the foundations for catching up with the advanced capitalist states in, expressed historically, a few years.

The writer of this history spent two decades at the British Foreign Office, was assistant editor of the *London Times*, has occupied several top-ranking academic posts, and has ‘neither a marxist nor a Russian background’.

The period covered, 1917-1923, is subjected to deep analysis from various standpoints by this trained scholar—the preparations for the Revolution, the structure of the Party and the State, relations with the former Czarist colonies; the impact of the Revolution, during the periods of ‘war communism’ and the New Economic Policy on agriculture, industry, the labor movement, trade and distribution, finance, and foreign policy. The whole work is thoroughly documented.

How significant, then, the extent to which this non-marxist debunks so many of the treasured ‘theories’ of anti-communist propagandists, still prevalent, on the nature of communism, and, specifically, its application to Russian conditions! This is the picture as established beyond doubt by Carr’s many-sided research and acknowledged by him—the October Revolution came, not as some arbitrary ‘creation’ of the Bolsheviks, but as the consequence of the collapse of the Czarist regime and the incapacity of the Russian bourgeoisie to consolidate a bourgeois regime...

The Bolsheviks set out to make a *peaceful* revolution, through democratic institutions, with a *gradual* change in social relations, but the treachery of the bourgeoisie prevented it, making armed insurrection inescapable, but even then the take-over itself was ‘almost bloodless’ and took place with majority support...

The ‘blood’ came as a direct consequence of the counter-revolution, backed by military intervention, economic blockade and sabotage by the major and many minor capitalist States. The ‘Iron Curtain’ was a product not of communist policy but external capitalist actions...

‘One party’ rule was not a Bolshevik ‘principle’ but a product of circumstances, and for many years Soviet Republics were non-Bolshevik in composition, some former Czarist colonies became completely independent, and, indeed, bourgeois States, accepted and recognised by the central Soviet State.

But there are lessons here, too, for communists as well as non-communists, for the main lines of the Soviet State’s development were determined in a
continuing ideological struggle between reformist, anarchist, syndicalist trends and marxism, and a battle within marxist circles against opportunists, who 'emptied marxism of any immediate revolutionary content', and sectarian, doctrinaire, dogmatic approaches, which would have doomed the Revolution to defeat.

This ideological conflict is traced in meticulous detail by Carr, within his own selected 'framework', namely, that marxists, including the Bolsheviks, based their strategy on the concept of a simultaneous revolution in the advanced countries as being essential and when that did not occur expediency took over completely in Russia and the Bolsheviks became 'capitalists' in practice.

So says Carr, plagued by the allegedly 'fatal' dilemma of the Bolsheviks in having to build socialism in one, backward country. But then he is a non-marxist, who regards communism as utopian anyhow, and really does not accept the dialectical law of development (if he even understands it).

Lenin summed it up in a statement quoted by him: "a transformation must, by historical necessity, take place along a certain broad line, that private ownership of the means of production had been condemned by history, that it would break, that the exploiters would inevitably be expropriated. This was established with scientific exactitude. We knew it . . .

"But the forms of the transformation and the rapidity of the development of the concrete reorganisation we could not know. Only collective experience, only the experience of millions, can give decisive indications in this respect."

Carr established in his outline of the conflicts of 1917-23 the pre-eminence of Lenin on whom he lavished praise as a genius of theory and practice, as a dedicated constructive revolutionary . . . 'perhaps the greatest of all time'.

He reveals the errors of Trotsky, on such questions as coming to terms with the capitalist States and policies regarding the peasantry, even if he does appear to lean a good deal towards him and provides evidence sufficient to raise the question of reassessment in some respects.

Exposed, too, are the seeds of subsequent Stalinist excesses (the book was first published in 1950), but also of its tremendous achievements, leaving an even stronger feeling of the need for reassessment by present-day communists.

The conclusive 'arguments' in many instances are provided by life itself. The seemingly insuperable difficulties were overcome. The Soviet State was consolidated; peace was made with the capitalist States and relations normalised with them; the State soon to become the leader on such vital issues as world disarmament.
Socialism was built in one country, in 'catching up with the other States with a rapidity of which they have not yet dreamed,' because whatever concessions were made to capitalism the 'commanding heights' (Lenin) were held by the Bolsheviks. And the foundations were laid for communism, material and spiritual.

