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TRIBUTE TO LANCE SHARKEY

The sudden death of Lance Sharkey at 68 deprived the Australian labor movement of a great figure. Lance Sharkey was associated with the Communist Party for over 40 years. He contributed much that is permanent to the theory and practice, not only of the Communist Party, but of the labor movement as a whole.

His political life spanned a generation and a half of the most turbulent and decisive era of Australian and world politics. He first entered political activity in the struggle against conscription in the first world war. The son of a battling farmer of Irish descent, he became a worker in Orange and the West of New South Wales. Moving to Sydney in the early twenties, he was soon drawn into active unionism and became a student of socialist theory.

He was one of that generation of militant workers whose thinking was profoundly influenced by the Russian Revolution. The world war, expressing through horrible carnage the contradictions of imperialism, had turned the thoughts of millions to the need for social revolution.

The experience of Australian workers had traversed a wide field, from the great union struggles of the 1890's to Labor Party reformism and various socialist trends (Australian Socialist Party, Victorian Socialist Party, the Industrial Workers of the World).

The Russian Revolution illuminated the darkness cast by the war, and had a great impact all over the world. This was true for Australia too, even though it was more isolated by distance than now. The impact of the first victorious workers' revolution led to an upsurge of socialist ideas, thinking, debate and action. The Communist Party was formed in 1920, the Labor Party adopted the socialisation objective in 1921; a few years later the Australian Council of Trade Unions was founded.

Lance Sharkey, after deep study and thought, threw in his lot with the infant Communist Party. For over 40 years he remained steadfast and loyal, through many trials, struggles, and sacrifices. If any one man more than many others of ability and devotion can be said to have moulded the Communist Party, it is he.

He was a man of action, in the thick of innumerable struggles. He was an active unionist, a fighter for the unemployed in the great depression. He took an active part in the struggle of the
miners in 1929-30. He fought against the New Guard, incipient Australian fascism. He was an underground leader of the Party when Menzies outlawed it in 1940, an organiser and propagandist for the war effort to defeat the Axis powers. In 1949, he was framed and jailed for courageous opposition to the Cold War. Courage, tenacity, single-mindedness and loyalty were essential parts of Sharkey the man.

Yet he was more than a man of action and organiser. Editor of Workers’ Weekly, Tribune and Communist Review, he was a writer, thinker and theoretician of outstanding ability.

Of all his contributions, his theoretical work was perhaps the greatest. His work The Trade Unions was both a generalisation of a century of militant unionism and a theoretical concept that still profoundly influences Australian unionism.

A considerable part of his theoretical work was devoted to unity of the working class, the central problem of the struggle for socialism in Australia. He was a leader of the revolutionary trend in the Australian labor movement, to the fore in all the striving of this trend to find the ways to unite the movement. This striving took many paths, including some wrong turnings, yet was always guided by sincere desire to reach the goal. One of his great contributions was to summarise this experience, of which he was a participant, in his article “The Labor Party Crisis.” Written in 1952, a few years before defeat of the extreme right bid for domination of the ALP, this article marked out a new path for Australian communists. They have since followed this path, again with some diversions, developing its ideas in changing conditions. Indeed, it might be said that this article was an important strand in the thinking that is expressed in the concept “Towards a Coalition of the Left” that Australian communists are now debating as their 21st Congress draws near.

The concepts also owe a lot to another theoretical contribution by Lance Sharkey. It was he who made the first draft of the 1951 Party program, Australia’s Path to Socialism. This program, with its subsequent amendments, was the foundation on which the Communist Party is building its new ideas of the way forward in a world and an Australia that has changed a lot even in 16 years.

It would be impossible to write an appreciation of this man without referring to a vital strand in his makeup—his internationalism. His Irish descent was a matter of pride. One of his favorite quotations from Marx was on the heroic struggle of Ireland for independence. The part played by Irish immigrants
in the Australian labor movement was also a source of pride, expressing also his Australianism. His favorite song was *The Wild Colonial Boy*, with its merging of the Irish and Australian rebel spirit.

This deep spring of sympathy for peoples oppressed and exploited by imperialism was the emotional chord of his internationalism, to be developed into a scientific concept through his study of marxism. Some of the best of Sharkey's writings deal with the struggles of oppressed peoples. In the thirties, he wrote several brilliant articles on the Chinese Revolution. These show a depth of understanding and a prophetic vision of China's emergence as a great nation through the fires of revolution. The support given by Australian workers to China was always a source of pride to him.

His internationalism was naturally expressed best in his association with the international communist movement. He was a member of the Executive Committee of the Communist International, a colleague and comrade of revolutionaries like Dimitrov, Thorez, Togliatti, Pollitt and Buck. The divisions in the movement hurt him deeply. A participant in the Moscow meetings of 1957 and 1960, he found it hard to believe that agreements reached by the world forum of Communist Parties could be breached. Yet he retained a deep confidence that the divisions were only a temporary phase, that the discussion and testing of different ideas would lead to a new and higher form of international unity.

Lance Sharkey made his own contribution to international marxist thought. Some of his writings were translated into many languages, and proved helpful to communists in many countries, particularly in those countries emerging from colonial status. D. N. Aidit, murdered leader of Indonesia's communists, often referred to the help given by Lance's writings, taken back by Indonesian communists exiled in Australia during the war.

To those who knew and honor him, his death is a great personal loss. It is certainly a political loss to the movement he so profoundly influenced. He will long be remembered by his comrades; tens of thousands will honor him as he leaves us. He has a secure place in the history of the Communist Party and the movement that is working for socialism, the vision and dream of generations of advanced thinkers; the socialist Australia of the future will remember him as one of its greatest pioneers.
THE VIETNAM WAR is moving towards a new and even more dangerous stage. U Thant has warned that it may even be the beginning of a climacteric World War III. This warning underlines the urgency of a renewed wave of protest actions, in Australia and the world over. It raises to a new level the imperative need for joint action of the socialist countries, with an urgency that requires a massive increase in military and material aid to back the moral support already given by most of the world's people.

Burning indignation, moral condemnation and even the worldwide protests have not yet been enough to stay the hand of the warmakers headed by Johnson. One can understand the anguished cries of conscience that call for a confrontation to stop the endless series of crimes that go further and further beyond limits only recently believed impossible by world opinion—napalm, mass bombing aimed at civilians first of all, mining of irrigation works and the open seas, torture, gas and chemical war.

Even sincere friends of the Vietnamese people are saying that they cannot win, that US imperialism will overwhelm them by technological barbarity and force of numbers. But this view is rejected by the Vietnamese, whose opinion has been stated to Tribune correspondent Malcolm Salmon in these words:

Some foreign friends tell us "The Americans are committing the crime of genocide but the Vietnamese are committing the crime of suicide". We are grateful for their concern but they are wrong. We are confident that we can survive and win against all the Americans can do to our country, South and North.

The concern of Vietnam's friends is understandable. There has never been such an apparently unequal war in all history. Not satisfied with using the full might of their own armed forces, the Americans are pressing willy-nilly into service all possible allies. Arrayed against 30 million Vietnamese is an unholy alliance of the United States, South Korea, Australia, New Zealand, Thailand, the Philippines, not to mention the army of the puppet Ky regime. Taken together, the six allies have a population of nearly 300 million. Industrially, Australia by itself surpasses Vietnam.
Yet what is the reality of the war, after all? The Americans are not winning; this in itself is a colossal, humiliating defeat. The progress of the war is subject to increasing American censorship and biased reporting, a tacit admission of the reverses they are suffering. Every so often, a great operation is proclaimed with a fanfare of trumpets, only to fizzle out into silence. What has happened to Operation Attleboro, to the Mekong Delta pacification campaign, and a score of others? The operation in the North West, allegedly to forestall an invasion from the North, has failed, with heavy American casualties and heavy losses by the puppet army, unreported as usual. In the midst of this operation, the US base at Bien Hoa is once again attacked by guerillas—and Bien Hoa is supposed to be in a pacified area, long occupied by the elite US Marines!

People’s war is the invincible force against which all the might of US imperialism crashes in futile fury. This people’s war increasingly receives powerful reinforcement in the form of advanced arms from the USSR and other socialist countries. Vietnamese pilots are training at Soviet airbases, learning to fly MIG121’s, so feared by US pilots. More and more SAM missiles are shooting down more and more US planes. US plane losses already run into thousands, and these losses will grow.

Westmoreland and other generals now call for more and more troops, more planes, more bombings, a wider and dirtier war, a total war that demands also suppression of domestic opposition. This is not a sign of strength or looming victory, but a sign of desperation and feared debacle.

Far from suppressing opposition in America, the threatened debacle of US aggression is continually propelling new forces into at least conditional opposition. Governor Romney, contender for the Republican nomination for the Presidency, seems to be exploring the possibility of a political coup like Eisenhower produced in 1954, promising peace in Korea. J. K. Galbraith, former US ambassador to India, recently accused some of President Johnson’s advisers of trying to bail out their past reputations at the cost of genuine peace efforts in Vietnam... (those) who have staked everything on the possibilities of a military solution. (Australian, 12/5/67.)

This type of criticism, whatever its motivation, reveals both the crisis of US policy and its blatant, brazen immorality. If it is indeed true that Vietnam policy is influenced by domestic political considerations, the incredibly sordid immorality of the US aggression has plumbed new depths of depravity.
This moral crisis of the capitalist West broadcasts corruption from its centre in Washington. The socialist Harold Wilson, according to two writers in the London Sunday Telegraph, has struck a bargain with Johnson. George Ball, former US Under-Secretary of State, is reported as saying:

Any British Prime Minister can have what he needs in support of the pound and of East of Suez defence. But Wilson can have more—he supported the President on Vietnam and this gives him a pretty good bank balance over here. (Australian, 10/5/67.)

This certainly casts a new phosphorescence of corruption on the Menzies-Holt deal with Johnson. Holt’s complete cynicism recently found expression in his defence of US bombing of civilians in Vietnam. He said:

It is unfortunate that civilian casualties are an accompaniment of war . . . But it can be fairly claimed that efforts have been made, so far as humanly practicable, to avoid causing damage to the property and harm to the life and limb of civilians in this Vietnamese campaign. (Hansard, p. 2031.)

Mr. Holt casts himself in the role of the Pharisee in the parable of the Good Samaritan, with one difference. The Pharisee only walked on the other side of the road to avoid the man injured by robbers. Mr. Holt washes his hands of responsibility for actions he not only condones but also helps to perpetuate.

What hypocrisy, what cynicism, is displayed here, when even the censored Australian television shows films of villages deliberately burnt, civilians bashed and children blasted with napalm!

The agony of Vietnam is incredibly more painful because the war is waged precisely against a whole people. To the Americans and their allies, all Vietnamese are enemies, and the bombings in the North are specifically to deter alleged intervention and, hideously, to raise the morale of the South.

Australians who oppose the war in Vietnam, on whatever grounds, have the clear duty to step up their actions, exposing all the cynical immorality of the justifications for this most unjust and horrible war of our time.

Whether the motivation for opposition comes from morality, religious or humanist pacifism, or working class internationalism or from considerations of Australia’s place and destiny vis-a-vis Asia, the duty is clear.
AUSTRALIA'S FOREIGN POLICY and official morality were again revealed in dubious light with the Government's attitude to the Greek military coup. With indecent haste, the Government recognised this military-fascist regime, washed its hands of any responsibility for its citizens of Greek origin, with Australian passports, who had visited Greece for Easter.

This in face of spontaneous protests by thousands of Greek immigrants, indeed the whole community except for the wealthy Royalist-fascist fringe, and from Australian unionists, democrats and the Opposition. This despite clear evidence that this was a brutal military-fascist coup, undertaken only weeks before an election that would clearly have resulted in victory for a democratic coalition, and following a series of governments without mandate concocted by Constantine and his reactionary group.

The full extent of the repression, and the danger of an Indonesian-type massacre are withheld from Australians. Over 100,000 Greeks are on the sinister islands of exile, or crammed into mainland jails, schools and even theatres commandeered by the military. The military junta has ordered its troops to shoot on sight anyone even reading the posters and leaflets that have appeared overnight throughout Greece. They banned the celebration of the Orthodox Easter, permitted even under nazi occupation.

The military-fascist dictatorship is shaky and fearful, for it rules against the popular will and depends only upon violence. Great danger exists precisely because it may unleash a bloodbath; tremendous possibilities exist for democratic victory because the coup has clarified the deep and vicious anti-popular character of the military clique, the monarchy and the small minority of wealthy men in whose interests these reactionary forces act.

An immediate, vigorous and broad movement in Australia is needed, swelling world efforts to save the lives of thousands and prevent Greece returning to fascist rule.

Military dictatorship is a menacing feature of world politics. With the active support, connivance and even direction of the Central Intelligence Agency, army dictatorships exist everywhere the West has influence. From South Vietnam, where the CIA had Diem murdered and the military installed, to Latin America, Africa and now Greece, military dictatorship is the rule rather than the exception.

When the full story of the Greek coup is written, it will show, in sinister detail, the already clear outline of CIA involvement.
A contributor with many years of service in the labor movement analyses the forces and issues involved in the Congress of the Australian Council of Trade Unions to be held in Melbourne in August-September.

THROUGHOUT AUSTRALIA TODAY, many rank and file trade unionists as well as their leaders are asking the question: "Where is the ACTU going?" a pertinent question in this, its fortieth year.

Because of the decisive role of the national union leadership, the capitalist class and all its agencies exert every effort to limit or divert all ACTU sponsored activities into 'safe' channels. They use the secret police apparatus and files of the National Civic Council, massive propaganda and repressive legislation to try to determine the nature of the leadership and policy of the unions and to place formidable obstacles in the way of militant activity.

That these and other measures have fallen far short of their initiators' original plans testifies to the deep going democratic traditions of the trade union movement and the tireless and principled work of the militant progressive forces in the labor movement of which the communists are a necessary and important part.

The present position is in marked contrast to the stand taken by the ACTU in earlier years. For example the 1955 Congress reflected the vigorous struggle going on against the anti-union policies of Santamaria and the Industrial Groups, and of the US Labor Department which quite openly interfered in affairs of the Australian labor movement. The defeat of reaction was evident in the progressive policy decisions made by the Congress on many issues, including the basic wage, margins, long service leave, equal pay, education, social services and an overseas shipping line. This Congress also adopted the valuable foreign policy decisions of the Hobart Conference of the Australian Labor Party. Furthermore it laid the basis for representation through union
groups on the ACTU Executive, in addition to the representation from the State Labor Councils. At subsequent Congresses in 1957 and 1959 these decisions were further advanced and important new policies adopted.

During these years the ACTU not only adopted progressive policies but carried many of them through in an effective way. There was much encouragement to unions and workers to show their support for margins and basic wage demands which were before the Commonwealth Arbitration Commission. Union and shop committees were developed; labor councils were strengthened; special conferences of federal unions and subsequent decisions of the ACTU Executive further encouraged unions and their members to participate in the struggle. At the same time, there was a firm stand against the penal provisions, and against the State and Federal Arbitration Acts, while ACTU attitudes on world peace, notably the 1959 Trade Union Peace Declaration, attracted people beyond the labor movement to join the struggle against atomic weapons, and for disarmament and peace. The ACTU took practical steps to promote international understanding by sending delegations to socialist and other countries.

This period witnessed a further strengthening of the trade union movement with the emergence of the Australian Council of Salaried and Professional Associations (ACSPA), the organisation which unites the 'white collar' workers at the national level. The ACTU and ACSPA have co-operated on many issues of common interest to all workers, in particular on basic wage and margins campaigns.

However this growing unity of trade union organisation round workers' needs was not to the liking of the rightwing, the Industrial Groupers, and the US elements, which no doubt were inspired and financed, partly at least, by US Central Intelligence Agency funds, and which all aimed to turn the trade unions and the ACTU into 'tame cat' organisations. The Australian Workers' Union also threw its weight into the struggle to move the labor movement to the right. To this end, its leadership projected plans for a separate trade union federation intended to provide organisational backing for reaction in the unions. At the same time there were increasing attacks on ACTU policy, especially on trade union peace committees, on reciprocal visits by trade union delegations, on shop committees, and on methods of mobilising trade unionists behind ACTU policy.

The right wing planned to force drastic changes in ACTU policy, to retard or at least neutralise the mass movement of
the workers in support of their demands, and to secure a position of strength in the leadership of the ACTU. The first open challenge by the right wing came at the 1961 ACTU Congress where a group of unions led by the Clerks, Ironworkers and Australasian Society of Engineers, with the AWU in the background, used the levy for reciprocal visits as the basis for a boycott of the Congress, in the belief that this would force the ACTU to succumb to their pressure. However they were not at this stage successful and the Congress continued without them.

In 1963 they were back at the Congress. In 1965 confident that they had the numbers the right wing made another bid to establish their domination by seeking to have the group representatives on the ACTU Executive elected by the whole Congress instead of by the delegates of the unions concerned. This overt attempt to secure rightwing control was also defeated. The return of rightwing representatives did, however, increase their influence in the ACTU Executive.

Some ACTU leaders quite clearly set out to defeat any form of mass action, using any pretext for the purpose. Similarly conferences of federal unions have been almost dropped. The last one of any significance was marked by a clumsy manoeuvre to damp down the struggle against the penal powers. The affiliation of the AWU to the ACTU must be considered in the context of a strengthening right wing. Without the AWU the right wing inside the ACTU felt uncertain of the ‘numbers’.

One of the aims of the extreme right is to copy the American pattern of turning the trade unions into ‘big business’ type organisations. Such a move, while portrayed in glittering terms about efficiency, expertise, the need to meet the boss on equal terms (including of course salaries, allowances and perks) is in reality designed to emasculate the fighting strength of the unions, stifle democracy by denying the members the right to make the decisions and to control their own affairs, (which are to be left to experts) and to limit all activity to the Conference table and arguments in the courts. The opponents of this ‘big business’ concept do not deny the need for efficiency, experts, research, etc. But they see them as means to assist independent trade unions, controlled by the members themselves, to win their demands, and not as ends in themselves.

Another example of right wing ascendency in ACTU policy making is the shift in relation to Vietnam. The Boonaroo-Jeparit incident showed that the standpoint of certain ACTU leaders differed little from that of the Holt government. The government
was obviously preparing to introduce industrial conscription and threw down a clear challenge to the ACTU on the issue. But instead of the ACTU taking up the challenge, it was left to the Seamen’s and Shipwrights’ Unions to take a principled stand against industrial conscription, against the bombing of civilians, against escalation of the war, and for peace in Vietnam. A similar weakness on the part of the ACTU was evident in the conference against the French Tests held at the end of 1965, when issues affecting Australian workers and Vietnam were deliberately excluded. It is evident that on many international issues, the ACTU follows the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions whose policy has strong US overtones. In this organisation recent disclosures in the United States underline CIA manipulation and bribery.

In view of the shift in ACTU policy over the last five years, it is no wonder that many workers and unions feel that the ACTU is not championing their cause, is not giving a strong lead on economic and other issues. Concern is frequently expressed that workers are losing ground, that the ACTU is weakening organisation, and that its failure to encourage mass support on basic issues has held back the advance of workers’ conditions. There is growing concern about the lack of enthusiasm for ACTU basic wage policy, no doubt because the ACTU does not give the sort of leadership to enthuse and encourage workers to organise the massive opposition necessary to the employers’ total wage for example.