The way it was all done impinges upon many issues still 'alive' in the world communist movement . . .

How far to 'defend' a capitalist State, the concept of 'permanent revolution', peaceful co-existence in its relationship to world socialist development, national independence and the proletarian revolution, trade in capitalist markets, capitalist investments, in socialist countries, the United Front, the role of the trade unions, relationships between CPSU and other communist parties, in the capitalist and socialist worlds.

Particularly, there is the current problem of China, with its peasant 'base', its initially weak industrial movement, the 'Long March' tradition of its Party, its colonial background . . . and now its pre-occupation with 'commune' development, 'Great Leaps' to bridge big gulfs, and maintenance of revolutionary fervor.

Has China's leadership failed to draw the correct conclusions from the ideological struggles of the Bolsheviks and their outcome? Does it stand, in fact, with the vanquished Russian 'Lefts' in, for instance, its striving for the communist 'principle' even if it means 'sharing scarcity'? As to its main charge against the Soviet leaders, if they are revisionists, Carr's book established that it is a deviation which dates not from the 60's or 50's but the 20's . . . indeed, back to the Communist Manifesto itself.

But another thought intrudes: the Bolsheviks were early confronted with the problem of what to do about territories that had been claimed both by the Czarist Empire and other imperialists, including those then making China their happy hunting ground, and determined the issues on the interests of socialist development, inevitably identified with the interests of socialist consolidation in Russia. But there were then perhaps sown the seeds of friction that grew and were not automatically extinguished by the overthrow of feudalism and/or capitalism in those territories . . .

For, as emphasised in Lenin's statement, quoted by Carr, "national and state differences between peoples and countries . . . will remain very, very long after the realisation of the dictatorship of the proletariat on a world scale." Have the Soviet leaders always taken this fully into account in their dealings with other States? Difficulties flowing from it can only be settled on the basis of mutual trust between Socialist States.
and a dialectical approach with as the starting point the consolidation and further development of socialism throughout the world.

In setting out to learn the lessons of the October Revolution, as laid bare in this intriguing work, there is a continued emphasis by Carr that is thought-provoking . . . the influence of the specifically Russian conditions and world conditions of 1917-23 upon the character of the Party (the Czarist regime made a conspiratorial, even small party inevitable), upon the nature of the Soviet State and its policies (with a working class that literally had 'nothing to lose but its chains' and dependent for its survival upon a backward peasantry) and even perhaps upon the very type of socialism it developed as the first socialist State in a hostile capitalist world.

How to distinguish between what is fundamental in the marxist position and what is subject to modification in given — and changing circumstances. Such was the key problem confronting the Bolsheviks, and that is the problem confronting the communists of Australia in applying marxism to the conditions in our country at this time.

How far to go, if at all, in changing party constitution and practice on such questions as disagreements, discipline, etc.?

How assess the Australian Labor Party, its positive and negative aspects, and its future?

How proceed, if at all, towards the building of a ‘coalition of the Left’?

What policies here and now to further the cause of socialism in Australia?

These are among the questions to be asked, and in answering which the developments in Russia in 1917-1923—and afterwards—have so much to offer . . . as long as the correct approach is made, and the big lesson grasped that there are really no 'short cuts'. Even Lenin underestimated the time it would take to achieve communism, even in the Soviet Union.

EDGAR ROSS.


FROM early childhood, Jessie Lillingston (later, Street) rebelled against the restrictions imposed by her sex. About the age of ten, she says, she pledged herself to the effect that she would never allow her sex “to interfere with anything I wanted to do, and in the future to exert all my efforts to remove discriminations against women and to gain for them equal status, rights and opportunity”.

This pledge was, and doubtless still is, the driving inspiration of her life, and, as with many others who set forth to remedy a deep social injustice, it involved her in numerous fundamental socio-political issues.

Economic and social status allowed Jessie Street a university education frequent and extensive travel and time
and means to immerse herself in public affairs.

Endowed with an honest, inquisitive and empirical mind, a stubborn will, inexhaustible energy and an impregnable confidence in her capacity to cope with and overcome obstacles in her crusading path, such a woman would be outstanding whatever her background.

All these advantages gave her access to organisations and political circles far removed from her feminist-socialist bent, and allowed friendships with politicians, trade unionists, diplomats, women’s leaders, of right, left and centre.

Her life, as she retails it up till 1945-46, falls roughly into four periods of development and activity. First, enterprising girlhood, initiation into the struggle for women’s rights at Sydney University, marriage and the rearing of a family, and ever-increasing involvement in the feminist movement including involvement with the British suffragettes.

The economic depression of the thirties “turned me towards socialism”; a visit to the Soviet Union brought her full face to accept it.

In 1938 Jessie Street took her daughter on a world tour. Letters of introduction from the German Ambassador to Australia, “an enthusiastic nazi”, opened doors, during a stay in Germany, to nazi officials and institutions. The near-chattel status of German women shocked her, the “idolatory of war” sickened her.

Shortly after, with “a sense of excitement at the prospect of visiting this country which was shrouded in mystery”, she was en route to the Soviet Union in fulfillment of a promise made to the Sydney Society for Cultural Relations with the USSR.

First sights to delight her feminist eyes were women train conductors, and engine drivers, bricklayers and carpenters. Here she found a society that both affirmed equality of the sexes and was genuinely striving to make that affirmation a reality. From observations and discussions about many other aspects of Soviet life she found a “different set of moral values”, particularly concerning women, and a new vista of truths.

“I asked myself what other circumstances and characteristics of the life I was accustomed to in the capitalist world were the consequence of capitalist society with its emphasis on money making and self interest . . . I was convinced that the new way of life they were developing . . . would put an end to the exploitation of man by man, and women by man as well, and would ultimately be popular as soon as it was understood”.

Jessie Street returned to Australia filled with zeal to make this new society understood. A press interview, “the largest I had ever had”, awaited her in Sydney, but to her surprise not one word of her Soviet experiences was printed. “It dawned on me that all the misinformation given over the years about the USSR had been done deliberately . . . the press blackout indicated that I was being given the chance of becoming party to the conspiracy of silence about the USSR”.

The battle to “pull aside the Iron Curtain conjured up by the Western World” was one of the most courageous Jessie Street ever entered into. There were many Australians, however, who did want to know the facts, and in spite of powerful opposition, abuse, ostracism, insults anonymous and overt, she reached many hundreds through lectures, articles in some journals, and made many new friends, right through the difficult period of the German-Soviet Non-Aggression Pact till the tide turned with the German attack on the USSR and the exploits of the Red Army.
Her part in organising Medical Aid and Sheepskins for Russia absorbed only some of the energy of this indefatigable woman; there was plenty left for vigorous campaigning around conditions, wages and status of women flocking into industry and the armed services, for initiating a woman's journal, even for contesting the seat of Wentworth in the Federal Elections as selected candidate for the Australian Labor Party of which she had long been an active member.

Jessie Street was a friend and admirer of H. V. Evatt, Ben Chifley and particularly of John Curtin whom she regarded as "one of Australia's greatest Prime Ministers". She had become over the years so outstanding a public figure, including President of the League of Nations in Sydney, that her selection as member of the Australian delegation to preparatory United Nations Organisation discussions and first Conference surprised no one but herself. From then on her work expanded into the international field of UNO and the World Peace Movement.

Jessie Street's adherence to socialism had little theoretical basis, no actual acceptance of the class struggle or the role of the working class. It was her capacity for honest examination of the facts she discovered in her endeavors to serve her sex and humanity, her first observations of socialist society, (later confirmed by many other visits to the USSR) and the answers she found there to the injustices she had fought against all her life, that gave her a deeper understanding of the causes of poverty and war and influenced her consequent actions, opinions and interpretations of events.

The book is long, discursive, overfilled with personal detail and somewhat repetitious. It is for leisurely, but rewarding reading as a summary of most of the important events of the period and above all as a credo and work of one of Australia's most outstanding women.

(The terms of this review covering the period of the autobiography are in the past tense. Lady Street, during the following years chose, and still chooses, "Truth rather than Repose.")

JOYCE TATTERSELL

THE SCIENCE OF SCIENCE, Edited by Goldsmith and Mackay. Penguin, 317 pp., 95c.

WHEN FIFTEEN SCIENTISTS of world repute including three Nobel Laureates, join to pay tribute to the 25th anniversary of the appearance of J. D. Bernal's famous work The Social Function of Science, we have a reading 'must' for scientists and all interested in science.