However, a contradiction exists between the drive of the right wing to take control of the ACTU and the mood and need of the workers for action to defend and improve their position. Struggles have taken place outside the ACTU. Some unions go ahead in spite of it, while others don’t allow the ACTU to get hold of the issue, comparing the tragic ACTU handling of the GMH struggle (from which GMH workers have so far had no real gains) with the Mt. Isa struggle which, though not completely successful, did have considerable positive results.

As the burden of the Vietnam war rises and there are new imposts to meet the expenditure, as wage and other gains become harder to extract, such problems will increase for the rightwing leadership. Indeed, they are already to some degree conscious of this, and different attitudes on how to meet the situation are likely to make them rather less than one happy family, particularly when squabbles over the ‘succession’ are already appearing, and with the entry of the AWU with its long-standing policy of ‘dominate or destroy.’
There are also growing demands for strengthening the ACTU apparatus to act on policies in the interests of all workers, for the ACTU to develop its own policy of industrial unionism to match the growing strength of international monopoly and big business in Australia, and that the ACTU seek a wider basis of unity with ACSPA on matters of common interest to all workers, particularly in problems arising from technological developments.

The trade union movement will be compelled by the very change in industry to give more attention to wider social problems including education, retraining of workers arising from automation and new technical methods, to health and social services, and to asserting demands for democratic control and a union say in changes taking place. More acute political questions are arising because of the Government's foreign policy and its support for the war in Vietnam.

These issues have to be faced up to, they cannot be resolved by retreating or acceptance of Government and employer demands. The main difficulty facing the ACTU leadership is the growing gap between bureaucratic right wing control and the developing mass movement of trade unionists in the industries. This conflict can be seen in the current basic wage and margins cases. It is reflected in the right wing call for support for their bankrupt arbitrationist policy on the one side and the united action taken by workers to press home trade union demands on the other side.

The ACTU Congress will be faced with these issues also.

What will the Congress do? Will it move further to the right, which can only weaken trade unionism, or will it move to the left and develop more reliance on the fighting qualities of the trade unions, developing unity in action for the demands of the workers, and fostering democratic control by union members. One of the great needs today is improvement of democratic consultation between trade union leadership and members with the aim of increasing understanding of the policies and objectives of the trade union movement.

The forthcoming Congress of the ACTU will be held under the close scrutiny of trade unionists all over Australia to see how it responds to these problems.
Victor Williams

ALIENATION
AND INDUSTRY

An Australian poet who works on the waterfront in Western Australia discusses the effects of the alienation of the worker in capitalist industry on mental health and attitudes.

THE COMMUNIST PARTY CONGRESS documents state (p. 18) 'marxism has revealed the alienation of man in capitalism', and call for more study of this aspect of socialist theory. Marx and Engels in The German Ideology forecast that the communist regulation of production would remove the 'alien relationship between men and what they themselves produce'. An article in Soviet Literature No. 12, 1966, examines the task under socialism of liquidating the economic causes and the ideological consequences of alienation and its influence on literature, and the role of literature in helping to overcome them.

The economic effects under capitalism of the alienation of man from what he produces have been examined in Capital and other works. But in Capital Marx also wrote: "It is not the place here to go on to show how the division of labor seizes upon not only the economical, but every other sphere of society." It is our loss that he did not go on, there or elsewhere.

But the social and psychological effects of the alienation of man from what he produces are wide and varied. They influence man's response to work, to life and sport, to literature and art. William Morris, one of the pioneer socialists in England, employer of more than a hundred men in his factory, saw one of the social results of alienation, the loss of creative satisfaction in work.

I could not do anything to give this pleasure (in creative initiative) to the workmen, because I should have had to change their method of work so utterly that I would have disqualified them from earning their living elsewhere. You see I have got to understand thoroughly the manner of work under which the art of the Middle Ages was done, and that that is the only manner of work that can turn out popular art, only to discover that it is impossible to work in that manner in this profit-grinding society.

The lack of creative satisfaction in work for wages comes from several causes. The loss of economic right in the product
cannot be overlooked although the worker has been conditioned and educated and brainwashed into accepting it. Division of labor is also an important factor in loss of satisfaction. Marx in *Capital* wrote:

> It is not only the labor that is divided, subdivided and portioned out between divers men: it is the man himself that is cut up, and metamorphosed into the automatic spring of an exclusive operation.

The knowledge, the judgment and the will which, though in ever so small a degree, are practised by the independent peasant or handicraftsman . . . these faculties are now required only for the workshop as a whole.

The social and psychological effects of alienation under capitalism have not yet been studied as a whole, nor their effects traced in the affluent society of Australia today.

Industrial psychology in USA since the war has been concerned with part of the problem, as it has affected production, labor turnover and strikes. But the sorest point, the economic alienation of man from what he produces, is avoided. The lack of creative satisfaction in work is not courageously handled, but there is a facing up to much of the realities inside modern industry. T. Wise, in *Human Relations in Modern Industry*, sums up:

> It is a terrible thought to realise that much of present-day work is inherently incapable of satisfying the man who does it—and it is getting worse with the increase of machines.

Figures given by other psychologists endorse this. Henry Clay Smith in *Psychology of Industrial Behavior* gives figures for some English factories. When there was only one operation of work only 33% were fairly interested. 92% of executives found the job interesting, but only 54% of factory workers.

In six firms in Michigan 11% of executives were dissatisfied, 48% highly satisfied. Of the unskilled workers 27% were dissatisfied, only 18% highly satisfied. Gilmer in *Industrial Psychology* found job dissatisfaction round 12%, very high among young workers, going down to the lowest at about 30 and rising steadily to a middle aged revolt. He found 25% of unskilled workers dissatisfied.

In *Human Behavior in Industry*, Finlay, Sartain and Tate considered some of the non-economic satisfaction people need to get from their jobs. The man with craft skill gets much satisfaction from a tool or gauge he has made, even though he may never know the end point the tool is for. Production workers find it very difficult to get personal satisfaction of accomplishment from jobs where they have no choice of method, and all the brain and skill are built into tools and machines. Gilmer found that security
rated as top factor in job satisfaction, interest in the job rated next, even ahead of possibilities of advancement.

He found in 14 out of 26 studies that workers with positive attitudes to the job showed higher productivity than those with negative attitudes. Nine studies showed no reaction. Only three of the studies showed that workers with a negative attitude to work produced more.

But apart from its effect on production, there are at least two other effects of job dissatisfaction. One very interesting one is touched on by Ross Stagner in Psychology of Industrial Conflict. It is the possible causal factor in neurosis of occupational origin. He said (1956) that the study of the problem had scarcely begun. He quoted figures from Frazer in 1947, which showed that where there was a liking for the job, 24% suffered from neurotic illness, 46% from physical illnesses. Where the job was boring, the neurotically ill rose to 43%, the physically ill to 55%, a much smaller rise in proportion.

The workers in jobs with above average wages were 29% neurotically ill, workers in jobs with low wages 23%, no significant difference. But workers in jobs with above average wages had 42% physically ill, and with low wages 58%, a considerable rise that could possibly be related to the effect of food, accommodation and immediate medical care that would go with the different wage levels.

The very high figure of 43% neurotically ill in boring jobs surely must be one of the grave and increasing danger signs of modern life.

But workers don't only go slow or go mad because of job dissatisfaction; they go on strike. Industrial psychologists, Finlay, Sartain and Tate, found that where men had no opportunity of self-expression or creativeness in their work, there was a willingness of many union members to contribute time and energy to union affairs as officers and committee men, strong evidence of the urge to be recognised as individuals and people of importance. Ross Stagner digs deeper in his Psychology of Industrial Conflict. He does not believe men go into picket lines and endanger their lives in bloody violence for the mere wage increase or shorter hours. Behind every blow in a strike, days, months, years of hurt feelings, resentment bitter and strong because it expresses the very will to live.

Within industry is the watershed of the world. There are those who are numbed and defeated and become neurotic, who sink back into the swamps. There are those, growing in numbers and organisation, whose energies, expressed in collective actions,
flow in a radically different direction, fighting the destructive influences, expressing the very will to live. The directions of this fight under capitalism are extremely wide and varied—from the almost irrepressible working class humor that flourishes on many jobs, to massive strikes and insurrections where the workers take over the factories.

The same watershed exists outside industry. There are those self-employed and those whose work is creative, where they use to the full their capabilities of hand and brain, who have creative satisfaction in work. Those who have been or are still pioneering, surgeons, research workers, teachers, are possibly among such lucky ones. They do not feel the tensions that are becoming so unbearable for many moderns. Those whose creative urges have not been blunted or destroyed by education and work, but have little satisfaction in their work, turn to other outlets after the eight-hour desert. They continue old hobbies, or take up new ones, from hunting to gardening, from gemstones to surfboard riding; they turn to making or repairing engines or boats, to an infinite variety of constructive, healthy, creative activities.

But there are also those who have lost the pleasure in most activities, who are bored with work and bored with life. The energy that drives them, potentially their creativeness, demands some outlet, but the outlets they seek are too often destructive, and regressions to earlier reactions. They range from the bored and savage critic, to the vandal, the alcoholic, to the suicide and the murderer. They all in different degrees seek revenge on themselves or on the society that has robbed them of something, but they do not know what it is. Racial intolerance, fascism, war-mindedness feed on this blocked and distorted creativeness that is continually growing under the conditions of capitalism and imperialism.

These creative and destructive streams flow into every aspect of life. The analysis of modern Australian literature and art, from the viewpoint of the social results of alienation, of lack of creative satisfaction in work, could be very useful. Much work needs to be done to fill in, correct and apply this outline of the social effects of alienation of man from what he produces.
DISCUSSION:

FIVE CENTS A RIDE

IN ALR 4/1966 and 1/1967 Roy Nelson and Maurie Crow discuss some of the problems of forward planning for Australian cities, in particular that of passenger transportation. The private motor car has become a major means of transport in recent years and is producing a serious crisis for our cities. It is the writer's opinion that whatever form the future city takes, public transport must be the main means for travel.

In 1963-64 all forms of urban public transport in Australia carried 1,437 million passengers and earned $132 million, or an average of 9.1c per passenger journey. This is just over $20 per head of the urban population. Operating expenses would be slightly more, as nearly all government-owned utilities ran at a loss. About one-third of the passengers and revenue were on trains, mostly in Sydney and Melbourne. The remainder were on trams and buses.

In the same year the number of cars, station wagons and utilities licensed in Australia was 3.3 million (300 per 1,000 people). Licences and registration fees came to $137 million. In the same year about $370 million was spent on road construction alone. About half would have been spent on city roadworks.

The Australian Transport Advisory Council estimated that road accidents in 1956-57 cost $170 million or $4,000 per casualty-causing accident. These costs would have increased considerably since then and about half would arise in the cities. The annual cost of city road accidents alone must approach 75% of the running costs of public transport. Hospitals bear much of this burden. Accident victims often require difficult, lengthy and expensive treatment. This is one cause of the financial crisis facing our hospitals. The victims moreover are often young people in their most productive years.

It has been estimated that to move 100,000 people in one hour, or 50,000 in each direction, requires:

(a) one double track underground railway
(b) four lanes of trams, two in each direction
(c) eight lanes of buses, four in each direction in a roadway 108 feet wide
(d) sixty lanes of cars, 30 in each direction in a roadway 650 feet wide.

All the people in eight lanes of cars on Sydney Harbour Bridge at peak hour could be seated in five tram cars.

To help reduce accidents and traffic congestion, nearly all capital cities are planning or building major expressways with grade separation at intersections. These will certainly reduce congestion and accident rates (by as much as one-quarter), but at a price.

One and a half miles of the Warringah Expressway on the northern end of Sydney Harbour Bridge is costing $20 million with an ultimate $80 million for nine miles. By contrast the estimated cost of Sydney's famous Eastern Suburbs railway is $85 million. In Perth the Mitchell Freeway and Narrows Interchange is costing $20
million for a distance of about one mile. The Hawkesbury-Newcastle Expressway is costing about $1.5 million per mile. These are extreme examples. Nevertheless, traffic congestion will still remain on their completion.

The case on economic grounds alone for urban passenger transport as opposed to the private car is strong. This is without considering the heavy accident toll, noise, congestion and atmospheric pollution from car exhausts which is beginning to be a serious problem in some parts of the world (e.g., Los Angeles).

There can be no doubt that planning based on motor cars for city transport suits the motor and oil industries, as Maurie Crow has pointed out. Both Roy Nelson and Maurie Crow rightly criticise the basis of many of the transport studies made in Australia to date. They also suggest alternative principles. In doing so they highlight both the strengths and limitations of planning in general under present-day capitalist society. It is difficult, if not impossible, for planning in the interests of the community as a whole to be implemented when this conflicts with the vital interests of big business. The writer believes that the progressive movement will win the day in this country to the extent it can elaborate and fight for specific constructive policies that will serve the people as a whole and not just the narrow interests of a few big companies.

However, the motor car is extremely adaptable and versatile. One can go anywhere at any time (almost!). Many people would be willing to pay a high price for this convenience. Furthermore, the sense of power and command that comes from driving a car is not to be ignored, especially in a society where most people are, and feel like, mere cogs in an organisation over which they have little control. Many youths would regard their cars (for better or worse) as a means of freedom and escape.

Nevertheless, cities all over the world are finding it necessary to expand public transport regardless of the cost. Streets cannot cope, nor can finance cope with the expenditures needed to build roads for the flood of cars, London, Paris, Milan, Hamburg, Rome, Toronto, Montreal are all building or extending underground railways. Brussels, Copenhagen and Frankfurt are either extending, modernising or undergrounding trams—they still have an important role to play. At least 15 other European cities are doing the same.

Washington D.C., USA, is considering a plan based on rapid rail transit as opposed to an earlier plan largely of motor highways and freeways. San Francisco is currently building 75 miles of rapid rail transit at a cost of $A900 million.

All authorities agree that public transport in cities must play a greater role than it does. The problem is to get people to use it. The Metropolitan Transport Trust in Perth recently introduced a 50c family fare on Sundays and public holidays. For 50c a family of any size may travel anywhere on any number of buses or ferries and return. Pensioners can do the same for 20c. Previously empty buses on Sundays now carry many passengers. This points the way.

Public transport in each major city should be under the control of a single authority. It should be made responsible for control, planning and operation of trains, buses, trams, ferries as an integrated whole as well as for financial performance. Possibly supervision of taxis, hire cars and major parking ventures could be included.

The guidelines and standards of service should be set for the authority by town planning bodies basing them-
selves on principles akin to Roy Nelson’s ‘maximum accessibility, convenience, and mobility, minimising capital investment in transport networks—while retaining the desired residential densities.’

Timetables and routes could be based on origin and destination type surveys of passengers as is done with motorists now by Main Road authorities. Vehicles should be frequent and comfortable, if necessary air-conditioned to encourage people to travel in them.

A single fare of 5c should apply for all journeys with concessions for off-peak travel, and to students, pensioners and school children. This revenue would meet 30% to 40% of operating costs. The deficit could be collected by the authority from rating or land tax on the area served by the transport authority.

Such a policy would need to be introduced gradually over a number of years so that necessary expansion of public transport facilities could be made to cater for increased traffic. A reduced level of expansion or activity in the motor manufacturing and servicing industries which might result would require planned re-adjustment with compensation for workers and garage owners or lessees displaced from work.

Reduced revenues from petrol tax, a major source of road funds, would hardly affect road funds to local authorities as the level of expenditure on freeways and expressways would eventually be reduced.

The proposals above are not going to solve all the problems of our cities. They have many others. The writer still believes that whatever form the future city takes, public transport must be the main means for travel.

BARRY PETERKIN.

PRESERVING OUR SURFING BEACHES

THE GOOSE that lays our golden sand is the foredune. It is golden sand, literally and symbolically, for the eyes tell us so and it brings gold in the form of dollars to many. Yet, in our blindness and stupidity we are killing the donor which supplies this asset free. What is more, after storms, our donor will replace the sand that is lost free, once again.

Even if we have not the ability to read the seascape, beach erosion experts are repeatedly presenting the lesson to us — free again. Yet, we remain stubborn and determined to throw away our heritage, level our dune system and lose the golden sand of our beaches.

Why? Many reasons are given. The space is needed for car parking, playing fields, etc. Listen to Mr. C. Carey, MLA for Albert, which includes the Gold Coast, as he was reported in the Gold Coast Bulletin:

“Mr. Carey said he wanted to thank the Mines Department for the way sand-mining was conducted along the Gold Coast. Sandhills had been turned into very beautiful playing fields, minerals had been mined and the State had received the benefit of this export trade. The Gold Coast, in turn, had received the benefit of having the land improved, Mr. Carey said.”

The Premier of Queensland, Mr. G. F. R. Nicklin, MLA for Landsborough, which includes the beaches from Caloundra to Maroochydore on the Sunshine Coast, is of the same opinion. The Nambour Chronicle reported him as saying:

“Until recent years, beach mining was frowned upon socially as a despoiler of beaches, but the companies now operating on a big scale planned
elaborately for the restoration of dredged areas before beginning operations. By the use of new techniques for the restoration of dredged areas, dredged land, whether on ocean frontages or in back areas, is returned to a condition far better than it was originally.”

Local authorities support these views, as the Courier Mail reported:

“The Gold Coast City Council will support a protest to the Lands Department about the 'menace' of the sandhills at Broadbeach, near Lennons Hotel. The Council agreed yesterday to join the Chamber of Commerce in urging the Government to level the area. The Chamber describes the area of sandhills as an 'eyesore'. The Council will forward to the Department of Health a report from its medical officer, which says that the dunes are a health hazard, being near a school.

“In a stiff wind, the sand is blown about and can cut the skin and sting the eyes. In the case of school children, it is obvious that cut lunches must be polluted”, the report says.

The possibility of re-stabilisation by vegetation was not mentioned in this report.

Wherever one looks at beaches, north or south of Brisbane, destruction of the foredunes is synonymous with 'development'. Concurrently with this urgent desire of authority to eliminate all the 'ugliness', 'waste space', 'untidiness', 'health hazard', etc., is the problem of beach erosion.

Strangely, the powers in control see these two matters as quite separate and entirely unrelated. It is analogous with the primitive aborigine not associating copulation with birth. The uneducated do not see beach erosion as the result of dune removal, and this is despite the advice of experts, commissioned at the expense of the taxpayer.

The Queensland Government engaged the services of a Dutch expert, Dr. Diephius, of the Delft Water Research Laboratories in Holland, who advised that special attention be given to sand dunes protection, also minimising of pathways through the dunes. In Holland the sand dunes are so important as a buffer between the sea and the land that walking on them is entirely prohibited. This is also the case on some American foreshores where, at great expense, the foredunes have had to be rebuilt with sand pumped from a distance.

Further advice, along the same lines, entirely disregarded by most local authorities has been issued to them by the co-ordinator General's Department, in a paper entitled "Beach Preservation-Basic Principles", a document prepared for the guidance of local authorities and others interested in beach erosion problems. This is summarised with the following advice.