The editors proclaim the task of the book as being the "application of scientific methods to the understanding of science itself, especially in its relations with society". The title may lead one to expect some attempt at formulating the internal laws of development of science as well as its interactions with society. However, none of the writers has been sufficiently bold to attempt the former.

The problem, according to D. J. de S. Price, is that of being "scientific about the phenomenon of science itself". A scientific approach must in essence be an historical approach, but, as Price points out, while the history of science has been written about extensively, this history has, in the past, been "used only in the internalist sense of providing an understanding of the technical subject matter".
In thinking scientifically about science itself, Bernal the marxist still fills the role of a pioneer, even though a quarter of a century has elapsed since his great work appeared. During this period science has grown 'big', so big indeed that the process of its assimilation by the State machine parallels the growth of State monopoly capitalism itself. The result is that though the principles of cybernetics, servomechanisms, electronic computers and nuclear physics may still be understood by relatively few of us yet no one, for a single minute, escapes the consequences of their practical application.

One of the striking features of the book is the world outlook which most of the writers have adopted. It is here that one discerns the influences of Pugwash and other creations of the Science for Peace movement.

P. M. S. Blackett, Gerald Piel, C. F. Powell and Alexander King all deal extensively with the role and responsibilities of science in relation to the problems of the so-called 'Developing Countries'. There are a number of incursions into the malthusian bog, but for the most part they keep their feet on the solid ground of a scientific approach to what is both necessary and possible in the way of helping the progress of these countries. Blackett shows that the gap between the 'developed' and the 'developing' countries is widening. He points out for instance that in the pre-industrial countries of Asia the rate of spending per head is actually less than the rate of saving per head in the advanced capitalist countries, and asks the obvious question of how the former countries are to achieve the rate of capital investment necessary to their development.

The nature and effectiveness of foreign aid programs come in for much discussion. Nowhere does the reader get the impression that the writers believe that the present type of 'aid' programs can solve the problem.

A number of other themes are dealt with in an attractive manner by the other contributors. Haldane, for instance, wrote a challenging piece on the proper social application of the knowledge of human genetics. Soviet physicist Peter Kapitza, FRS has a paper on the Future Problems of Science which is both technically stimulating and philosophically provoking particularly in laying down tasks for marxian scientists. Again, no teacher or researcher should miss R. L. M. Synge's essay on Science for the Good of your Soul.

A sixteenth contribution comes from Bernal himself as he looks back 'After Twenty-Five Years' on the analyses and prophecies he made in 1939. In a masterly manner he lays bare the inner contradictions of the 'technological revolution' in a world divided by the barriers of class and of nationality. "In mastering the atom", he says, "something of the full power of science made itself manifest, but what is equally obvious is that the powers which controlled humanity at the time . . . were incapable of using the potentialities of science . . . The technical possibilities . . . that can be achieved through the proper use of computers cannot be fitted into the fragmented social frame of private interests and exploitation."

Bernal ends with a plea to scientists for contacts "with the people who can be the real beneficiaries of science". When that contact is renewed and improved we can hope to have a world where science ceases to be a threat to mankind and becomes a guarantee for a better future.
HENRY LAWSON’S BEST STORIES, by Cecil Mann. Angus and Robertson, 273 pp., $3.75.


CENTENARY YEAR is upon us, and it is open slather for the critics, the anthologists, the admirers and the detractors of Lawson.

Cecil Mann’s selection of Lawson’s short stories is admirable. Your own pet favorite may be missing (though I doubt it!) but every story which he includes is a good one. Lawson’s humor, irony, dramatic sense and genuine love of humanity are very fairly represented: his all-too-frequent lachrymosity is played down. As an index of this, Jones’ Alley is in, and Arvie Aspinall’s Alarm-Clock is out. There is a brief, reasonable and modest preface by the editor. The price works out at about ten cents per story. A bargain!

Part of Professor Roderick’s book is about Lawson as short-story writer; but if you have read Mann’s selection then you will know more about Lawson than Roderick chooses to say.

This is Roderick’s approach: “What I wish to do is to invite you to consider how far his (Lawson’s) work adheres to the fundamental principles of the short story, meaning by the term ‘short story’ the modern art form so called.” Shades of the French Academy! Is Lawson to be judged according to the resemblance which his stories bear to the Platonic Idea of “the modern art form so called”? Actually the rest of the essay is less dreadful than this thunderous prologue promises; but it is bad enough.