1 Limit permanent development works within a barrier zone behind the frontal dunes, and at all costs preserve the frontal dunes.

2 Limit the removal of vegetation from dunes and replant bare areas with naturally occurring grasses and shrubs.

3 Where dunes have been destroyed, try to assist their regrowth by mechanical means, re-vegetation, brush fences, etc.

4 Do not undertake, nor allow the undertaking of any permanent works on a beach in the nature of sea walls, groynes, jetties, etc., without thorough investigation by competent authorities.

5 Limit sand removal from all parts of the beach and the frontal dunes.

The above document was sent to local authorities in April, 1966; since
then there has been no change in the pattern of destruction. In fact, since then, on the Sunshine Coast, foredunes have been razed along the following beaches:— Kings, Buddina, Mooloolaba, Maroochydore, Mudjimba, Marcoola and Noosa, which are the responsibility of the Shires of Landsborough, Maroochy and Noosa.

Only one local authority, the Caboolture Shire Council, has implemented the advice and carried out anti-erosion works on Bribie Island, which are proving most beneficial in rebuilding the island’s beaches.

During Cyclone Dinah, in January of this year (1967), although the seas were not as destructive as in many previous cyclones, waves broke through the lowered dunes in many places. To uneducated minds this was not the result of man’s destructive practices, but shrugged off as ‘cyclonic damage.’

At Noosa, plans are being prepared for rebuilding the beach by pumping sand from the river mouth, yet, at a recent (March) meeting of the local Chamber of Commerce it was suggested that when the frontal dune was rebuilt it be used as a parking area and a toll levied on the cars using it.

Also in March, the last of the foredune was removed from Kings Beach, Caloundra, to reclaim a swampy section on the inside of the Spit, which is used as a parking space.

Some people never learn. Can they be taught?

To finish this sad story with a message of hope: there are pressure groups within the beach communities working hard and intelligently on a program of education, lobbying and research on the selection and cultivation of foreshore vegetation.

The Government is conducting an offshore hydrological survey and has promised legislation to create a foreshore authority within the Department of the Co-Ordinator General.

All that will be needed then will be that rather rare attribute — the strength and determination to make good legislation effective. Time is not on the side of the conservation of our precious heritage — our golden sand beaches.

KATHLEEN MCArTHUR

ART AND THE WORKERS

MAY I be allowed space to add to some lines of thought developed by Ralph Gibson in his article on art in ALR 4/66?

Many Australian artists accept a political and class commitment, although it can be recognised that the great majority do not become active members of any party or accept a continuing commitment to political causes.

Artists of the Left, including communists, see a need to centre their art on working class attitudes and ideals and devote their talents to help the campaigns of the organisations of the working class. They follow tracks already blazed and their work develops the strong democratic and humanist strain in the Australian art tradition.

But a paradox appears to exist. The worker is not an eager participant in the art created by the Left artists nor is he a regular patron of the so-called ‘serious’ arts (theatre, ballet, graphic arts, literature, etc.).

Some artists, trying to bridge the seeming gap between the worker and themselves, have used ‘plain’ form and didactic content. Their intentions
were good but the results were often bad art.

Doesn't the answer lie in this? That the working class has been seen too often through the lenses of dogma and preconceived ideal? Seen as deprived souls with an instinctive love for the arts which is thwarted by capitalism? But there are few impediments in our major cities today to the worker who wishes to enjoy theatre, ballet, a film or symphonic concert. High prices can be mentioned (and there is a case for the right to enjoy the arts at cheaper rates of admission), but cost has not kept the worker away from the Moscow Circus or the film Sound of Music where they have appeared in Australia.

By and large we have failed to give due recognition to the fact that since 1945 the working people in Australia have grown tremendously in numbers and diversity; diverse in jobs and occupations, but also in their interests in art, hobbies, sports and intellectual pursuits. Among them must be counted great numbers of migrant workers of different cultural backgrounds and a vastly increased proportion of skilled and professional workers with higher education.

What section of this diverse mass at any one time has the Left artist tried to impress? Generally, the main approach has been to the 'established', the industrial worker. But these sections of the working people have not been seen exactly as they are, with specific tastes and cultural preferences, and this has led to failures in the work of the Left artists.

It should now be recognised that the industrial worker has no special interest in the 'serious' arts. The regular audiences for these art forms (and the artists who sustain them) would be found to come from the middle sections of the population. The industrial worker does not generally patronise or participate in these forms of art.

Capitalism induces corruption in art and depravity in taste and these affect all classes in its society. The arts, and the development of taste, have to struggle for survival in an alien atmosphere. Classes or sections of classes only come seriously towards art when they are acting for social change or when they are struggling to establish an identity. Even then it may be a random rather than an automatic activity. The revolution in Cuba would seem to have succeeded without a parallel activity in art.

The Australian worker (in the 'accepted' sense) was more interested in art for himself and his class at the turn of the century than he is today. Among industrial workers, the position was better some time ago than it is now. There were a number of union libraries, bands, film groups and so on.

But none of this is to say that the industrial worker has no interest in art, but only to recognise that he does not have the interest in arts that the Left artists would like him to have. We must consider the great spread of the so-called 'popular' arts which is the result of technological change (radio, film, television, paperback publishing, etc.) and the fact that for great numbers of people these arts satisfy a need for entertainment and relaxation. A visit to the rapidly growing phenomena of the club-beergarden-cabaret shows how many of our industrial workers and their families now seek entertainment and relaxation after a week's work.

There are some who would condemn the popular arts to a limbo of decadence; they see these arts as capitalist instruments to stupefy and indoctrinate; and they possibly see no need for the popular arts and forms of entertainment under socialism and
believe that the future socialist citizens will shun the remnants of ‘bourgeois rubbish’ and turn voluntarily to the ‘serious’ arts for their enjoyment.

It cannot be denied that the popular arts contain much debased and vulgar content; much that is inimical to the interests of the working people because they express the ethics and mercenary values governing the capitalist system.

But should we mistake this quantity of tainted content for the form? Some Left artists would take a stand completely opposed to the popular art forms and counterpose the attraction of ‘working class’ art, offer folksong as an alternative to pop song, etc., and hope to win audiences away from ‘reactionary’ art.

Again, these artists would set up a rigid dividing line between ‘working class’ art and the popular arts and say that we cannot step over this division in form and style without betraying our artistic principles and contaminating ourselves with the ‘bourgeois poisons’.

The task of marking boundaries in art is a delicate one. We have had to pull down fences before this, with due embarrassment to ourselves. Jazz provided one occasion.

The Left artist must come to the use of the art forms that the worker enjoys and try to imbue them with a worthwhile content. Of course, some artists, recognising what the worker enjoys in the popular arts, step back in horror to cry that he is under the spell of capitalist corruption and depravity.

But don’t we often make shortsighted and prejudiced judgments on what is depraved and corrupted? Is Beatle-type music corrupt? Are all pop songs and their singers worthless? Are the Twist and its offspring depraved dances? How should we judge the Young Labor Association in Brisbane for sponsoring a Go Go dance team?

When we try seriously to study what we have meant by depravity and corruption, don’t we find that a lot of our ideas are shaped by conservative habits of thought, by tendencies to reject all that is new and original and often by fine old-fashioned prudery.

The Left artists need to gain a greater knowledge of the worker’s way of life, especially of his choice of entertainment and relaxation and his cultural likes and pleasures. This does not mean that Left artists should see their only duty owing to the industrial sections of the working people, or that they should bend all their talents to a proficiency in the popular arts.

The growing diversity of cultural interests among the working people should be recognised, and this can be contrasted with the increasing vulgarisation of the popular arts. Artists like Barry Humphries, Garth Welch and Bruce Petty might scarcely have emerged in the Australia of 1936, neither could we have foreseen the Munster Family, striptease and the James Bond films as objects of popular entertainment.

JACK PENBERTHY

NEW GUINEA EDUCATION

I FIND a great deal to agree with in J.C.’s article (ALR No. 2, 1967), however I feel that Mr. Cooper has not gone far enough.

Education in the Territory, to be viewed with any sense of perspective, must be seen in its historical context, i.e. the history of Australian administration in the Territory, particularly
the history of New Guinea. Papua and New Guinea were, up until 1941, two separate administrative units, the two administrations being motivated by two almost diametrically opposed assumptions.

1 Papua, under Sir Hubert Murray, being run on the late 19th Century line of development and protection of local indigenous society.

2 New Guinea, a Mandated Territory, run by an administration which without much digging, appears to have been at the 'beck and call' of powerful commercial interests, interested in the 'take over' of German commercial interests of the Territory.

To quote the words of Murray, an ardent critic of Australian Administration of the Mandate, "There was a tendency to regard the native as an asset, and not to consider the well being and development of the native race for its own sake, as being one of the principal objects to be aimed at by the Administration." This being the case why have education?

The history of both administrations is plagued by a total disregard, on the part of the Commonwealth Government, for the financial costs of an administrating authority charged with the task of developing a subsistence society.

A reading of Murray's correspondence with his brother Gilbert, shows:

1 Murray had trouble convincing the Federal Government that there was a placed called Papua.

2 That the policy of 'Territories must pay their own way', was crippling developmental efforts.

At the same time, the view of the Federal Government seems to have been:—

1 Murray, with his policy of native protection and development, was a nuisance, and Papua an economic loss.

2 New Guinea, a new piece of 'real estate', was to be exploited to the limit, and would have to obtain its own funds for day to day administration; while to satisfy mandate requirements, nominal funds were made available for such luxuries as education, and native agricultural programs.

UNDER CONDITIONS SUCH AS THESE, HOW CAN YOU HOPE TO INITIATE AND DEVELOP A SYSTEM OF EDUCATION?

In 1930 the bulk of education was being carried by the missions in both Territories. By 1939, expenditure on education in the Mandated Territory, was £5,000. As Ralph says:

"It does not take much reading between the lines to make one realise that the main flaw in the administration of education in the Mandated Territory lay in two facts; that it was no one's responsibility, (no one was interested?), and there was little money available."

After World War II, the new Administration took a more direct and active interest in education. However:

1 There was no basis from which to build.

2 There was still a shortage of funds, e.g. in 1950 expenditure on education was still only £303,500.

The vote to education in the year 1966-67 has risen to 15.6 million dollars, or 15.4% of the total budget. As implied by Mr. Cooper, whilst 15.6 million dollars may look a sizeable amount, the position is far from adequate. Furthermore, the figure quoted is deceiving; the money voted has to cover all education expenditure, and a good proportion of the vote is directed towards an expanding
building program of schools and teachers' colleges.

The result is that the system is 'bursting at the seams'. Primary education has, according to latest reports, reached the stage of self sustained growth. The reports say nothing about quality of the growth, or the stability of its tenure. The secondary system is being pressurised to take in more students, whilst being limited by:

- lack of funds
- a shortage of trained staff
- a dearth of facilities.

Libraries are considered a luxury, science teaching facilities ludicrous.

To make an education program effective in a developing society, one requires an all-over program of economic and agricultural development. The hard facts at the moment seem to indicate that the rate of indigenous development in these two sectors does not seem to be adequate to absorb the output of the educational system within the next few years.

Old attitudes and prejudices die hard, particularly in a colonial or pseudo-colonial society. To an established, commercial section of the European population in T.P.N.G., 'a kanaka will always be a kanaka'. To understand and feel this word and what this word connotes, one has to hear it being used.

The effect of the attitudes which lie behind the word, are to be seen in everyday life in Papua New Guinea. The recommendation made recently by 'The Highland Farmers and Settlers Association', (made up of coffee and tea planters), "That the Administration takes steps to divert indigenous farmers away from coffee production back to the production of sweet potatoes, and other native crops," seems to indicate that the tweeded Pukka gentlemen are having difficulty selling their produce on the world market, and do not want indigenous farmers to move in on what little share Papua New Guinea has of this market.

As Mr. Cooper implies, the future of New Guinea lies in agriculture. Because of this, more money should be made available for education, particularly agricultural education. But more important, steps should be taken to advance local cash crop agriculture, by a program of protection, direction and development of indigenous agricultural effort. At present no effective steps are being taken in this direction.

To most of the pupils at a High School, the school is an avenue away from the village; it is the road to the promised land of white collars, the land of the 'Kuskas'. Unfortunately not all will survive the gauntlet of the educational system, and even if they did, a land with a good supply of clerks and little else, stumbles along the hard road of development.

There is little attraction for the schoolboy to go back to the village; what can he do there but go back to being a subsistence farmer? Under the present system of education he will have learnt little agricultural method, and even if he manages to grow cash crops, and establish himself on the margin of money economy, his scope will be limited.

For the indigenous, history seems to be repeating itself; to ex-patriate, commercial interests, he is still an asset, an educated asset, but then why not? It makes the asset more productive. The Australian Government has charged itself with the trust of Papua New Guinea and the substance of this trust is to give the people of Papua New Guinea the means to come into their heritage. This means economic viability throughout the economy starting at
the village farmer; while this base is missing, and under the present system it is missing and will continue to be missing, these people will not come into their own.

A.B.

IDEOLOGY OF INTELLECTUALS

IT IS ALWAYS satisfying to find that someone thinks one's views worthwhile enough to take the trouble to argue with them, and particularly so when the reply is as reasonably worded as that by Norm Docker in the April-May ALR.

Norm Docker's opinion seems to be that the industrial working class is decisive in the movement for socialism, and that the intelligentsia or intellectually trained have only a role to play in so far as they align themselves with the industrial workers. This section of the work force can have no ideology of its own, but if they adopt the ideology of the industrial workers (old style) can be effective. This is the fundamental issue; Norm Docker's quite true statement that some intellectually trained persons are self-employed or even employers of labor is beside the point. The remarks of Joyce Clark about the non-socialist nature of the newer sections of the work-force are also true; the actions and attitudes do however represent a spontaneous development which is objectively anti-capitalist, but quite different from that of the older working class. The transformation of these spontaneous ideas into a consciously-held anti-capitalist position requires some generalisation in which marxists might assist. But it is not likely to be helped if we refuse to examine the differences in the relationship to the productive process, and hence social ideas, of the older and newer strata of the workforce. The development of the productive forces, and the division of labor, produced a class of workers who performed simple operations, and were tied to machines. The workers were brought together into large concerns, their labor was collective, and the basis was laid for a 'collectivist' and later socialist world outlook.

The article by R. Richta in the January, 1967 issue of Peace, Freedom and Socialism makes it clear that the newer sections of the workforce stand in a different relationship to the productive process. The evolution of the worker is into that of 'a highly skilled supervisor and job setter' or that of a technician servicing a whole production cycle. With the change in his role, man develops a new outlook on the world, and a new conception of himself. It is I believe in opposition to the place allocated to him by capitalism. My article in the February-March issue of ALR tried to show how new conflicts are arising, around somewhat different issues, and how these are often fought in a different style. Clearly we need the sort of factual analysis, which Richta has made, for Australia; but it would appear that the trends he indicates are occurring in Australia and there is evidence to support this. Some of the major political conflicts now occurring in Australia show the emergence of the new strata on the political scene.

Norm Docker bases himself too much on the numbers game in his attempts to reduce the significance of the changes, although not as crudely as the C.P. Congress documents. It doesn't seem that this is altogether a new argument, for Karl Marx (in The German Ideology) points out that big industry was decisive in setting the leading trend, long before the workers in big industry were the majority.
Norm Docker has criticised some ambiguities and loosenesses in my article, for which I am grateful. However, I hope that his basic argument—that the world can still be realistically examined using only the old methods and categories—is not too widely accepted. Attempts to restrict thinking to minor tinkerings with the grand scheme laid down in the past might make the marxist position seem so unreal that political opportunism might have more appeal, and I feel sure that Norm Docker and I agree on that issue.

DOUG WHITE

MORE ON THE PILL

A few comments on Dr. Finger's excellent article on The Pill.

More emphasis on the role of the pill in the emancipation of women could be made. Women can (within the limits of capitalism) plan not only their family, but also their careers.

As communists, we aim to prevent disease, and that includes mental ill health. A lot of mental ill health follows illegitimate births. Whilst I do not advocate pre-marital intercourse, it does occur, and we should not be so conservative as to not make the pill more readily available in an effort to reduce these unwanted pregnancies and the emotional problems that follow.

R. STANTON.

DOUBT ON AFFLUENCE

IN BERNIE TAFT'S interesting and stimulating article, it is stated there has been a rise in living standards over the past two decades. Is this statement based on the real value of the male award wage over forty hours? That the total income in the majority of households has risen I can accept. There has been a rise in the employment of married women, there has been a rise in overtime working (many men work full time and part time), and the wages of the younger generation have improved: all this contributes to the greater family income and (in my opinion) the erroneous conception of rising living standards. In the course of the article reference was made to the thirties; then most families depended on the male wage which did not include overtime.

It would be interesting to know whether there are any statistics on this, or whether I'm being subjective or objective.

J. M. McINTYRE

FROM BIRTHDAY COMMENTS

Congratulations on your first birthday. I like the scope and breadth of the articles. I would like to see an article on the discussions between communists and Roman Catholics.

F.H., Victoria.

Should be out monthly.

J.P., SA.

I look forward to receiving each issue. One type of material we lack is the survey-summarisation type of treatment of international affairs.

J.C., NSW.

CORRECTIONS

In John Manifold's review of Colin Roderick's book on Henry Lawson ii. the last issue, 'rhyme' (line 28, p. 76) should have read 'rhythm'.

It is also regretted that two paragraphs became transposed in Judah Water's profile of Frank Hartley.—Ed.
THE JOURNEY OF HENRY LAWSON

In this two-part article Dorothy Hewett, well-known novelist and poetess, traces Henry Lawson’s life journey from Pipeclay to Elder Man’s Lane. Henry Lawson was born one hundred years ago this month.

THE GHOST of Henry Lawson has been exhumed and reburied many times since September 2, 1922, when his State Funeral, complete with the brass band he’d always wanted, wound through the Sydney streets to Waverley Cemetery, followed by many genuine and crocodile tears. Each time the figure that emerges is a different Henry Lawson, who tends to be remade in the image and likeness of his new creator, emasculated by the Establishment, mythologized by the Left. Yet Henry Lawson endures through all these vicissitudes, which tells us something important about the man whose 100th Anniversary we celebrate this year.

Who was Henry Lawson, and what is the power of this man who refuses to lie down and die? It is one of the ironies of Australian letters that a deaf introvert became the symbol of Australian mateship, an alienated Australian became the archetypal Australian, writes Stephen Murray-Smith. How much substance is there in the romantic figure, born on the diggings, following the gold rushes, living on a ‘free’ selection, leaving school at 13, the unemployed, unlettered wanderer, the bagman, the drunk, the rugged individualist, the ‘natural’ genius, the symbol of mateship, unionism and socialism?

It is not so much that the legends are all fiction. It is what lies behind the legends that explains the paradox and the complexity of Lawson the man, and the writer; the kind of complexity mirrored in the titles given to him: The People’s Poet, Australia’s Drunken Poet, The Poet of the Great Tribe of Down and Out, The Australian Chekhov, Australia’s Gorki.

PIPECLAY

It is true that Lawson was born in a tent under a tree about a mile from Grenfell on June 17, 1867. His father, Peter Larsen (afterwards Lawson), a Norwegian ex-seaman and navigator, fol-
owed the last of the poor man's rushes to Gulgong and free
selected a barren, heartbreaking block of land at Pipeclay with a
vain hope that gold might lie under it. Lawson had a scratchy
education in bush schools until he was 13. Later, his intellectual
restlessness led him to night school in Sydney and public examina-
tions. He never got over his sense of inferiority at failing his
matriculation, not a difficult examination in those days.

At school, and later in the Sydney factories, he was Balmy
Arry, deaf, delicate, introverted, victim of incompatible parents; a
foreign father and a rebellious, gifted, neurotic mother who, them-
selves, never fitted in. It is the kind of relationship he fictionalised
many times; the man gentle, feckless, footloose, the woman, over-
bearing, neurotic, and cold. The child, withdrawn, suffering, fey
appears again and again in Lawson's stories (e.g. Brighten's Sister-
in-Law, A Child in the Dark). “I wasn’t a healthy-minded, average
boy; I reckon I was born for a poet by mistake, and grew up to
be a bushman, and didn’t know what was the matter with me—or
the world—but that’s got nothing to do with it.” (Joe Wilson's
Courtship.)

There is another paradox here. The Poet of the Bush did
not grow up to be a bushman. After his first 16 years almost all
his adult life was spent in big cities, except for his 18 months’
tramp through western N.S.W. in 1891. The landscape of Pipeclay is
the first of Lawson landscapes he made his own, the landscapes that
haunted his subconscious and provided that unforgettable symbolic
background of melancholy and quiet despair, against which the
brotherhood of man, or mateship is the only defence (e.g. Settling
on the Land, A Day on a Selection, Water them Geraniums, all the
Joe Wilson stories).

Yet this non-average boy of non-average parents was to live
through the typical triumphs and tragedies of the Australian
working class of his period, and to write out of the point of view
of that class, even creating a style to communicate with his
audience, and to make the inarticulate articulate.

Faces in the Street

Frank Hardy points out in his article, “The Genius of Henry
Lawson, Time, Place and Circumstance”, that when Lawson came
to Sydney to live after 13 years on the selection at Pipeclay, the
focus of Australian life was moving to the cities, and Lawson
moved with it. The militant labor movement, the beginnings of
industrialisation, the whole political turmoil of the late '80's was
centred at Sydney. “His writings reflect the objects as well as the
ideas of the labor movement, national as well as class ideas, nega-
tive and positive, confused and clear, reactionary and progressive,”
writes Hardy.
“It is true that he came up with the rise of the working class and went down with it, the tragedy of a time and class was his tragedy. In thirty years he saw the last of the rushes, the bitter struggle to unlock the land, and the misery of the small selector, the industrialisation of Australia, and the creation of an urban working class,” writes Stephen Murray-Smith.4

The Sydney of his youth, working for sub-contractors painting coaches, often out of work, gave him the background for stories of greasy restaurants and boarding houses (e.g. The Full and Plenty Dining Room in Going Blind), the unemployed gathering before dawn outside the Herald offices, striking matches to read the ‘Want’ ads, Arvie Aspinall and his alarm clock on a tin tray, the early Republican, Nationalist and Socialist poems; A Song of the Republic, The Army of the Rear, Faces in the Street. Utopian socialist, rhetorical, often sentimental, a crude line following a fine one. this early poetry had enormous appeal, because of its topicality, humanism and class stand, and the driving force of the style, simple, passionate, sincere.

It answered a need by a new radical literate public, and still answers that need. The continual popularity of many Lawson poems, The Men who made Australia, Faces in the Street, Second class wait Here, I’m too old to Rat, Freedom on the Wallaby, The Cambaroora Star, The Leader of the Push (parodied, some say, by Lawson himself, as The Bastard from the Bush) proves the existence of a public far removed from Lawson’s ‘cultured critics’ and their standards.

“This is not ‘high poetry’, but the passion and grip of it make it valuable and, in Australia, memorable,” wrote A. G. Stephens, editor of the Bulletin Red Page.

“Something of Lawson’s human yearning voice still comes through the poems,” writes Judith Wright. “Lawson, at his worst, can still move us.”

Years later Lawson was to say: “I have lost the thunder both far and near, the almighty sympathy, the splendid crudity and the sledgehammer force of that lonely boy’s song.”

Lawson had done what all left wing poets ever since have dreamed of doing in Australia. He brought poetry to the people. “His verses were quoted up and down the country,” says Vance Palmer in National Portraits.6

The times created Lawson’s content and style, the Bulletin was there to print his work and spread it amongst the kind of audience he came from and understood. Later there was a nationalist publishing company, Angus & Robertson, to print his collected verse and short stories.
For a moment, ‘the thunder far and near’ tended to obliterate the limitations and contradictions in the point of view of Lawson and his public, and obscured the fact that Lawson’s genius as a short story writer would leave the Bulletin school far behind in range and subtlety.

**THE CAMBAROORA STAR**

"The worst influence on Lawson’s verse was the spirit of the time he lived in, with its smugness and its hollow patriotism and its taste for violence and drum beat rhythms," writes Judith Wright.7

But ‘the spirit of Lawson’s time’ was both the best and the worst of cradles, for alongside the smugness, jingoism, and white chauvinism (especially towards the Chinese), the sentimentality, and the brutality was the spirit of radical dissent, the democratic, nationalist and socialist ideas. Lawson reflected them all. Arthur Parker, Lawson’s mate on a building job in the Blue Mountains in 1887, tells us that Lawson’s whole soul was in his writings and his hopes for socialism. “I think he would gladly have died for the Revolution.” Together the two young men went down to Sydney and joined the Australian Socialist League.

Yet this is the same man, who, back from Bourke, in 1893 was to meet Jack LeGay Brereton in the Sydney streets and say: “I know what I’m talking about. I couldn’t say it in public, because my living depends partly on what I’m writing for The Worker, but you can take it from me, Jack, the Australian worker is a brute and nothing else.”8

Lawson’s parents had separated. Louisa Lawson was running a boarding house in Sydney, a Suffragette paper, The Dawn, and leading a movement for women’s rights. Her boarding house and newspaper office were centres of radical discussion. Although Lawson nicknamed her ‘The Chieftainess’, he resented her managing ways and lack of maternal warmth, Louisa Lawson was obviously the catalyst who steered Henry into a literary life and politics. She had named him after Henry Kendall, encouraged and published his early work. In her house he met Kendall’s widow who urged him to write, and Mary Cameron (afterwards Mary Gilmore) who lent him her books.

Yet he always openly sided with the quiet, withdrawn father he immortalised in An Old Mate of Your Father’s, his first short story, and much of his pathological hatred of ‘good women’ in his last years could be traced to his mother’s dominant personality and his unhappy marriage with a woman not unlike her in many ways. “All women are natural liars but political women are worse,” he was to write in 1913.
After a short period in Albany where jobs were scarce, Lawson was offered a job in Brisbane in 1891 working on *The Boomerang* with A. G. Stephens, and the editor Gresley Lukin. Here he met William Lane and again found himself in a centre of unionism and radical discussion. “It was the first and only chance I got in journalism,” he comments, not without rancour. He conducted the ‘Country Crumbs’ column for £2 a week.

After the defeat of the Shearers’ strike *The Boomerang* collapsed, and Lawson came home to Sydney in 1892, jobless, fair into the Depression and the bank failure. From this period dates his constant theme of ‘glory in defeat’. *The Boomerang* stands in for *The Cambaroora Star*. The ALP was jockeying in the political arena. The old ideas of revolution and mateship faded against the manoeuvres of reformism and it was a far cry from the romantic fervor in his early twenties.

But the image of Lawson standing on the wharf watching *The Royal Tar*, with Lane and Mary Gilmore aboard, set sail for Paraguay and a new Utopia, is a sobering one. Lawson was never as Utopian as that. In fact, perhaps Lawson was more realistic than Utopian in this period of his life. It is interesting to note that he wrote some of his best short stories at this time, stories which depend, not on romantic rhetoric for their impact, but the opposite: economy, realism, restraint, irony, and a deep sense of tragedy.


2. ibid.


(The second part of this article will appear in the August-September issue.—Ed.)
Rex Mortimer

INDONESIA’S ECONOMIC PROSPECTS?

A graduate in law and journalist now engaged in post-graduate study at Monash University continues his analysis of the situation in Indonesia. (For previous article see ALR No. 3, 1966.)

BY DIVESTING President Sukarno of all status and executive power last March, the army-controlled junta in Indonesia has solved its most immediate political problem. The long period of dual state power has come to an end.

Even so, the junta was obliged in the end to compromise. As far as can be gathered from the extraordinarily imprecise decision of the Consultative Assembly, Sukarno retains the title, but none of the rights or powers, of President. At the same time, General Suharto has been appointed Acting President! The powerful pressures of the students, of General Nasution and his supporters, and of the stacked Parliament for Sukarno’s outright dismissal and trial were resisted by Suharto, who appreciated the delicate political balance in the country could easily be upset by too drastic action.

One of the factors that undoubtedly influenced Suharto and his advisers was the knowledge that economic discontent in the country was growing and feeding disaffection against a government that has by no means established its mandate to rule among the populace. The Indonesian people have had unpleasant experience of military rule: before, during and after the regional rebellions of 1958, army officers assumed far-reaching powers over the economy and administration and distinguished themselves mainly for their corruption, repression and arbitrariness. Suharto is by no means unaware of the simmering cauldron in the provinces; he has preserved a civilian gloss to the regime, and has moved slowly in curbing the President and his supporters. But ultimately it may well be in the economic sphere that the success or failure of the ‘New Order’ will be determined.

At the time of the military takeover in October 1965 the Indonesian economy was in a shocking state. The post-independence period was peculiarly devoid of economic rationality. The
colonial character of the economy was hardly altered; mining, oil and estate production provided the exports, light industry the manufactures, and peasant agriculture the food supply. No heavy or machine tool industries of any consequence were established; but, far worse, the existing productive sectors were allowed to stagnate or decline. Light industry, especially textiles, starved of raw materials and spare parts, declined to 20 per cent or less of productive capacity. The rubber, copra, tea and sugar estates dwindled in output through mismanagement and, more seriously, the failure to carry out the vital replanting programs on which their futures depended. Transport and communications collapsed, exports steadily fell away, while the foreign loans used to cover the trade deficit mounted to the point where interest repayments alone could not be met. (Foreign indebtedness by the end of 1965 amounted to 2,300 million US dollars.) The swollen bureaucracy, totalling some two million, including the armed forces, imposed a crushing burden which state finances were unable to support, especially since corruption and inefficiency were rife. (In 1965 government revenues amounted to only 1.5 per cent of national income, compared with 13 per cent in 1960; this was due, not to the lightness of taxes, but to the fact that they were either evaded or appropriated by officials.) Food production fell far behind the needs of a population rising by close to three million a year. The meagre survival of the country rested upon the bent shoulders of the peasant and small export crop producer.

So far the main concentration of the Suharto Government in the economic sphere has been to reassure and woo the West, to placate old creditors and attract new ones. In pursuit of this objective, priority has been given to the control of inflation, the negotiation of loan deferrals and new loans, the return of nationalised undertakings to their foreign owners, guarantees and favorable terms for capital investment, and promises to widen the scope and ease of the operations of private enterprise. In this direction, the regime has achieved modest successes: inflation has slowed down, although in the last quarter of 1966 the retail price index still rose by 33 per cent and the money supply by 32 per cent; loan repayments have been rescheduled, and small amounts of foreign capital have been forthcoming. Given the interest of the West in sustaining this impeccably anti-communist government, we may expect aid to be enlarged so long as the regime shows signs of lasting and of meeting imperialist terms, economic and political. However, no amount of aid sufficient to stimulate substantial economic development is feasible, and meanwhile the political effectiveness of foreign assistance depends on the performance not of friends abroad but of the men in power in Indonesia itself.

The key question is whether the measures being taken will be translated into economic development and betterment for the
masses of the people. On this score, the results to date are negative and the prospects dim. Economic activity has slowed down, particularly in industry and trade, including exports. There has been a marked increase in smuggling of goods into and out of the country. (*Bulletin of Indonesian Economic Studies, Australian National University, February 1967.*) Inflationary control steps have brought added misery to an already sorely tried populace in the form of price and tax increases, and harsh credit controls which have impoverished the small producers and traders. As stated by one of General Suharto’s economic advisers, Dr. Emil Salim:

Rates and charges on all public utilities such as electricity, drinking water, postal services, train, bus and air fares have been raised twenty times, and even petrol prices have been raised eight times... It has raised unemployment and high price problems. (*The Australian, April 18, 1967.*)

Combined with these have gone measures to oust the Chinese minority from their near monopoly of domestic commerce and small scale manufacture. The results have been widely disruptive, and have resulted in serious riots in Djakarta and provincial towns. Even the conservative Moslem trade union federation and the Moslem Students Organisation, both supporters of the government, have been driven to protest the price increases. In centres where anti-government sentiment is strong, seething discontent is reported.

Surabaya’s economy, and therefore the economy of the whole of East Java, is rapidly coming to a standstill. The combination of the political persecution of the Chinese community, national as well as foreign, and the Government’s tight money policy, is progressively paralysing trade not only with other countries, but with neighboring Indonesian islands and regions. Food prices in Surabaya have risen 10 per cent in the past two weeks. Interest rates are up to 30 per cent. Local factories are closing because of shortages of raw materials and rising transport costs—the direct result of the Government’s recent increase in the price of petrol. (*Creighton Burns in The Age, March 26, 1967.*)

It might be argued that these are but the pains of readjustment which will gradually pass as the government puts into effect more fundamental economic reforms. To accept this argument, however, one would have to assume two things: first, that there is a sufficient reform spirit within the government leadership to want to bring about a basic overhaul of the economy, and second, that the government will be able to make its will effective in the spheres of administration and management. Neither of these two assumptions appears likely to be borne out. That some members of the government aspire to create conditions of stability and prosperity may be conceded; the same could equally be said of President Sukarno. But no more than of him can it be said of the new power-holders as a group that they are prepared to take the drastic steps necessary to cleanse the machinery of the state, since to do so would be to run head on against the interests of those upon whose support the regime depends—the civil service
heads, army administrators, political fixers and speculators, all of whom have been battening on Indonesia's economic corpse and making fortunes from the pickings.

Certainly the regime has effected some economies. As Dr. Salim summarised them, they amount to a cut-back in expenditures to bare necessities, the abandonment of most prestige projects, and the cessation of subsidies to State and other enterprises. These are minor reforms in themselves, and no more than could be expected of any new administration in the first flush of its takeover. Sustained results are a different kettle of fish, where attention must be focused not so much on what the government claims it will do but on what the social and political structures over which it presides will make possible.

The first and most essential step towards long term stability would have to be the purification of the bureaucracy, without which no reforms can be carried through effectively over a sustained period. The bureaucrats are in a position to control everything that goes on in the economic sphere, from the collection of taxes, the distribution of supplies and the functioning of industry to the channelling of such foreign aid as may become available. Fifty per cent of this bureaucratic apparatus is redundant, but the government would find it politically impossible to scale it down to an efficient size — the prestige of higher officials depends on the size of their establishments, and complex ties of mutual interest bind the State functionaries together in a massive self-protection league. Even the student organisations which act as agitators for the army have an interest in the maintenance of the bureaucracy, since most students want to become executives in State business enterprises, where the biggest incomes are to be had. Yet without this purging of the administration, the best-laid plans of government are bound to founder in the mass of corruption which has become a way of life for Indonesia's officials. The only significant change so far in the composition of the bureaucracy is the replacement of civilian officials at various levels with army officers, in furtherance of General Suharto's dictum that "the armed forces are faced by the heavy task of becoming the nucleus of the New Order". On past experience, the only effect of these changes will be to enlarge the scale of corruption, since army men can operate with far less fear of arrest than can civilians. Relations between the military and civilian elements in the regime are not likely to improve as a result.

To make matters worse, General Suharto announced on March 31 that Indonesia's armed forces will be doubled in the next ten years, with a substantial increase of 75,000 by the end of 1968. No reason was stated for this staggering increase in an already inflated military establishment, and strangely enough the
Australian Government, which in the past was wont to comment upon the extravagance of Sukarno's armed forces, has been silent on the subject. The extra financial drain of this expansion will alone be enormous; the salaries of civilian and army officials already swallow almost half of routine expenditures, making it more than doubtful that the regime will achieve its aim of a balanced budget this year. But of even greater consequence will be the added impetus given to military intrusions into the economic and political life of the nation.

It was stated earlier that small scale production by peasants and growers of export crops has kept that economy functioning in some manner. To maintain and accelerate their contribution, the government would have to create suitable conditions of security and incentive. So far as the peasants are concerned, this would involve land reform, relief of debts, price stability and technical aid. There is considerable room for agricultural expansion in Indonesia, but the precarious position of the small-holder reinforces his conservatism and inhibits innovation. The Sukarno regime tinkered with land reform and drew up ambitious plans for technical improvement, but these were never carried through in the face of the resistance of wealthy rural interests and the disinterest of the urban elite. The new government is even less likely to tackle the problem, since it is considerably more dependent on the political goodwill of the landowning class than its predecessor. Nor has it come to the assistance of the small export crop producers. On the contrary, its credit restrictions have hit this group hardest, and the measures taken against Chinese merchants have upset the traditional channels of small scale production and trade. The Chinese alone have the connections overseas and the knowledge of external markets to act as the priming force of this basic production; and now, under the weight of persecution, they are not supplying the credit which is the lifeblood of small scale production and trade.

In summary, then, the alignment of class forces in Indonesia is inimical to economic stability and development. The power apparatus in the country serves, not as a lever of improvement, but as the major obstacle. In these circumstances, Western aid is more likely to promote Latin American patterns of instability than to put the economy on its feet. Failing a breach in the ruling coalition and the emergence of some genuine reforming movement from within the establishment, the short-term trend is almost certain to be towards more exacting demands on the populace, greater degeneration of the state apparatus, and more stringent military repression to suppress the symptoms of mass discontent.
Robert Kirk

AIDING THE THIRD WORLD

An authority on economic affairs gives the facts about aid to under-developed countries and discusses the attitude marxists should adopt.

THE MOST EXPLOSIVE 'statistic' in the world today is that the distribution of world income is becoming more and more unequal—for example, that Asia's share in world income has fallen from 17.3 per cent in 1938 to 14 per cent today. The total flow of economic 'aid' to the underdeveloped countries, which is supposed to halt the trend to inequality, amounts to a mere three per cent of the national income of the under-developed world.

One way of improving this situation is for the workers' states to step up 'aid without strings' and for socialists in capitalist countries to demand that bourgeois governments share the burden of a transfer of wealth from richer to poorer countries.

For marxists to advocate such a course, however, requires prior analysis of what would happen in the circumstances of today's concrete historical conditions if this kind of strategy were to be implemented. Among the vital questions to be asked, the following seem crucial to a marxist analysis:

What happens when an ex-colonial country receives aid?

Should economic aid aim to raise the absolute level of capital assistance or have the wider aim of bridging the gap between developed and 'developing' countries?

What is the inter-relationship or dialectical interplay between capital inflow, 'aid' and indebtedness?