The short story, or rather “the modern art form so called”, according to Professor Roderick, was created by Hans Andersen, Gogol and Poe. Plain enough, I suppose, though it seems damned unfair to Merrimee and to E.T.A. Hoffmann! But what has this to do with Lawson?

Well, Poe’s influence if I may continue to quote, “extended, as far as mood and influence go, to the youthful Henry Lawson . . . He laughed at it in The Ghostly Door”. Nonsense! The ‘influence’ at which Lawson is laughing in The Ghostly Door is that of Deadwood Dick. Lawson says so himself.

Furthermore; “through his father” Lawson “may have caught one point in his technique subconsciously from Hans Andersen, namely the way in which he ends many of his stories”. Are we to imagine Peter Larsen making verbatim translations from the Danish for his son’s technical benefit? You will be relieved to know that: “I (Professor Roderick) do not know that Lawson ever read Gogol, although of course it is possible.”

No mention of Kipling, whom Lawson certainly might have read. Barely a passing reference to Maupassant, some of whose stories are thoroughly Lawsonesque. No mention either of John le Gay Brereton, who knew more about Lawson’s literary tastes than most people did: “At the height of his powers (Lawson) devoted more of his time to the perusal of Deadwood Dick’s adventures than to anything that could be called literature. I (Brereton) remember his borrowing only one book from me in all the years of our friendship; it was Barrack Room Ballads”.

No, taken all round, I don’t find much of value in this essay that was not better expressed by A. A. Phillips ten years ago. Nor is Professor Roderick much more illuminating when he discusses Lawson as a poet.
The facts about Lawson as a poet are these. He wrote a great mass of verse. Some of it is good; much is rank bad. He was a poor critic of his own work; and the work was edited by various literary men whose taste was certainly no better than his own. Consider only the ten or twelve best things he wrote, and Lawson is a poet. Consider his bulk output, and Lawson is an industrious manufacturer of doggerel. Roderick elects to take up the former stance, but his advocacy is impaired by three defects.

First defect. He misquotes. He says that a line in Andy originally ran: "With Drought, the red marauder". But on the facing page he prints a facsimile proof-sheet showing the original as: "Gainst Drought . . ." In improving Lawson in this way, Professor Roderick is doing what he condemns David McKee Wright for doing.

Second defect. In refuting Dr. Todd's views, Professor Roderick shows that both he and his adversary believe 'rhyme' to be the same thing as 'metre'. I'm not quibbling: this is an important distinction. Rhythm is born of the fiery impact of metre against meaning. It is precisely the dead regularity of metre, irrespective of meaning, that makes Lawson's lesser verse so wearisome to the ear.

Third defect. In his peroration, Professor Roderick says: "He (Lawson) was not interested in form and technique; he was interested in what he had to say, and its form followed the first impulse of his mind." That shows Professor Roderick as a prose-man; and, if true, it would show Lawson to be equally a prose-man. To the poet, form and content are inseparable. 'What you say' and 'How you say it' are head and tail of the same penny. The attitude of the man who is 'not interested' in the fundamental labor of giving form (by every technical means at his command) to the inchoate content in his mind, is not one that a poet can easily understand.

JOHN MANIFOLD

THE WINDS OF CHANGE IN CENTRAL AUSTRALIA, by Frederick Rose. Acadamie-Verlag, Berlin.

EUROPEAN OCCUPATION of Australia has almost everywhere destroyed Aboriginal society before this could develop by absorbing new ideas. Australia's official policy is largely based upon the theory that Aboriginal society and its culture contains nothing of temporary or permanent value and that its destruction is a necessary stage towards assimilation into the white community. The Winds of Change is an important book because it shows how a group of Aborigines in contact with European Australian society can continue actively to support themselves while making purposeful adaptions to the new culture. Rapid changes have occurred with the absorption of a great many new activities; with modification, but without destruction of sacred beliefs and tribal practices.