What are the short-term and long-term disadvantages of 'bi-lateral' aid compared to 'multi-lateral' economic aid?

What are the pre-conditions (class structure of the society, size of public sector) for the aid to be effective in terms of raising mass living standards and encouraging independence from the penetration of imperialism and neo-colonialism?
What is the present policy of neo-colonialist bodies (bourgeois governments, World Bank, etc.) and of workers' states with regard to aid, and how should they be assessed?

**Impact of Aid on Colonial and Ex-Colonial Societies**

From the purely quantitative point of view, foreign aid can be seen as equivalent to a positive shift in the terms of trade, provided the country's capacity to import is increased. Against this, however, foreign credits (especially from bourgeois sources) must be repaid. Moreover, unless international arrangements are made to reduce fluctuations in the quantity of exports sold by underdeveloped countries and to stabilise the prices at which they are sold, these adverse trends can cancel out the effects of an inflow of foreign aid.

That is what has been happening. Data collected by various United Nations agencies point to the stark fact that the 'real' inflow of foreign capital to the developing countries in the last decade was offset by the growing burden of servicing foreign debt and the losses caused by adverse shifts in the terms of trade. During the United States recession in 1957-58, falls in the demand for raw materials and staples from the 'Third World' and the consequent disastrous shift in terms and volume of trade against underdeveloped countries cancelled out all 'aid' that had hitherto been given by multilateral agencies. Today these countries are paying their debts at a rate of 5 billion dollars a year as against less than one billion a year ten years ago. Many countries in the 'Third World' have to devote 50 per cent of the value of their exports to the amortisation of their foreign debts. The total foreign debt of the countries concerned which stood at 10 billion dollars in 1955 is expected to reach 90 billion by 1975.

Another danger arises from the class structure of demand for goods in the 'receiving' countries. While, *theoretically*, an inflow of foreign aid may be instrumental in stepping up the rate of growth in a country like India faced by the barrier of difficulty in exporting more and importing industrial goods, this result may not follow if the foreign aid is dissipated in additional consumption of luxury and 'non-growth' goods.

In evaluating foreign aid we should therefore pay due attention to its double-sided aspect, by asking:

to what extent has the inflow of foreign capital improved the recipients' balance of payments position and has the improvement been used to remove the bottlenecks in the supply of capital goods or of luxuries?

were the additional financial resources made available from abroad instrumental in raising the rate of economic growth by allowing
increased investment above the level governed by domestic savings or did they merely finance an increase in the consumption of luxuries or a higher volume of social services?

'Aid' may be considered appropriately utilised if it adds to investment other than that increasing the output of goods for consumption by ruling class groups and if it adds to consumption of essentials by the masses and/or the output of social services.

It defeats its own purpose if it releases local savings for an additional consumption of luxuries and reduces the pressure to tax higher income groups or if it fosters investment leading to an increased output of luxuries.

Then, how much aid can a country actually absorb? Two factors at least set a ceiling on the 'absorptive capacity' of the recipient country. On the one hand there is the problem of the financial capacity to service or repay the debt; unless new outlets of exports are created, servicing the debt will absorb a higher and higher percentage of foreign exchange earnings. We should never lose sight of the fact that credits are a form of postponing the payment for a delivery of goods and this payment must ultimately take the form of an export.

On the other hand, capacity to absorb foreign aid depends greatly on the availability of skilled manpower of different grades and types. That is why technical assistance and supply of foreign technicians as well as domestic investment in human resources are crucial complements of foreign economic aid in the form of credits, loans, capital grants. Political difficulties can arise in recruiting foreign technicians whose withdrawal can be disastrous.

All the above factors point to a significant conclusion: the role of foreign aid can only be effective (and, indeed, can only be evaluated correctly) in the context of an economic plan and a significant public sector which is free of 'free enterprise' interference. This point, obvious to marxists or to economists from countries with experience in comprehensive planning, is being increasingly accepted by authorities (such as J. K. Galbraith, United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, etc.) who for a long time denied the need to plan.

These considerations need to be borne in mind in evaluating capitalist economic aid to the underdeveloped countries, which is shown by the United Nations World Economic Survey for 1965 as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Outflow</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1955-59</td>
<td>$6,097m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960-64</td>
<td>$14,716m.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Bilateral Aid and Multi-Lateral Aid

The case for the kind of bilateral aid given by socialist countries is a simple one. The ‘developing’ countries have good reasons to prefer aid coming from public funds in donor countries. Such aid reduces possible pressures on the part of powerful private corporations which want to operate and seek super profits in the developing countries. Developing countries, by contrast, want to expand their public sectors—a project opposed by foreign corporations and neo-colonialists. ‘Bilateral aid’ from such sources has invariably been associated with political strings or with economic strings often wrapped up in financial forms that are not easily discernible—‘wrapping’ which is also becoming unpopular and inappropriate.

The Australian Government has concentrated on bilateral rather than multi-lateral forms of aid, but this has been mainly due to its hostility to the UN and such multi-lateral agencies as the Technical Assistance Office, the United Nations Special Fund, and the International Development Fund. Its attachment to bilateral aid is likely to increase as the phoney ‘civil aid’ to Vietnam policy is stepped up and as Australia becomes more intimately involved in the international political chess of the Pentagon.

In a more perfect world there would be a strong case for multi-lateral aid forms which better co-ordinate the variety of sources of international assistance to the underdeveloped world. In the present era, however, with an offensive by neo-colonialism through bilateral aid with strings attached, the socialist countries have little alternative but to reply with bilateral aid from their own public sectors to the public sectors of ‘third world’ countries.

An Indian economist, writing in the Economic Weekly, Bombay (April 4, 1964) noted that the World Bank insists on the ‘Bank-ability’ of projects to be financed, demanding that projects in the public sector should be tested purely by profit criteria.

Since 1964 the World Bank, as the major lever of neo-colonialism and US political interference in the ‘third world’ of Africa, Asia and Latin America, has been much more aggressive in its interference. It reserves the right to inspect and amend the development plans of countries—even those not on the capitalist road. It demands the setting up of foreign corporations in sectors hitherto in the public sector (Indian fertilisers), as well as the reduction of import controls, devaluation, and other measures aimed to weaken central economic planning and to promote the private sector against the public sector.

The Indians feel they are being bludgeoned by Washington into self-help measures which New Delhi considers unduly onerous. These include a further shift from industrial development to agriculture, acceptance of stiff terms
from foreign oil companies for construction of fertiliser plants, and de-control of food prices and distribution. (Editorial in New York Times, 22.1.67.)

The World Bank follows in more indirect and sophisticated ways, the more openly brutal policies of the US Government. A similar role has been played by the International Monetary Fund in Indonesia, Argentina, Chile and Brazil.

Many humanitarians (such as people involved in the ‘Freedom from Hunger Campaign’) tend to welcome any kind of assistance to the underdeveloped world without carefully analysing the activities of the World Bank and their own bourgeois governments in the aid field; invariably also they fail to examine the class structure which ultimately determines whether such aid is used. It is up to Marxists to point to these realities whenever the drum-beats of such campaigns are heard. Otherwise humanitarians can be misled into believing that effective assistance is being given when in fact it is not; otherwise the ‘capitalist road’ of Asia can be assisted rather than the ‘socialist road’.

Soviet aid is crucial in this context, and its beneficial effects can be introduced into the discussion of this whole question. Professor K. N. Raj of the Delhi School of Economics, in his 1965 lectures Indian Economic Growth: Performance and Prospects sums it up this way:

> It is only in the case of loans from the Soviet Union that aid has been closely tied up with trade, and this has produced good results. Though the annual servicing burden on Soviet loans has been nearly 12 per cent, the rapid expansion in exports to the Soviet bloc has made it possible to meet liability without much difficulty. In fact Soviet aid is really in the nature of trade credits tied only to more trade and this is advantageous to both the lending and receiving countries. (p. 23).

The recent downward trend in the cost of foreign credits to underdeveloped countries can, actually, be ascribed to the action of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries which not only broke the western monopoly for the supply of industrial equipment to the former colonial and dependent countries (Soviet exports of complete industrial plants to credit-receiving countries rose from $1m. in 1955 to $300m. in 1963) but introduced and generalised the practice of giving loans repayable in 12 years and bearing a low rate of interest of no more than 2.5 per cent.

Socialist bloc aid, especially since 1955, has been considerable and has increased in the South-East Asia region: in 1955 the total amounted to $145m. rising to $275m. in 1964. The total for 1955-64 was $2,579m.

By contrast, “what obviously distinguishes Australia from the major donors is that she is small. On a generous reckoning Australia is this year contributing no more than 1½ per cent of the world total of aid to developing countries.” (Arndt, Joseph
Australian expenditure on foreign aid of all forms is $100m., or two-thirds of one per cent of the national income. This places Australia, among Western Nations, well behind France (1.9 per cent) and two smaller comparable countries, Belgium (0.9 per cent) and Holland (0.8 per cent)—and two-thirds of official aid is net government expenditure by the colonial authorities in New Guinea! The obligation assumed by developed countries at the UNCTAAD conference in Geneva was to raise their contribution to at least 1 per cent of national income.

Australia is far from achieving this target, and only a third of the Australian contribution goes to Asia—$13m. to Colombo Plan and the South-East Asia Treaty Organisation plus a part of the $19m. contribution to the World Bank and UN agencies.

**Conclusions**

There are considerable economic benefits for 'neo-colonialist' capital exporters from 'aid'. Profits can increase because unused capacity in the domestic economy is reduced by the giving of capital goods in the form of aid. Because the economic growth of capitalist advanced countries can be improved by the giving of aid, or at least their economic health can be maintained, this ultimately prevents any reduction in the gap in the rates of economic growth between donor and recipient countries. It is therefore unlikely that a 'bridging of the gap' is feasible, and 'developing' countries will never 'overtake' the developed countries while ever capitalism retains any industrial dynamic in the West. The most that can be achieved is a higher absolute level of income per capita in Asia, Africa and Latin America. Ultimately this depends on massive flows of aid from the socialist countries that will help to strengthen the public sector and social investments in recipient countries.

The low rates of interest barely cover the expenses of the organisation entrusted with preparation and implementation of the aid programs (G. M. Prokhorov, *Peaceful Co-existence and the Underdeveloped Countries*, Moscow 1965, p. 132). It can be expected, therefore, that their current re-evaluation of aid programs will place less importance on aid as loans and credits and more stress on 'aid through trade'—to help 'developing' countries to exchange domestically produced commodities for socialist investment goods, thereby helping the growth of traditional exports. The trend shown in the statistics below can be expected to alter and the 'aid' will increase in size, while being more unobtrusive and more closely intertwined in trading agreements.

Total commitments of bilateral economic assistance to underdeveloped countries can be seen to have increased substantially,
whether we compare the figures for particular years, or the totals over four-year periods. Thus:

(a) 1955 - $162m.  
1964 - $1246m.

(b) 1955-59 - $2253m.  
1960-64 - $3776m.

Total $6029m.

The volume of assistance to individual countries is indicated by the total credit of $1014m. extended to India by the socialist countries during the period 1955-64.

The strengthening of the public sector through aid and favorable trading arrangements with the centrally-planned economies is the \textit{sine qua non} of successful development through aid. The result of ‘Freedom from Hunger’ donations, IMF loans, World Bank loans and Western bilateral aid, has, by contrast, been mainly the propping up of a number of conservative, feudal and fascist governments which can be relied on to respect foreign property enclaves. In short, the aim or result of most of these aid programs has been to perpetuate the system that makes aid necessary. Much of the aid has been on financial and political terms which are building up a Latin-American situation for the future in Asia and Africa.

Marxists can certainly put pressure on bourgeois governments to increase aid flows to the public sector of the recipient country. Ultimately, however, only the aid of the socialist world will be able to get the job done in a way that ensures national independence and expanded trading opportunities for ‘developing’ countries.

\textbf{SINCE THE ABOVE WAS WRITTEN,} the Conference of ECAFE (Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East) has been held in Tokyo. The following extracts from the discussion on “The Economic Situation in Asia” are typical of the views of many delegates:

I. G. KHAN (Pakistan) warned that in Pakistan and other Asian countries, debt accumulation threatened to reach a stage at which loans would be used only to repay debts.

UBA SHWE (Burma) stated that Burma’s efforts at increasing the production of primary commodities had been largely frustrated by the twin burdens of debt services and the higher cost of plant equipment and fertiliser.

HIROSHI KITAMORĀ (Chief of ECAFE Research and Planning Division) said the ECAFE region as a whole was falling behind what had seemed to be reasonable expectations of development compared with the preceding five years, a slowing down rather than a speeding up of development.
The president of the Communist Party in Victoria continues the discussion on political parties under socialism.

IT MIGHT HAVE BEEN EXPECTED that the article “Socialism: Only One Party?” by Eric Aarons (ALR No. 4, 1966) and the concept projected in the Documents for the 21st Congress of the Communist Party of Australia relating to socialist political democracy, would have received more comment. This is an area over which socialist thinking will be forced to range for a long time. On this question we are confronted by the experiences of the USSR (all of which should be carefully analysed in this 50th anniversary year), China and other socialist countries, the fears, misconceptions and hostility of many Australians, the large remnants of bigoted, rigid attitudes among most leftwing advocates of socialism, and the fact that socialist transformation has yet to be embarked upon in the circumstances of a country like ours.

Communists daily meet with the argument that socialism as yet practised in the world seems to mean, as well as economic advances and elimination of exploitation, a monopoly of political power in the hands of the communists, a lack of democracy, political opposition and real rights of criticism. Surely such questioning must be seriously regarded in the light of the democratic abuses under Stalin and the current happenings in China!

The criticism of Stalin, there is no need to hide this, has left rather deep traces. The most serious thing is a certain degree of scepticism with which also some of those close to us greet reports of new economic and political successes. Beyond this, must be considered in general as unresolved the problem of origin of the cult of Stalin and how this became possible. To explain this solely through Stalin's serious personal defects is not completely accepted. There is an attempt to investigate what could have been the political errors that had contributed to giving rise to the cult . . . We do not discourage it because it helps towards a more profound awareness of the history of the revolution and its difficulties. However we advise prudence in coming to conclusions and the taking into account of the publications and research in the Soviet Union. (The Memorandum of Palmiro Togliatti, *Foreign Bulletin C.P.I.*, August-September 1964).
The reasons for the rise of Stalinism, within the development of socialist society in the USSR, seem to me clearly to reside in the conditions which gave rise to the revolution, the type of country Russia was up till then, the way in which developments occurred in the early years after seizure of power and the external threat which existed for the new socialist state in its formative years, a threat which resulted in the terrible devastation of the country in World War II.

Russian communism was born and developed as a decisive political force in conditions of tsarist autocracy. Features of that society were the lack of democratic political institutions and rights, savage reprisals against political opponents, poorly developed industry, the cultural and material backwardness of the huge mass of the population. As Lenin described, the Russian Communist Party organisation grew in conditions of revolutionary upsurge in autocratic conditions, requiring the utmost tightness of organisation, secrecy and considerable centralisation of authority.

The carrying through of the revolution, the waging of the civil war and the war against foreign armies of intervention, followed by the stupendous problem of restoration of the economy and building industry in a backward country already devastated to a considerable extent by ravages of war, in the FIRST country of socialism, extended the period of austere and harsh conditions in which the survival of a socialist government had to be secure.

The establishment of the Soviet government in 1917, contrary to popular belief, was not a very bloody affair.

The almost effortless success of the Petrograd coup... seemed to show that it indeed had behind it the vast majority of the population. The boast of the Bolsheviks that the revolution itself cost remarkably few lives, and that most of these were lost in attempts by their opponents to wrest the victory from them when it had already been won, was justified. By one of those acts of generosity which often attend the first hours of a revolution, the young officer cadets captured at the Winter Palace were allowed to go free on promising not to 'take up arms against the people any more'. Krasnov, the 'white' general... was released on parole—which he broke a few weeks later to participate in the civil war in the south; and that this clemency was no accidental freak is shown by a statement of Lenin ten days after the Bolshevik victory:

"We are reproached with using terror. But such terror as was used by the French revolutionaries who guillotined unarmed people we do not use, and, I hope, shall not use... When we have made arrests we have said 'We will let you go if you will sign a paper promising not to commit acts of sabotage'. And such signatures are given." (Lenin: Collected Works, Vol. XXII)


However, sabotage, political assassination, disruption and uprisings followed.

Faced with treason on this large scale at a moment when allied forces were landing in Murmansk and Vladivostok, when the Czech legions had begun open hostilities against the Bolsheviks, and when the threat of war
was looming on all sides, the Soviet Government was under no temptation to resort to half measures. (Ibid.)

It was with that background and in those conditions that the Bolsheviks *found themselves in a position of political party monopoly* as the civil war drew to its close.

The fiction of a legal opposition was, however, long since dead. Its demise cannot be fairly laid at the door of one party. If it was true that the Bolshevik regime was not prepared after the first few months to tolerate an organised opposition, it was equally true that no opposition party was prepared to remain within legal limits. (Ibid. p. 190.)

Carr goes on to claim that the three main developments marking the period between the revolution and Lenin's death were the increase of authority in the hands of a small central party leadership; the transformation of the party from a revolutionary organisation directed to the overthrow of existing institutions into the directing nucleus of a governmental and administrative machine; and, finally, the creation for it of a monopoly position through the elimination of other parties. (Ibid. p. 191.)

It is interesting to note that political opposition existed, and was allowed to exist, during the blackest days of the civil war. Carr devotes many pages of his history to demonstrating this point. The Kadet newspaper *Svoboda Rossii* was still being published in the summer of 1918, Menshevik papers likewise. The Mensheviks had party offices in Moscow in 1920 and in local Soviet elections of that year 46 seats in the Moscow Soviet and 250 in Kharkov. In August 1920 a Menshevik Congress was held in Moscow and reported in the Soviet press.

However, the bulk of political opposition took the form of armed revolt and was dealt with accordingly.

The association between party and state directly involved the party in every national crisis, and transformed every call for national unity and national leadership into a call for party unity and loyalty to the party leader. To close the ranks was, for the party as for the nation, the natural reaction to the national danger. Nor was it possible to separate Lenin the party leader from Lenin the leader of the nation. The ascendancy which he exercised was one of moral authority rather than of external power. But it helped to establish in the party, as well as in the state, a tradition of personal leadership which it was difficult to shake off. (Ibid. p. 192-193.)

Thus the foundations of the one party system arose on the basis of particular historical conditions in the first country to undertake socialist transformation. It was against the background of all these circumstances that the distortions of the Stalin period emerged, distortions which are not at all inherent in socialism, inevitable or desired. But the existence of the one party system in the Soviet Union had a deep effect on the world communist movement and the subsequent development of its ideological outlook because of the prestige of the Soviet Union, its tremendous successes, and the dominance of the ideas of Stalin over a long period.
The controversy with the German Communist leader Rosa Luxemburg in 1919 reveals both aspects of the problem. On the one hand, Lenin and others felt that she assisted the ideological campaign against them by giving inadequate weight to the fact that the Bolsheviks had no alternative at the time to the course of action they took. This view is supported by Carr, reviewing the events from a non-communist standpoint years after, and the brutal murder of Rosa Luxemburg herself by German reaction in 1919 was a further stark revelation of the realities of the times. On the other hand, Rosa Luxemburg’s warnings on the dangers inherent in the measures taken, unless they were very consciously seen as being a particular response to particular conditions, were very prophetic.