Professor Frederick Rose came to make this valuable study only after circumstances had diverted him from his primary purpose of visiting Australia in 1962 to continue his studies of kinship, age-structure and marriage in Aboriginal society. The author will be known to many Australians as one who was victimized at the time of the Petrov Inquiry. Finding it impossible to obtain suitable employment in Australia, Rose took a post in the Humboldt University, East Berlin. He has since gained an international reputation as an anthropologist.
Rose's early studies had perforce been undertaken during leave from his bread-and-butter job as a meteorological officer in Northern Australia. Since he left Australia there has been a realisation of the urgency attached to anthropological studies to record Aboriginal practices before these are lost for all time.

Rose was fully aware of this need and returned to Australia in 1962 to continue earlier studies. Government authorities refused to grant him permission to visit the Aboriginal Reserves where his work may have been feasible. Despite this refusal, Rose travelled to Central Australia. Although he found it was impossible to pursue his original objective, he turned his attention to the life of Aborigines in process of transition from a hunting and food-collecting economy to one of money values and trade. These Aborigines lived at or visited Angas Downs station in Northern Territory west of Alice Springs on the track to Ayers Rock, during 1962.

The Aborigines were active in availing themselves of the possibilities open to them as a result of contact with the white man and consciously adapted these possibilities to their own use.

As elsewhere, Aborigines at Angas Downs had acquired camels and donkeys for transport which had completely revolutionised the semi-nomadic habits of the people and had made possible the transport of purchased food and other possessions. Hunting had not been forsaken but had been improved by the use of rifles. An entirely new economic development was that of trade with tourists and others. Within the short period of five years they had changed to the production of goods for sale without passing through the decades-long process of becoming wage laborers dependent on the pastoral industry.

Contact with tourists visiting Ayers Rock had promoted the production of articles for sale. Although some of the Aborigines could not speak English, they had a keen sense of the value of the goods they produced. Some change in the design and decoration of traditional Aboriginal articles had occurred and new art forms had developed.

In addition to trade, money income was obtained from pastoral work, dingo scalps, and age pensions. Food supplies were supplemented by hunting. Although the per capita income from all sources was quite small, the Aborigines had advanced economically and had money for the purchase of food, clothes and tools.

Leisure time had increased and was often filled by gambling on a card game and a match-box tossing game.

Many aspects of tribal relations had persisted in either original or modified form. Although private ownership of property existed, there was much borrowing and sharing of possessions, including camels and rifles. Aboriginal beliefs and cult life had persisted although modified and influenced by the new conditions.

Aborigines of the centre of Australia previously practised polygamy and as the wives were usually younger than the men, gerontocracy existed. Rose found that by 1962 polygamy had virtually disappeared. He attributes this to the change in economic relations.

Rose believes that polygamy in Aboriginal society was due to the need for a child-bearing woman to have the assistance of other women with food gathering. The ability to purchase flour and the use of camels and donkeys for transport had reduced the work of the woman considerably. She no longer needed assistance for food gathering, and for the man additional women became a
burden and not an asset. Hence polygamy had ceased.

Rose's approach may over-simplify a rather complex problem. The Aboriginal group studied was a small one which had ceased to preserve original tribal boundaries. It was made up of individuals from various clans and tribes. Obviously various modifications of tribal requirements have occurred some of which may be equally important in the disappearance of polygamy. Previously, when married, a woman usually left her own group and territory. In these circumstances the attachment of a young girl to an old man and his family would have allowed the young girl to become familiar with the new territory, new dialect and new food gathering regions. Similarly, it was obviously an economic necessity for a widow to be able to join the family of another man. These factors may have been as important in maintaining polygamy as those described by Rose. Changing conditions and the merging of tribes would make unnecessary the attachment of young girls to older men to gain experience in a new territory. Similarly, older widows may now obtain a pension and so find it unnecessary to attach themselves to another family.

For some, the author's claim to follow "the materialist view" will irritate. Few scientists, materialist or otherwise, will accept Rose's statement that "if marriage is simply an expression of the relationship of men and women in the work process then a change in the productive forces, or more generally expressed, in the economy of the society, can be expected to bring about a change in the relationship of man and woman and thereby a change in the marriage relationship."