Everything that happens in Russia is comprehensible and represents an inevitable chain of causes and effects, the starting point and end term of which are the failure of the German proletariat and the occupation of Russia by German imperialism. It would be demanding something superhuman from Lenin and his comrades if we should expect of them that under such circumstances they should conjure forth the finest democracy, the most exemplary dictatorship of the proletariat, and a flourishing socialist economy. By their determined revolutionary stand, their exemplary strength in action, and their unbreakable loyalty to international socialism, they have contributed whatever could possibly be contributed under such devilishly hard conditions.

The danger begins only when they make a virtue of necessity and want to freeze into a complete theoretical system all the tactics forced upon them by these fatal circumstances, and want to recommend them to the international proletariat as a model of socialist tactics. When they get in their own light in this way, and hide their genuine, unquestionable historical service under the bushel of false steps forced upon them by necessity, they render a poor service to international socialism for the sake of which they fought and suffered; for they want to place in its storehouse as new discoveries all the distortions prescribed in Russia by necessity and compulsion—in the last analysis only by-products of the bankruptcy of international socialism in the present world war.

Rosa Luxemburg: The Russian Revolution.
(Extract from The Marxisits by C. Wright Mills).

With the emergence of Stalin’s ideological dominance the weakness noted by Rosa Luxemburg did great harm to the communist movement, giving rise to dogmatic ‘copying’ which led many influential communists to believe that the ‘classical’ Russian methods of carrying through a socialist revolution, consolidating its strength, the method of party organisation, Stalin’s attitude to opponents within the party, etc., was holy writ.

Such ‘old’ conceptions are now greatly shaken. Of necessity much re-thinking is occurring and there are serious attempts to return to the really classical approaches of Marx, Engels and Lenin. It is characteristic of Lenin’s range of vision that in November 1918 while vehemently defending the Bolshevik policy from the criticism of Kautsky he wrote:

It should be observed that the question of depriving the exploiters of the franchise is purely a Russian question, and not a question of the dictatorship of the proletariat in general . . .
And it must be said now that the question of restricting the franchise is a nationally specific and not a general question of the dictatorship. One must approach the question of restricting the franchise by studying the specific conditions of the Russian revolution and the specific path of its development. (The Proletarian Revolution and the Renegade Kautsky—Lenin’s emphasis)

Lenin was here writing of the franchise, but the same attitude surely should apply also to political parties, opposition and the rights of criticism.

Enforced curtailments of democracy such as these enacted after the revolution in Russia must be of only a temporary character and need only arise in particular circumstances.

Freedom for supporters of the Government only, for the members of one party only—no matter how big its membership may be—is no freedom at all. Freedom is always freedom for the man who thinks differently. This contention does not spring from a fanatical love of abstract ‘justice’ but from the fact that everything which is enlightening, healthy and purifying in political freedom derives from its independent character, and from the fact that freedom loses all its virtue when it becomes a privilege . . .

The suppression of political life throughout the country must gradually cause the vitality of the Soviets themselves to decline. Without general elections, freedom of the Press, freedom of assembly, and freedom of speech, life in every public institution slows down, becomes a caricature of itself, and bureaucracy rises as the only deciding factor. No one can escape the workings of this law. Public life gradually dies, and a few dozen party leaders with inexhaustible energy and limitless idealism direct and rule . . . in the last resort cliquism develops a dictatorship, but not the dictatorship of the proletariat: the dictatorship of a handful of politicians, i.e. a dictatorship in the bourgeois sense, in the Jacobin sense . . .

(Rosa Luxemburg: The Russian Revolution, quoted in Rosa Luxemburg by Paul Frolich.)

Despite the by-paths along which the Bolsheviks were forced, and the additional serious distortions and malpractices developed under the Stalin regime, socialism of the USSR demonstrated during that time phenomenal virility and viability. In his famous criticism of Stalin and the Stalin period in the USSR, Isaac Deutscher in 1948 made this point very clearly.

The nation has, nevertheless, advanced far in most fields of its existence. Its material apparatus of production, which about 1930 was still inferior to that of any medium-sized European nation, has so greatly and so rapidly expanded that Russia is now the first industrial power in Europe and the second in the world. Within little more than one decade the number of cities and towns doubled; and her urban population grew by thirty million. The number of schools of all grades has very impressively multiplied. The whole nation has been sent to school. Its mind has been so awakened that it can hardly be put back to sleep again. Its avidity for knowledge for the sciences and the arts has been stimulated by Stalin’s Government to the point where it has become insatiable and embarrassing. It should be remembered that, although Stalin has kept Russia isolated from the contemporary influences of the West, he has encouraged and fostered every interest in what he calls the ‘cultural heritage’ of the West. Perhaps in no country have the young been imbued with so great a respect and love for the classical literature and art of other nations as in Russia . . . Nor can the fact be ignored that the ideal inherent in Stalinism, one to which Stalin has given a grossly distorted
expression, is not domination of man by man, or nation by nation, or race by race, but their fundamental equality. Even the proletarian dictatorship is presented as a mere transition to a classless society; and it is the community of the free and the equal and not the dictatorship that has remained the inspiration. Thus, there have been many positive, valuable elements in the educational influence of Stalinism, elements that are in the long run likely to turn against its worst features.


The period since Stalin's death has been marked by strenuous endeavors to overcome whatever deficiencies hampered socialist development in the earlier period.

Today Communist Party policy in Australia must be based on the concrete situation of Australia, which is vastly different from the Russia of 1917 or the China of 1949, and on the fact that world politics and the international situation, because of the strength of socialism in the world, have changed greatly since the revolutions undertaken in the abovementioned countries. Realisation of this has, perhaps, been slow in crystallising.

Additionally many communists have in practice assumed a marxist approach to be merely the understanding and implementation of the writings of Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin, Mao Tse-tung. Such a view is in fact contrary to marxism which demands the concrete examination of concrete facts; its founders always warning that their outlook was not a dogma but a guide to action needing application in constantly changing circumstances. Until such misconceptions are overcome, 'marxist thought and analysis' will be a caricature of marxist thought and analysis.

Hence in an advanced, highly industrialised, capitalist democracy such as Australia, it is necessary to view the transformation to a socialist society and the process of building and consolidation of socialism as being undertaken not by the Communist Party and its supporters alone, but by a coalition or alliance of parties and groups, and that political opposition and political party opposition must be guaranteed. The laws of the day will have to be observed. Those who break them will have to be dealt with.

The Italian Communist Party speaks of the prospect of a socialist, pluralistic, democratic society, not a centralised one, not controlled by bureaucracy and not identified with the power of a sole party.

We propose the collaboration of several parties, as we believe that this collaboration is not only important at this stage of striving for power but also in the holding of power. These are all elements which guarantee democracy and also guarantee that the economic, political and ideological necessities of the working class will be expressed in this alliance. (Luigi Longo: *Foreign Bulletin I.C.P.*, October and November, 1966.)

The resolution of the 18th Congress of the Communist Party of France held in January this year states:

In its 16th and 17th Congresses (the Communist Party of France) declared
itself for a lasting co-operation between Communists and Socialists, not only in the present fight for a genuine democracy but tomorrow, in the setting up and building of socialism. It rejected the thesis of a one party system as a necessary condition for the socialist revolution and declared itself for a plurality of parties, guaranteed by the Constitution of the new regime.

The rights of the minority will be exercised within the framework of the new legality established by the majority in a democratic way.

Australia is neither Italy nor France, but both are countries similar in many respects to our country.

Before socialism becomes a possibility here, and indeed before a 'coalition of the left' to work for socialism is realisable, vast changes in political thinking and alignments need to occur. Nonetheless, clarification of attitudes towards the long range objectives is essential in order to 'free' thinking, attitudes and actions to make the objectives realistic. Therefore communists desire and work for dialogue amongst all left forces, unity in action around programs for reforms of all kinds and debate about ultimate objectives and the ways of their possible fulfilment. In all this the problems concerning democracy under the new society envisaged must loom large.

**DECIPHERING THE GENETIC CODE**

... we know chemically the material of the genes ... (and) we know how this chemical structure enables them to store all the information which directs the inherited development of the individual. In other words, we have some very definite and important clues about the code—the genetic code—in which the information is stored and used.

(This) represents a triumph of investigation, thought, logic and reason ... this triumph of thought, logic and reason represents to my mind the antithesis of appeal to the superstitions and supernatural. It shows us the place of life as part of the atomic and molecular universe, and the place of man as part of nature. Therein it represents the proper intelligent advance over the beliefs in the gods of the Greeks. All the birds in ancient Greece sacrificed to Aesculapius would not have one iota of effect on an hereditary disease, but now we understand the nature of the deficiency, and some day may be able to do something about it.

From an article by R. N. Robertson, Professor of Botany with the University of Adelaide, in the Medical Journal of Australia, October 1, 1966.
THE SCIENTIFIC & TECHNOLOGICAL REVOLUTION

Recently the Communist Party and Academy of Science of Czechoslovakia sponsored the formation of a large research team to compile a study "Social and Human Relations in the Context of the Scientific and Technological Revolution". The following article by an eminent Czech philosopher is based on this study, and is republished, slightly abridged, from the journal Peace, Freedom and Socialism.

THE COMMON DENOMINATOR of the multiform processes presently under way in the developed industrial countries is the steady and ever more rapid advance of science and technology. The very profile of industry is undergoing change, so too are the actual forms of labor, the way of life; the dimensions of time and space are compressed, man-made environment is replacing the natural, opening to man new areas of both the microcosm and the macrocosm; in a word, man's place is changing in a world that he himself has changed. If we regard these material conditions of human life as the foundation of civilisation, it can be said that we have reached the frontier between two epochs.

The substance of the revolution under way is not easy to perceive at first glance; indeed, it often presents only a vague and deformed semblance.

A declaration issued by 26 scientists and other specialists, among them Linus Pauling, Ben. B. Seligman and Gunnar Myrdal, and headed "The Triple Revolution", says this of the present scientific and technological revolution: "Neither Americans nor their leaders are aware of the magnitude and acceleration of the changes going on around them... Mankind is at a historic conjuncture which demands a fundamental re-examination of existing values and institutions."

Marxism came into the debate on the new developments in the late fifties when John Bernal, S. G. Strumilin, Victor Perlo, K. Tessmann and others characterised the changes taking place in contemporary civilisation as a "scientific and technological revolution". The thesis contained in the programme of the CPSU that "man is entering upon a scientific and technological revolution" is, we believe, one of the cardinal precepts of modern Marxism.
Changes in the Structure and Dynamics of Productive Forces

The term "scientific and technological revolution" is now established usage in the vocabulary of modern science. It is used in the "forecast for 1985" by a group of French economists. And the US National Commission on Technology, Automation and Economic Progress prefaces a report with the statement that the "world is experiencing a scientific and technological revolution."

The growth of civilisation over the last 150-200 years had its roots in the industrial system of production. Today, however, we can see in those countries where the industrial civilisation is at its peak new processes transcending the boundaries of this civilisation. The future belongs to the scientific and technological revolution, which is laying a new groundwork for civilisation. Although these two historical types of civilisation are interconnected and mutually interactive, they differ in the matter of intrinsic content and, in their social and human connotations, they are even contradictory.

Industrialisation, which was accompanied by structural changes in the production base and by corresponding changes in social relations, proceeded on the foundation of two independent, diametrically opposed social productive forces: increasingly more efficient and complex machines, on the one hand, and a steadily growing army of labor, on the other.

Although the production base of the industrial civilisation was dynamic, the changes affected mainly the instruments of labor—means of production. Mechanisation fragmented the labor process, making it the sum of simple abstract elements. But even if the technical forms of production changed, the essentially dual structure of the productive forces remained the basis of industrial civilisation.

What really distinguishes the modern processes from those of the industrial revolution is the much deeper changes which they bring into the structure and dynamics of the productive forces. Modern civilisation develops on the basis of a far wider range of social productive forces, among which science and its applications in technology, management, training of skilled personnel, and so on, are acquiring ever greater, and in the long run decisive, importance. True, the industrial revolution enabled science to make its entry into production, but it found only a limited application; it remained something brought in from without.

As science penetrates into the various spheres of production, technology tends, step by step, to replace the simple labor power of man, with his limited physical and emotional powers and mem-
ory in production proper. Production becomes an automatic process set in motion by man and, consequently, controlled by him. Man, as Marx foresaw, "takes his place alongside the production process" whereas formerly he was its "main agent." Not only the means of labor (technological revolutions) but also the objects of production (use of new types of raw materials) and not only the objective means of production but also the subjective, human factor change. When the scientific and technological revolution emerges from its initial stage its true purport will be revealed—a universal and unceasing changing of all the productive forces of human society. In other words, the scientific and technological revolution is not merely a matter of technical progress.

Marxism appeared on the scene in the nineteenth century, but it was only in the mid-twentieth that the full depth of its ideological content was revealed. It is the only contemporary theory of social development which, with its concept of the productive forces, and investigating the changes taking place in their structure and dynamics, affords a reliable picture of the scientific and technological revolution. It is not by chance that a number of students of modern civilisation (Fourastie, Diebold and others) admit that the Marxist thesis concerning the influence, as they put it, of technology on society has a greater bearing on present-day realities than was anticipated. But these authors interpret Marx incorrectly when they substitute the concept "technology" for "productive forces," thereby tending to obscure the revolutionary character of the changes now taking place. If these changes are examined solely from the standpoint of technology (or energetics), disregarding the qualitative changes in the structure and dynamics of the productive forces, and in particular in the position of the "subjective factor"—man—it would be difficult indeed to define and substantiate the revolutionary character of the present and future metamorphoses of civilisation.

The Technological Revolution and Models of Growth

The dynamics of industrial civilisation were in the final analysis determined by the increase in the number of the instruments of labor (machines) and of the people tending them (labor power). Hence, from the standpoint of the theory of growth, industrialisation represents extensive development. From the standpoint of economics the character of the two basic productive forces of the industrial system is determined by the fact that the sum-total of the useful product is by and large proportional to the quantity of labor, both living and materialised, expended. In other words, to obtain a greater quantity of use values more factories, machines
and workers are needed. Capital-intensity, the relationship between capital and output, remains basically unchanged or, when living labor is replaced with machinery, grows.

Industrialisation clearly is an essential transitional phase of extensive growth which alone creates the conditions for the crystallisation of the factors of intensive development associated primarily with the application of science in all areas of production—in technology, in training personnel and in the managerial sphere alike. The significance of the intensive factors in the development of the productive forces is predetermined by their specifically economic character. "The product of mental labor—science—is always priced at far less than its value inasmuch as the labor time necessary for its reproduction is in no way comparable to the labor time needed for its initial production," Marx said. As soon as science begins to play the leading role in the development of society's productive forces, the proportions of economic development shift in the direction of intensive growth. And with Marx we might say that economic development now depends to a greater extent on the general state of science and technological progress than on the growth in numbers of the machines and men directly engaged in production. The output curve does not coincide with the curve of expenditure of living and materialised human labor in production. The capital-intensity index falls. At this stage of the development of the productive forces the growth of capital clearly ceases to be, even from the economic standpoint, a precondition for the advance of civilisation.

Despite the existence of capitalist social relations, the experience of the developed industrial countries has already confirmed this theoretical characterisation of growth during the initial stage of the scientific and technological revolution. A study made by M. Hajek and M. Toms on the basis of US data reveals the increased significance of intensive factors as a source of economic growth:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Share of extensive factors (labor force and capital)</th>
<th>Share of intensive factors (technology, skill, organisation)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1899-1909</td>
<td>74.4%</td>
<td>25.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1909-1919</td>
<td>60.5%</td>
<td>39.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1919-1929</td>
<td>54.8%</td>
<td>45.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1948-1953</td>
<td>48.9%</td>
<td>51.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1953-1957</td>
<td>31.8%</td>
<td>68.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the developed West European industrial countries intensive factors accounted for 60-70 per cent of the economic growth in the fifties. In the socialist countries, where the initial industrial poten-
tial was considerably less, economic development in the past decades has been marked by a rapid expansion of industry and by a simultaneous probing of the approaches to the scientific and technological revolution. Consequently, the considerable increase in the role of the intensive factors notwithstanding, changes in the proportions of economic growth could not assert themselves in full measure. Experience shows, however, that for a socialist country like Czechoslovakia, for instance, where industrialisation has been completed in the main, transition to intensive development is a vital necessity.

Marxist theory is now called upon to elucidate the perspectives of intensive growth in situations when the application of science to production technology (automation, chemical processes, etc.), necessitates big investments. Use of chemical processes is a form of technological rationalisation which economises capital. According to estimates by the Marxist economists C. Vincent, W. Grossin, Z. Chrupek and H. Flakierski, complex highly efficient automated units and the new technological methods (including nuclear) in the long run do not require heavier expenditure—in relation to output—than building of traditional-type industrial enterprises.

On the other hand, intensive development calls for research facilities and a backlog of scientific findings to facilitate effective technological solutions well in advance and thereby prevent the capital-intensity index from rising. This condition of intensive growth has been described by M. Keldysh, President of the USSR Academy of Sciences, as the antecedence of science to technology and of technology to industrial production—a correlation which, clearly, is an obligatory law of the scientific and technological revolution. The new ratios of economic growth naturally presuppose adjustments in the overall system of economic proportions established in the process of industrialisation.

Intensive growth, characteristic of the scientific and technological revolution, brings with it important social consequences because, as distinct from the earlier industrialisation, the accelerated economic growth does not necessitate increasing the share of accumulation in the national income or reducing the share of consumption; it can be achieved (due to the efficacy of the new productive forces) by channelling the same share, or perhaps even less, to accumulation. It is this type of economic growth that meets the intrinsic requirements of socialism.

Prospective Changes in the Character of Labor

A Marxist analysis of the changes in the structure and dynamics of the productive forces provides a sound basis for ascertaining the
impact of the scientific and technological revolution on the more deep-seated spheres of life, on the character, structure and division of labor.

Industrialisation brought human labor mostly under the factory roof. In the developed industrial countries the number engaged in industry and allied branches amounts to 30-45 per cent of the labor force. It was on this basis, more or less typical of both capitalist and socialist society, that one of the variants of the theory of the "industrial society" was evolved. In the world of today and tomorrow, according to Raymond Aron, industrial production is the typical form of production, but the onset of the scientific and technological revolution points to the relativity and limitations of this definition. The percentage of the labor force engaged in industry is as a rule, not increasing. At a certain stage the branch structure of employment tends to develop in the opposite direction.

The rapid fall in the percentage engaged in agriculture is accompanied also by a steady decline in the share of industrial workers. In the United States the share of those employed in industry and allied branches dropped from 37 per cent in 1950 to 34 per cent in 1964, and it is anticipated that by 1972 it will have dropped to 31 per cent.