Most scientists would be more likely to accept that in addition to economic factors, reproductive functions, traditional practice and psychological aspects all influence the family structure. Although Rose's theories may yet prove to be correct, he advances a personal theory under the banner of the "materialist view" as shown by a comparison of Rose's statement above with that of Engels: "According to the materialist conception the determining factor in history is in the final instance, the production and reproduction of the immediate essentials of life. This again is of twofold character. On the one side, the production of the means of existence, of articles of food and clothing, dwellings and of the tools necessary for that production; on the other side, the production of human beings themselves, the propagation of the species. The social organisation under which the people of a particular historical epoch and a particular country live is determined by both kinds of production: by the stage of development of labor on the one hand and of the family on the other . . . " (Preface to First Edition, Origin of the Family.)

This book is a stimulating study of Aboriginal transition containing much of value for those concerned with Aboriginal advancement.

A.H.

AMERICAN INVESTMENT IN AUSTRALIA, by Donald Brash. Australian National University.

RESEARCH into the ownership of the powerful industries which dominate the Australian economy was for many years a neglected field with only the late Brian Fitzpatrick, E. W. Campbell (both extremely capable researchers) and a few others producing work of lasting value.

Now the leeway is being made up with competent economic researchers
like E. L. Wheelwright, Bruce McFarlan, Hylda Rolfe, Pete Thomas—to mention only some—investigating the structure of Australian capitalism or aspects of it.

One such aspect, the degree of overseas investment in Australian manufacturing industry, has drawn the attention of the Commonwealth Government's Department of Trade and Industry, which for reasons different from those of the above writers, has published several books on this.

The latest of these is the 1966 Directory of Overseas Investment in Australia. This is an attractively produced, full-of-facts volume, but unfortunately is not for sale to the public.

Which brings us to Dr. Donald Brash, formerly of the Research School of Social Sciences at the Australian National University and now with the International Bank of Reconstruction and Development in Washington, who has made the most detailed analysis yet of United States ownership in Australian industry.

Dr. Brash's 366-page book outlines at length the growth of United States investment in Australia (this has been particularly marked since the early fifties), ownership patterns, sources of funds employed and the management, productivity and costs of US-affiliated companies. Two chapters ask and answer the questions—"Why do they invest?" (it's profitable!) and "How profitable is American investment in Australia?" (more profitable than British or Australian!). Appendixes give extensive and valuable details of all industries in which American investment is influential. A bibliography of Dr. Brash's sources is a tribute to his thoroughness and an invaluable reference. The book is very well indexed, and is worth buying.

American Investment in Australia is not an easy book to review. One cannot challenge the veritable mountain of facts uncovered nor the proof (as has been known for some time) that United States investment in Australian industry is very substantial and, if those concerned have their way, is here to stay. Dr. Brash gives facts on this.

Between 1950 and 1962 total direct United States investment abroad expanded by 216 per cent. But the value of US direct investment in Australia expanded by 446 per cent during that period. On a per capita basis, corporate American investment in Australia, which was widely dispersed, was almost four times that in Germany and was substantially greater than that in the United Kingdom.

The Department of Trade's 1966 Directory, published well after Dr. Brash had sent his book to the printers, shows just how well entrenched overseas investment (US and British) is in Australian industry. Four in every seven manufacturing firms in Australia with some degree of overseas ownership are wholly owned by foreign interests. Australian firms wholly or more than 50 per cent foreign owned total 748 and their assets are $4,515m. The assets of Australian firms apportioned to overseas associates by country of ownership are: Britain $2,368m., United States $1,874m., Canada $234., other countries $255m. It's often said that money is power. There's a lot of power here.

Dr. Brash confesses that at one time he was opposed to foreign investment but has changed his views somewhat. He admits that there is considerable sentiment in Australia (even among some heads of companies foreign-owned) against investment and control by foreign companies. He also says the people have the right to ask whether they are being exploited by highly profitable foreign-owned companies and is Australia losing control
of its own economic destiny. He puts what he terms the economic, political, social and moral objections to foreign investment.

While Dr. Brash has shown himself to be expert at unravelling the various ramifications of American investment in Australia, his estimation of the consequences of this is not impressive and shows his isolation from political life.

Any consideration of overseas investment in Australia—all investment not American alone (is it any better to be eaten by an alligator than by a crocodile?)—must accept that many important sectors of production and distribution in Australia are largely foreign controlled. The Department of Trade's 1966 Directory shows that foreign ownership in the founding, engineering and metal working industries is $995.4m.; motor vehicles $697.5m.; electrical goods, equipment, cables $334.5m.; chemicals and oil refining (including paints, cosmetics, etc.) $1,603.4m.; food, tobacco and drink $540.8m.; other manufacturing (including paper, building materials, rubber and plastics, textiles, etc.) $559.1m.