The scientific and technological revolution excludes, so to say, man from direct participation in production. Inasmuch as this is accompanied by a relative increase in the service sphere, some theorists have advanced the concept of what they call the "post-industrial" (Clark) or "tertiary" (Fourastie) civilisation. These views proceed, however, from the assumption that in principle it is impossible to introduce technology in the service sphere. The scientific and technological revolution, however, is changing things in this area as well. Such spheres of the "tertiary" sector as trade and administration are being put on a technical footing. It can be assumed that after a time, when the sphere of elementary services has been saturated, there will be a steady redeployment of labor to the spheres of science, technology, computer operations, education and services in the full sense of the word. If at present the number engaged in scientific research in the USSR amounts to 2.2 per cent of the total engaged in the national economy (the percentage is 2.1 in the USA) while the share of those engaged in education and the service industries is 11 per cent, in the future the share of these groups will most likely equal or perhaps even exceed the share of those engaged in industry. If we take the trends evident in the branch structure of employment as the criterion, it will be seen that we are about to cross the frontier between the old industrial civilisation and a new era of development.
An extremely important part in the development of contemporary civilisation is played by changes in the materialised forms of labor. In the conditions of the industrial revolution simple labor became, in the words of Marx, the basis of industrial production. Mechanisation dissected labor into abstract elements. People, regarded as "things," played the role of an appendage to the machine (Friedmann). The very nature of wage labor determined its real, material forms, depriving the greater part of industrial labor of its anthropological value, "de-intellectualising" it and turning it, in effect, into a mere means of livelihood. The more productive and effective the factories became the more the role of the working man was debased.

The scientific and technological revolution opens altogether different perspectives. True, up to a point (as can be seen from the studies made by Tourain and Naville, for instance) the tendency will be for labor to be shallow in content inasmuch as its function will be to tend imperfect or insufficiently reliable automated production lines. But at the same time the "classical" labor of the machine minder will partly evolve into the labor of a highly skilled supervisor and job setter, or will be wholly excluded from the direct production cycle and become the job of technicians.

Many researchers studying employment trends have noted alarming symptoms of a decline in the demand for simple labor which threatens to assume "dramatic forms," that human labor is being squeezed out from industry and also to some extent from the service sphere. But the regressive aspects notwithstanding, the development is an ascending spiral towards a metamorphosis of the nature of man's labor. In the twenties in the USA semi-skilled workers engaged in simple operations showed the highest growth rate, while the share of skilled workers tended to decline. Today the opposite is the case. Needless to say, this process is slower and takes distorted forms where adequate social stimuli making for a higher structure of labor are lacking. Analysis of the more progressive forms of production shows that with all-round utilisation of science and technology labor tends towards more complex functions requiring the higher qualifications 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 historic 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). Whereas Marx could note that numerically speaking the educated part of the nineteenth century working class in the early phase of industrialisation was negligible, the current scientific revolution is changing the picture. In the USSR, for example, highly skilled workers, researchers and technicians, who registered a 6-7 per cent annual increase in 1940-60, are the most rapidly growing section of the working class. According to B. Levcik and F. Kutta, the share of the different categories of workers in the economy of the USA changed in 1947-64 as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Change (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Specialists</td>
<td>+5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managerial personnel</td>
<td>+2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workers in the services</td>
<td>+2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distributive workers</td>
<td>+0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manual workers</td>
<td>-4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural workers</td>
<td>-7.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Whereas the diverse types of the traditional industrial production required 35 to 37 per cent unskilled and semi-skilled workers, 60 to 33 per cent skilled workers, 4 to 8 per cent workers with a secondary education, and 1 to 2 per cent engineers with higher education, fully automated enterprises, according to computations made by J. Auerhan, make different demands on skills. In these enterprises the employment structure is as follows: 40 per cent skilled workers at most, or none at all, 40 to 60 per cent with secondary education and 20 to 40 per cent with a higher specialised education. Comprehensive automation therefore presupposes the practical abolition of the educational difference between the worker and the engineer.

While the earlier industrial revolution necessitated universal literacy—the Three Rs—modern scientific and technological revolution needs polytechnical or scientific education and opportunities for further training throughout a man's working life. Only the long-term operation of all these factors can impart to the greater part of human labor a creative character, transform it into that spontaneous activity of which Marx spoke. However, for consummation of the revolution in labor brought about by the scientific and technological revolution a revolution in social relations is essential. Only with this social revolution will the transmutations undergone by labor lead to the most far-reaching changes in man's conditions in the history of civilisation.
Changes in the Role of Man

The scientific and technological revolution imparts added impetus to production and consumption and impinges on the sphere of working and living conditions, transport, communications, work and leisure, and the rational and emotional areas of man's life. In the technical and economic conditions of the industrial system created by capitalism man was used as a rule as simple labor power. He was expected to do what he was told, and could at any time be replaced by a machine. It can be said that the significance of the human element was reduced in proportion to the degree of mechanisation.

Industrialisation in the socialist countries was attended by a shortage of means which made it difficult, if not impossible, to ensure at once a rapid growth of both production and mass consumption. The scientific and technological revolution does away with this dilemma. At a certain stage in the development of the productive forces, as the economy goes over to intensive growth, rising consumption is not only compatible with growth of production, it is as much a prerequisite of this growth as was the restricted consumption during the earlier industrialisation. New aspects of this logic of development have become manifest with increasing clarity in the USSR ever since the Twentieth Congress of the CPSU. Mass consumption in the West is based (in addition to exploiting developing and dependent countries) on analogous aspects of the dynamics of the productive forces. Some Marxist economists maintain that the shattering crisis experienced by the capitalist economy in the thirties demonstrated the significance of the connection between consumption and the then incipient trend towards intensive development. Needless to say, Western "mass consumption," as is acknowledged by both its theorists and its critics, constantly comes up against its own internal contradictions: needs are artificially created and imposed on the public to create a demand governed by its own dynamics, with the result that production for the sake of production is, in effect, turned into consumption for the sake of consumption. The fact that the arms drive in the USA can be regarded as a kind of consumer impulse to economic growth is fairly striking demonstration of one of the aspects of "mass consumption."

The moment science and its practical applications become decisive factors of growth the release of man's creative powers acquires a new social and production connotation, for the release of these powers provides the basis for research and for the applications of its findings in production. To the extent that science makes his life dynamic, man's endeavors are the driving force of civilisation. The
human factor grows in proportion to the advance of technology and the improvement of working conditions. Hence the conclusion that a higher level of technology “will enable man for the first time in history to pay the attention to himself which he rightfully deserves” (V. A. Trapeznikov). In time the most effective way of expanding the productive forces of society will be the development of the human personality for its own sake. The equivalence of the maximum development of the productive forces of society and the all-round development of man is a fundamental point of Marx’s communist humanism.

Here mention should be made of the emergence of the new areas of science, for instance, the economics of human resources. Even such expressions as “human capital” or “investment in man” are an inverted reflection of the growing importance of man’s creative powers. Similarly, sociology of human relations reveals the significance of production of aspects of life which were formerly ignored. Ergonomics is making its debut, the principle of modern anthropology are being elaborated, and so on. This widening of the horizons of social science, in which a growing role is played by Marxists, affords an idea of the nature of the tasks posed before Marxism by the scientific and technological revolution.

This revolution lays bare some of the dramatic moments in the life of the modern man. In the conditions of contemporary civilisation men become prisoners of the creations of their brains, must bow to the forces they themselves have set in motion. The artificial environment of the era of industrialisation came about not as a result of man’s planned activity, but rather as the product of his “industrial” utilisation. This environment is in every respect a long remove from the natural biological and psychological attributes of man. And if formerly man could still make his way together with Mephistopheles to the untouched and eternally green tree of life, in our days the circle of the artificial civilisation is constricting. There is nowhere to run away. Yet automation and modern means of communication, construction and so on enable man to transform a civilisation in which he is the slave to things into a civilisation which would serve his needs. A society that cannot cope with this can hardly avoid the tragic disruption of the biological and psychological conditions of human life. For the age of the scientific and technological revolution, in addition to giving people power over the conditions of their development, also puts them in possession of the means of their own self-destruction. “The development of technology has posed before man a problem engendered by his own power. Man’s existence depends on his own decision” (R. Garaudy).
Scientific and Technological Revolution and Social System

As we have said, the consequences of the technological revolution for society and for the individual will probably be even more far-reaching than the changes it will bring about in the material and technological base of society. On the other hand, as was the case with the earlier industrial revolution, it cannot be carried to the end unless it finds adequate forms of production relations and in this way becomes a revolution in all areas of civilisation.

"In each instance people won themselves freedom in so far as they were constrained and permitted to do so not by their human ideals but by the existing productive forces," so wrote Marx and Engels in The German Ideology. The very onset of the scientific and technological revolution is intrinsically linked with the emergence and affirmation of the socialist trends in the modern world. It is proof of the deepening of the social revolution, that it is steadily reaching out to the mainsprings of historical development.

It is sometimes said that science, technology and the productive forces are socially neutral factors. This is so only at times when the changes in the productive forces have not gone far enough. Actually, fundamental changes in the structure of the productive forces always have profound social implications. The industrial civilisation arose as the realisation of capitalist production relations, and vice versa. Marx spoke of the mechanical system of production whose unity was based on a system of machines—this "subject" of production which subordinated the working community to its power—as the "technological realisation" of the capitalist relations of production, as a matter of the subordination of labor to the conditions of labor. In the era of industrialisation the growth of the productive forces was ensured by developing instruments of labor rather than labor itself. This was indeed the historical mission of capitalism as a transitional form of the development of the productive forces; at the same time it revealed its historical limitations as a form that promotes production at the cost of devaluating the creative abilities of generations of working people.

It goes without saying that in countries where capitalism did not play its historic role to the end as a form of development of the productive forces, the new socialist society had to complete the industrialisation. And history is the witness that it did this more rapidly and more consistently than capitalism. But for all that industrialisation is the precondition and the starting point rather than the goal of socialist progress. Socialism was able to suppress or neutralise some phenomena characteristic of the industrial revolution under capitalism, but it could not change, or was able to
change only partly, its inner logic (the breaking down of the labor process into separate simple operations, and a certain restriction of growth of consumption). The traditional industrial structure of the productive forces, as experience shows, cannot ensure the conditions for collective life based on the full, free development of the individual and the mutual spiritual enrichment of the members of the community. It can be said that in its initial phase socialist society makes use of an alien, inherited production base, just as capitalism once used the forms of small-scale cottage industry and only gradually, in the course of the industrial revolution, built up its own production base. Only the all-round advance of the scientific and technological revolution can give rise to a new form of civilisation which, as regards both level of development of labor and consumption, corresponds to the requirements of communist society.

Marx's criticism of capitalism was directed not only against the capitalist relations of production. It was criticism of the entire industrial civilisation created by capitalism and reflecting its contradictions and limitations. This criticism looked forward, in addition to the revolutionary reconstruction of production relationships, to a new foundation for civilisation—the process which we today call the scientific and technological revolution. Marx's definition of the production base of communist society is a remarkably precise picture of this revolution; for what is in question is a civilisation founded "not on developing productive forces that reproduce or perhaps enlarge the given condition, but, on the contrary, on the free, unrestricted, progressive and universal development of the productive forces which is the precondition for the existence of society." From this standpoint the scientific and technological revolution is a complex social process, an integral component of communist reconstruction in general.

The concrete progress of civilisation is not, however, merely an illustration of this logical pattern. The socialist countries had to complete the process of industrialisation, while the developed industrial capitalist countries were confronted with the alternative, either use some of the elements of the scientific and technological revolution or be found wanting when confronted with that universal "imperative of growth" which nowadays in the West determines the basic mass of practical solutions and theoretical quests (theory of growth). This imperative engendered by social revolution and the existence of socialism obscures the relationship between the technological and social processes. Yet grave social problems also arise wherever fundamental problems of the scientific and technological revolution are on the order of the day. This is manifest in the unceasing conflict between capital and science, since the latter,
being essentially a social productive force, calls for more far-reaching forms of social integration than those offered by the capitalist private-property relations. From this conflict stem reform programs aimed at adapting the economic and political forms of capitalism to the conditions of the scientific and technological revolution. One cannot but note the growth of state regulation and state financing of the bulk (about 70 per cent) of all research projects in the developed capitalist countries, the evolution of the monopoly system into state-monopoly capitalism, and the spread of forecasting and programming bodies in the West-European countries. It would be a mistake to underestimate the new developments in the economic, social and cultural system of capitalism. On the other hand, each step forward in science and technology demonstrates that the above-mentioned “adaptation” of the capitalist production relations to the new conditions is only partial, that in view of the social consequences of scientific and technological progress in our time the industrial system of capitalism by and large begins to misfire and deforms the process of the revolution under way.

But even in the industrially developed socialist countries, whose social structure make it possible fully to use science as a direct productive force, this question is far from easy to solve. The economic forms in a number of socialist countries have so far conformed to the needs of industrialisation. This is evident from the example of Czechoslovakia, where management by directives proved inadequate when the sources of extensive growth became exhausted.

Development of social relations which not only do away with the narrow confines of antagonistic interests but which also readily react to the new aspects of civilisation, to the dynamic potential of the scientific and technological revolution, is a condition for the triumph of socialism. This revolution is not a short-lived upheaval to be carried out by directives issued at the top. It is a prolonged universal process of structural change which greatly enhances the dynamics of growth. Only a flexible economic system of management extending to all areas of social labor and possessing an adequate system of reciprocal interconnections can ensure intensive growth. Man’s interest structure itself must be dynamic.

Ever since the socialist countries began to go over to economic forms of management, bourgeois ideologues have tried to persuade the world that we are restoring the capitalist relations of production. Actually the contrary is the case. A careful examination of the theoretical concepts underlying the new system of management and economic reforms will leave no doubt that contemporary Marxism is engaged in perfecting a strictly socialist economic
structure, and thereby solving a key problem from the standpoint of tackling the tasks of the scientific and technological revolution. Analogous tasks face Marxists also in the study of other areas of social life. The Thirteenth Congress of our Party underscored the intrinsic link between the new system of management, the scientific and technological revolution, and the development of socialist democracy.

We are now only at the beginning of the scientific and technological revolution. Hence it is not easy to visualise all its social and human implications. The economic processes in the developed industrial countries as before are based mainly on the old industrial structure of the productive forces. The initial elements of the scientific and technological revolution are therefore finding realisation in the context of the processes of the final phase of industrialisation under way in the two diametrically opposed social systems. Moreover, these elements are emerging at a time when other countries and continents are just setting out on industrialisation.

The development of capitalist industry deepened the gulf between the imperialist countries and that vast section of humanity which lives in perpetual want in practically a state of natural economy. Theoretical reflections concerning the future of the third world lead to the conclusion that the economic problems of the developing countries, especially those with large and rapidly growing populations, cannot be solved in the lifetime of generations unless the scientific and technological revolution is drawn on to reduce to the minimum the pains of the initial industrialisation, and unless the influence of the socialist forces accelerates the search for ways of doing away with the yawning gap between the haves and have-nots of modern civilisation.

In all probability it will take decades for the scientific and technological revolution to become the predominant process in the areas where it does not encounter social obstacles. The revolutionary social changes of recent times, however, hold out the promise that the obstacles can be overcome. But unless we understand the essence of the scientific and technological revolution we will not be able to grasp the meaning of the changes taking place in the world. The ideological basis of the future development of civilisation will surely be creative Marxism, which remains true to the principle inscribed by its founder on the portals of science:

*Here all mistrust must be abandoned*

*And here must perish every craven thought.*

THE PREDOMINANT form of private ownership in modern society is the public company; public in the sense that any citizen with sufficient means can become a part owner of the enterprise by buying shares traded on the Stock Exchange.

The number of part owners or shareholders in any one company may run into hundreds, or, in the case of the largest, many thousands.

With so many hundreds, or thousands, of part owners, how is singleness of purpose arrived at in the conduct of the company? This is achieved through the elected Board of Directors, who formulate and carry through company policy.

The common aim of all shareholders, big and small, is to obtain the maximum return on their investment, by way of income through dividends, or appreciation through capital growth.

If the Board of Directors continues to realise these aims it is seldom subjected to challenge or change in composition. Hence there is a pronounced tendency for Boards of Directors to become self-perpetuating institutions.

E. L. Wheelwright, in Ownership and Control of Australian Companies, showed that a minority of very large shareholders owned a big majority of the total shares in all companies. Furthermore, these large shareholders tended to exercise a controlling interest in the Boards of companies in which their capital was invested.

Where a large shareholder's eggs are dispersed in more than one basket it is natural to find the same name appearing on more than one Board—multiple directorship. Where the companies in which this occurs are functionally related, as in the case of a supplier of raw materials or consumer of finished products, the multiple directorship acquires a new quality, that of interlocking directorship.

Not every multiple directorship is an interlocking directorship, nor is every multiple director necessarily a large shareholder. Mr. Raymont Moore, for example, is the holder of possibly the largest number of company directorships in Australia, a position due to his accountancy business, not to any interlocking investment interest. Mr. R. A. Irish is another accountant whose services are frequently sought as a director, particularly by companies faced with financial difficulties.

However, the pattern that clearly emerges from the carefully documented evidence in Hylda Rolfe's book is that most multiple directorships in large Australian companies are interlocking directorships. Furthermore, this pattern conforms with conclusions drawn from a study of fifty of the top British companies by Michel Harratt-Brown and others, published in Universities and Life Review, London 1958, viz.:

"A network of interlocking directorates and connections ensures harmony between the different members of the capitalist power elite and between the different centres of economic power."

Hylda Rolfe confined her study to the fifty largest predominantly Australian-owned companies, a sufficiently exhausting task for one research worker.

She found that the 302 directors of these companies between them held
750 directorships—348 of them in the fifty companies examined and 402 in 275 other companies.

The greater number (54) of multiple directorships held in the greater number (five and a half times) "outside" companies infers a dominating influence of the fifty largest over the smaller companies.

Closer examination reinforces this inference, because 133 of the 302 directors of the top fifty companies held only one Board place each. This left 169 who share between them 617 directorships in 325 "outside" companies.

In delineating the interconnections of these interlocking directorships and in outlining, so far as was possible, the professions, education and social background of directors concerned, the author has provided valuable data from which significant conclusions can be drawn about whose class interests they represent and serve.

The author refrains from drawing any such conclusions, but Marxists will find that her fully documented work confirms their views on the role and structure of monopoly capitalism in Australia.

E.W.C.

AUSTRALIAN DICTIONARY OF BIOGRAPHY. Vol. 1, 1788-1850, A-H.


This is a book which should warm the cockles of Australian nationalism—particularly if one is tolerant towards the idea that the academics of Australia, particularly historians, have accepted a responsibility for the preservation of our culture.

The Editorial Board, the National Committee, the working parties from the various states are mostly historians. Of the 250 writers who contributed the 535 entries in this volume about half are academics, a few from universities in England, Holland or America, the majority from Australian universities.

Entries, some short, some long, depend usually on the significance in Australian history of the man or woman whose life is described. Some of the characters are English governors; some are ex-convicts; there are explorers, scientists, business-men, clergy, farmers, Aborigines. All had some influence on the development of the colony's life in the period to 1850, or were influenced by the colony in some way; so Charles Darwin has a page devoted to him, since the Beagle, with Darwin aboard as naturalist, was anchored at Sydney in 1836 for some weeks and "Australian flora and fauna gave Darwin some very valuable evidence on evolution".