Serious as is the situation in many of the industries manufacturing machines, plant, consumer goods and the like, it is even more so in the case of the very 'stuff' of production—bauxite, iron ores, uranium, copper, lead, zinc, tin, other minerals and coal. Alcoa (US-owned) has assets of $92m., Australian Aluminium (Canadian owned) $28m., Comalco (US-UK-owned) $89m., Conzinc Rio Tinto (UK-owned) $151m., Mt. Isa Mines (US-controlled) $145m., New Broken Hill (British owned) $47m. These are some of the foreign owned giants plundering what should be the people's wealth.

There is not much time left for the labor movement in Australia to clarify its attitude to the invasion of foreign capital which is bringing with it powerful political (All the way with LBJ), economic (Diggers for dollars) and other harmful pressures.

In the recent period, Mr. Calwell took a stand against those prepared to betray Australia's independence. In a recent article in the Australian, Mr. Whitlam wrote against "exploitation whether by local or overseas monopoly interests". Mr. Whitlam demanded the right of the Australian National Line to trade overseas, competition with the drug companies (mostly foreign owned) through the Commonwealth Serum Laboratories, repurchase of our shares in British Petroleum, the establishment of new government owned industries, especially in respect of mineral resources which he wrote were "moving into overseas hands". He called for public ownership of our national resources,

It would be good if the Labor Party worked out in more detail and publicised widely its proposals to free Australia from foreign ownership and to ensure that national development is based on what is best for the majority of the people. Those in the Labor Party who want to do this, and readers generally, will find much of interest in the documents available to the public, which will be placed before the forthcoming National Congress of the Communist Party of Australia, particularly the section on national development and democratic control.

If the facts are made known, we can reach the situation so well described in the Australian, a few weeks ago in these words:

In the Europe of ten years ago left-wingers monopolised the slogan 'Yanks Go Home'!

Today the same cry is echoing in boardrooms and parliaments from Westminster to Strasbourg. The old blind hatred of the post-war GI's has been updated by a new fear that American big business is taking over Europe.

RON BROWN.
Symposium on Marx

ON JULY 25, 1867, the first volume of *Capital*, the main scientific work of the great revolutionary thinker and fighter Karl Marx was published.

This was to have a more profound effect in shaping our modern times than any other single event.

One hundred years later, the influence of Marxism and interest in it is greater than ever.

To mark the centenary of the first appearance of *Capital*, *Australian Left Review* is sponsoring a public symposium at which a number of well qualified speakers will read papers on various aspects of Marx's thought and activity.

Full details will be announced later, but readers and all interested persons are requested to keep Saturday and Sunday, July 29-30, free to attend the symposium which will be held in Sydney on that weekend.

In Coming Issues...

The Scientific and Technological Revolution and Marxism
(an article by the Czech philosopher Radovan Richta, based on the findings of a research team sponsored by the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia and the Academy of Science)

Professor Frederick May on Italian Communist leader Gramsci

Henry Lawson Centenary

State Aid — What Now?
The Indonesian Economy
Aid to Under-developed Countries

Changing Views on Sex
(comment on the report of the working party of the British Council of Churches)
COMMUNIST PARTY OF AUSTRALIA

Documents for Discussion at 21st National Congress, June 1967.

These documents advance a general concept of the way forward to socialism in Australia.

Discussion Journals No. 1 and 2.

These booklets contain the views of contributors to the discussion on the Congress documents above. Further issues of the discussion journal will appear before the Congress.

These publications (free to members of the Communist Party and on public sale at 20c and 50c respectively) are available at 168 Day St., Sydney, and at all Communist Party offices.

ASHES OF THE ANGRY YEARS
by H. J. Summers

Australasian Book Society. 176 pp. $2.50.

This novel is set in the 1890's, when Australia's political and industrial system had its true origin, and when men like the hero had to go to goal to establish their claim to ordinary justice.

THE VIETNAMESE NATION:
Contribution to a History by Jean Chesneaux

English translation by Malcolm Salmon.


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.