It is a dictionary, and until the appearance of the other volume for this period, the reader is likely to be infuriated by cross-references to people whose surnames do not start with a letter from A to H. One gets good accounts of most of the governors, including the ill-fated Bligh, but naturally the two who probably contributed most, Phillip and Macquarie, must wait for the next time around. One finds oneself regretting that Marsden, Macarthur and Macquarie, all intimately connected in time, did not possess surnames starting with A, B or C, since these three men have remained controversial figures for historians to the present. But the absence of the M's and P's will soon be rectified and one should assess this volume with that thought in mind.

It is not 'Great Man Theory' stuff, though it is history in the form of the lives of individuals. The essence of good biography is the ability of the writer to show his subject in the
setting which helped to make him and which he helped to make. He is like an actor who is never alone on the stage. He is surrounded by others, some of whom have possibly more important roles to play than he.

Thus through the life of Bligh, who received, and deserves, four pages written by A. G. L. Shaw, the reader may learn a fair amount about the economic and social development in the penal settlement up to 1810. Similarly J. M. Ward, in his account of the life of Charles FitzRoy, governor until 1854, shows how the colony grappled with its political problems, the clashes between the conservatives and the more democratic forces (the urban middle and working classes) over the type of responsible government which was to be achieved, and the long-distance arguments between the British colonial hierarchy and the wild colonials.

There is a fascinating glimpse of FitzRoy's disagreement with "that acrimonious divine J. D. Lang, q.v." and a revealing passage about the character of FitzRoy himself: "He stood for no inconvenient principles. He genuinely sympathised with projects of colonial advancement, such as the railways, the university, and the growth of manufacturing. His sense of display and geniality commended him to the multitude. 'The lower classes' he wrote in 1853 'are too well off at present to trouble their heads about politics.'"

Both the entries quoted have helpful bibliographies. In general the bibliography work is sound throughout, but there are some poor patches—several authors merely quote their own published work as a guide to further reading! Some subjects get more space than they deserve, some less. The account of George Bass is not satisfying, omitting as it does any reference to the confirmation by Bass of the discovery of coal in the Illawarra district, not important in 1797 but of significance now.

Overall however, the first volume promises much for the student of Australian history. When the twelve volumes planned have been produced, two for 1788-1850, four for 1851-1890, and six probably, for 1891-1938, they will constitute an invaluable source of reference.

It is to be hoped that all secondary schools and all teachers will include The Australian Dictionary of Biography in their libraries, possibly as a first step towards an Australian section. It is unfortunately true that the history of our own country is but sketchily taught and even more sketchily learned in the schools.

M. W.

[The second volume has now appeared —Ed.]

**A CONTINENT IN DANGER**
by Vincent Serventy, Andre Deutsch (Survival Books), 240 pp., 45s stg.

**THIS BOOK is not to warn Australians about the yellow peril or the threat of black power (the daily press does that often enough), but about the less-publicized extermination of Australian wildlife, and the damage (in some places irreparable) to the Australian environment caused by "short-sighted greed". So there is plenty of politics in it, but like the destruction itself, the politics often remain unidentified by many of us.**

**Continent in Danger** is the latest of an urgent series of books by scientifically honest and indignant biologists—such as Rape of the Earth, This Plundered Planet, The Quiet Crisis, and The Great Extermination, which condemn the indiscriminate destruction of man's natural resources under the guise of "development" and "the quick quid".
The author is Vincent Serventy, noted naturalist and wildlife photographer and lecturer, who is now the Editor of *Wildlife in Australia*, a quarterly magazine which every patriotic Australian should read, if only to learn what he and his descendants are losing.

Losing is perhaps too mild a word. Stewart Udall, Secretary of the United States Department of Interior recently stated that what is not saved (in USA) as nature reserves, national parks and wilderness areas in the 1960's, will never be saved. This estimate also applies to Australia, which since the Second World War has witnessed an accelerated destruction of most natural habitats—the Brigalow country in Queensland is an example. Out of some 21,000,000 acres of this type of landscape, no reserve or national park of typical Brigalow has yet been permanently saved from the bulldozer, the match, and the four-footed plough.

Does it shock or interest you (as a citizen of the world) to know that over a hundred species of birds and animals—evolved over millions of years—have, over the last century, suddenly disappeared from the face of the earth?

Does it disappoint you (as an Australian) to learn that already six species of marsupials, about 5% of the total, are now extinct, and that about 40% are on the verge of extinction?

"If there is an animal heaven," says Serventy, "no doubt the native Australian animals already exterminated—as well as the passenger pigeon, the great auk and the dodo—look down in wonder, and ask: "Will humans never learn?"

It is a new twist to the folksong about when will we ever learn to stop misusing human energies and begin to live in peace.

Serventy's book is a mine of interesting information about Australian wildlife. It is the fruit of a lifetime's patient study of animals in the bush. As such, it deserves respect. The author is a knowledgeable enthusiast and a self-confessed optimist, even though he doesn't see round all the corners. Who amongst us does? After detailing the reckless exploitation of our landscapes, and the disappearance of many of our beautiful and scientifically valuable animals, Serventy adds:

"I am an optimist and I feel that the tide in the affairs of men is running in favor of conservation. If we work now, success will be ours. Forces which appear formidable will melt away. We must face the opposition, not with abuse, but with reasoned argument. But with passion, too . . ."

Serventy does not see the conservation of wildlife as preservation from man, but as preservation for man. He goes on to say that "a farmer does himself a disservice when he blames wildlife for pasture deterioration. When he has finally destroyed wildlife, he may find it too late to remove the real cause of the trouble, overstocking and often incorrect cultivation methods, including the use of fire".

Why is this? This is where Serventy falters: it is all caused by "the ignorance and selfish stupidity of man". Although he sees all too clearly the ravages of exploitative land use in a gruesome detail which only an experienced naturalist can appreciate, he tends to dodge its sociological implications. He does not realise that the biological crisis which he so tellingly describes (caused by introduced sheep, cattle, goats, rabbits, etc., as well as more direct forms of habitat destruction such as clearing forests, ring-barking and burning) is part of the general political and economic crisis of our time. It's a small world.
Sometimes he comes close to it: for example, in discussing the hazards of pesticides—first blown open by Rachel Carson's *Silent Spring*—he somewhat cynically comments:

“When listening to experts it is always essential to demand the background of the person concerned. If they are connected with a chemical firm the opinions can safely be ignored. If employed by a Government Department, then most statements can be taken with a grain of salt, since Governments often blandly quote the head of a department as saying one thing while his whole staff may have the opposite opinion. Even University Departments, once the stronghold of honest and fearless opinions, have become timorous, now that so much of their money comes from governments, business or farming groups. There are, however, notable exceptions in Australia . . .”

Vincent Serventy is in no doubt about the neglect of ecological research—that is, research aimed at understanding our natural environment, so that when we interfere with it, we know what we're doing, and it won't “go bad” on us. He points out that the reduction of the rabbit population by myxomatosis since 1950 added millions of pounds to Australian woolgrowers' cheques. Since the early 1920's, research had aimed to introduce myxo as a biological control of the rabbit . . . “The money saved by this team of scientists is far more than all the money spent on scientific research since Australia was founded.”

Where do we go from here? Unlike many naturalists who know intimately their birds and trees, and who derive pleasure from bewailing their fate, Serventy does not hesitate to propose, in the last and tenth chapter, what he calls “A Plan for Action”. For example, we need many more National Parks. At present Australia has a grand total of some 5,000 square miles of National Parkland, which is one-sixth of one per cent of the total area of Australia. “An acceptable figure would be 5%, or 150,000 square miles.” We need proper public zoos (“It is time these were either closed or put under scientific management. Those that are intended merely as animal circuses should at least be moved . . .”); Federal control; proper management of parks; professional training of conservationists; more education; more camps . . .

This is a useful, pleasing and stimulating book, and one wishes for more of the author's intimate photographs of animals which most of us city dwellers know only by name. (Ever seen a numbat?—no, not a wombat!)

It is also a sobering book. Will we learn to save in time? Serventy is an optimist, although he realizes that there is “no commercial value” in “a koala, an unpolluted river, a dinosaur footprint, a beach, a cave painting, an historic building, a stretch of wild coastline or forest wilderness.”

“When will we ever learn?” The protection of our natural resources—without which continued production at the highest level will be impossible—has now become a social responsibility, and a challenge to the understanding and activity for conservation of all sections of Australians.


**JOHN DONNE**, one of the great English poets of the seventeenth century, moved by his consciousness of the essential unity of the human race, once proclaimed that “no man is an island”. Yet today there are vast numbers of individuals who feel they are islands in a chaotic universe, who are
afflicted with a terrifying sense of spiritual isolation and loneliness. Though the majority of such people have neither the power nor the opportunity to express their sense of alienation, there are writers, artists and philosophers who can and do speak for them.

Among the ideas which consciousness of alienation has given rise to is the philosophy of existentialism, and it is the nature and history of this body of doctrine and its relationship with American literature which the American marxist, Sidney Finkelstein, examines in his book on the subject.

Like other ideas, existentialism has roots in the past, though it is contemporary social pressures which have been responsible for the wide and rapid spread of its teachings. Anyone who has heard of the French writers, Jean-Paul Sartre and Albert Camus, will have heard of existentialism, and in fact the increasing popularity of the existentialist philosophy throughout the western world during the last two decades largely stems from the initial publicity conferred by these two authors.

Although existentialist ideas are defended by their protagonists with great passion and sincerity, they do not form a clear cut system of thought, logical and consistent within itself, and for this reason some people doubt whether existentialism should be called a philosophy. However, despite its lack of systematisation, there can be no doubt that it presents a very particular and definite approach to life.

Finkelstein begins his historical analysis of existentialism by pointing out that the European thinkers of the eighteenth century, the 'Age of Enlightenment', believed that progress was a law of history. They saw the world as capable of rational explanation. But during the following century, industrial development intensified the contradictions of capitalist society to the point where some thinkers began to claim that there could be no such thing as progress for mankind, that life (as existentialists say today) was 'absurd'. A conclusion was that each individual must live for himself alone, and withdraw himself, in mind at least, from the problems of society and his fellow-men.

In their search for a philosophical ancestor, the existentialists have fixed on the Danish thinker and writer, Kierkegaard (1813-1855), and as Finkelstein demonstrates in his careful dissection of Kierkegaard's thought, their choice was logical. Kierkegaard totally rejected the concept of progress and proclaimed that 'subjectivity is truth'.

Finkelstein points out that the writings of Marx and Engels were beginning to appear at the same time as Kierkegaard's. While there was some truth in the latter's view of society, it was limited by its superficiality, whereas by making a thorough analysis of the way in which capitalist society functions, Marx and Engels were able to prove that the existing state of affairs was only temporary, and that in due course its contradictions would be resolved by a new and higher form of social organisation in which man would cease to be alienated and dehumanised.

Among the philosophers who have influenced existentialists is Nietzsche. Finkelstein's explanation of the contradictions in the latter's thought is most illuminating. Among other things he shows how some parts of Nietzsche's philosophy provided a basis for the ideas of German fascism.

One peculiarity of existentialism, which presumably derives from its lack of a systematic body of doctrine, is that its adherents may be either religious or atheist, as well as being either progressive or reactionary in politics. Sartre, for instance, is to
quite an extent in agreement with marxism, whereas Camus remained hostile to it until the time of his death. One of the German existentialists, Heidegger, is essentially a supporter of fascism, whereas another, Jasper, is much less reactionary in the political sense.

The title of the book is slightly misleading insofar as it deals with alienation in other literatures besides American. Apart from the French writers mentioned above, the significance of the work of Dostoievsky, Kafka and others in relation to the growth of alienation in literature is examined in some detail. Dostoievsky, it is pointed out, presents his alienated characters from an essentially humanist point of view, whereas Kafka projects his own alienation into his writing.

As the author puts it (p. 159), 'In such writers as Balzac, Tolstoi, Dreiser and O'Neill, who have depicted the process of alienation in bourgeois society, there is no accompanying alienation on the part of the writers themselves. As they depict it, alienation is a form of human suffering or self-destruction, and they thereby reveal the alienated themselves as understandably human beings through whom the reader learns something about himself ...'

"With the crisis in the 20th century, however, we enter a new stage where side by side with the humanised portrayal of alienated lives, a literature appears which expresses the writer's own alienation. These conflicting currents will often appear side by side in the same artist. Behind this expression of alienation lies a deepening subjectivism. The artist's absorption in his internal or subjective life begins to overwhelm his view of others, who take on a hostile, monstrous or fearsome appearance. The "humanisation" dwindles to the artist's own longings, fears and frustrations, often poignantly revealed, while his outer-world outlook reveals only what he is estranged from, finding in it no ties to or common ground with his own being."

Proceeding from this standpoint, the author makes an extremely interesting and capably argued analysis of various contemporary American writers. William Faulkner is shown to be a writer whose approach to literature was based on an idealised view of the former slave society of the southern States, and whose style is a compound of humanisation and alienation. Dos Passos' famous novel, U.S.A., comes close to being one of the great American social novels in conception and skill but fails because of its lack of humanism. Some writers, like Henry Miller for example, while not acknowledged existentialists, are very close to the existentialist position in their virtual rejection of the possibility of a rational explanation of reality. Others, like Norman Mailer and James Baldwin, seem to have been strongly influenced by existentialism, somewhat to the detriment of their literary work. Finkelstein is in no sense dogmatic in his treatment of the work of these writers, being careful to point out the positive features which exist even in the subjective naturalism of writers like Henry Miller, and to show that no writer is completely static in his approach to life or literature.

Altogether, Finkelstein's book demonstrates the power of marxism as a tool of thought, its ability to penetrate beneath the surface of things and discover the underlying essence of reality. No one who is interested in either philosophy or literature could fail to be completely absorbed by it, and it is to be hoped that some readers will be encouraged to inquire to what extent, if any, existentialism and alienation have influenced literature in Australia.

R.W.
THE BANJO OF THE BUSH,

CLEMENT SEMMLER begins his foreword to The Banjo of the Bush by paraphrasing H. P. Heseltine, who wrote on the occasion of the centenary of A. B. Paterson's birth, that we have retained from his literary career a number of well loved poems, but not an image of the man who wrote them.

In the course of the 250 pages which follow Semmler transposes Heseltine's statement into the past tense: we now have a vivid image of Banjo, the man: and we have what Semmler lays claim to in the subtitle of the book, a record of "the work, life and times of A. B. Paterson".

It is all there. The book begins with two chapters about Paterson as both collector and author of bush ballads and his emergence as a leading exponent of the literary ballad of the nineties. Semmler then takes us back to the birth of Andrew Barton Paterson near Orange in 1864, to the pioneering days, his bush boyhood amongst the struggling cockies, and his growing up in Sydney with his grandmother at Gladesville. And so on.

With superb constructive skill, Clement Semmler takes us through Banjo's life, work and times, analysing Paterson's ... in the social background of the nineties, following Paterson to the Boer war and sharply probing his attitude to the death of Breaker Morant. Paterson and his literary work continue to hold the centre of the stage but the background of London in the twenties and Sydney during the depression years is clearly etched in. Paterson's career as lawyer, journalist, war correspondent (1914-18) and editor are traced; his skill as horseman, his love of horses and horse racing are highlighted.

Banjo Paterson was a punter from way back. He rarely missed a race meeting. He wrote ballads, sketches, articles, a novel The Shearer's Colt, and an unpublished book which can only be described as an encyclopaedia of the gee-gees, titled Race Horses and Racing in Australia, all arising from his life long pursuit of 'the sport of kings'. Modern punters would be well advised to heed the message contained in Paterson's laconic comment: "If you back favorites you'll have no laces in your boots, but if you back outsiders you'll have no boots."

Paterson emerges as a most attractive personality: modest, with a dry laconic sense of humor, and deep strength of character. He spent most of his life in big cities but preferred the country and his verse is leavened with an obviously sincere desire to return to the good old droving days.

We see Paterson the young rebel reading Henry George, Mill and Adam Smith, writing a pamphlet vehemently arguing the necessity for land reform, and lashing out at the rich and powerful, complaining that the finest houses in Sydney belonged to "a man who inherited a huge fortune made solely out of the rise and rents of real estate . . . spends most of his time in England. He never did a day's work in his life, and yet can have every luxury while hundreds of his fellow countrymen have to toil and pinch and contrive to get a living." And there is Paterson the militant poet prophesying that the "tenants soon will carry arms on Kiley's run."

Then we see Paterson the conservative in his declining years, very much at home amongst the snobs in the fashionable clubs and badgering his publisher to get one of his books out "while the Prince is here (so) he and his entourage might take it home with them . . ." and deleting a reference to a gambling prince in the
book for fear of offending or even being sued by royalty. Clement Semmier comments: “How different the Paterson hanging on to the idea of royal patronage, from the Paterson who applauded Archibald’s almost republican enthusiasms.” However, Semmier makes it clear that Eric Butler’s ambiguous reference to Paterson as an advisor of the New Guard in the thirties is absolutely without foundation.

Indeed, Paterson showed in his tribute to J. F. Archibald, that the old rebellious fire was not entirely put out. He described Archibald as “the first Australian to call the English bluff” at a time when “we were insulted by imported globe trotting snobs, exploited by imported actors and singers, mostly worn out and incompetent” and we hear the echo of his words coming up through the years to our present day Australia.

Inevitably Clement Semmier devotes a long chapter to the origins of Waltzing Matilda: “it is at once bush song, community-singing song, marching song, school song and folk song, and has frequently been described as Australia’s unofficial national anthem.” He makes out a detailed and logical case in favor of Paterson’s authorship, refuting Oscar Mendelsohn’s theory that Paterson did not write Waltzing Matilda but rather heard it as an old bush ballad in his boyhood and at the age of twenty-six recalled it and set the idea to the tune, played by Christina MacPherson on the autoharp at Winton. I, for one, was impressed by Mendelsohn’s compelling point that Paterson never ever published Waltzing Matilda under his own name.

Banjo Paterson is undoubtedly the most read, quoted and loved poet who ever picked up a pen in this country; and threaded through this book is Semmier, the profound literary scholar, turning the various facets of Paterson’s peculiar genius to the light, thus showing the source of the magic.

The Banjo of the Bush is a major work of biography but it is also a supremely readable book which can be enjoyed by any literate Australian who has not yet surrendered to the cult of the Yankee pop song or retired to the un-Australian ivory tower where The Banjo is dismissed as a writer of crude doggerel.

JOSEPH COLLINS.

N. M. AMOSOFF, RUSSIAN SURGEON, Translated by George St. George, Neville Spearman, $4.25.

THIS is no cosy ‘Diary of a Doctor who Tells’. Rather, it is concerned with the harsh realities which confront the modern surgeon; with the way in which the growing sophistication of operating techniques means also a growing burden on the surgeon’s shoulders. In this sense Amosoff is concerned with one of the central dilemmas of our time: for in a very real way technological advances have outstripped man’s psychological makeup, his ability to cope fully with their significance and demands. And with the surgeon the problem is shown to be especially acute. His position makes it impossible for him to view the patient just as an inert object, there to have the wonders of modern medicine performed upon it. And so it is continually the question of human involvement, and human responsibility with which Amosoff deals.

Two of his patients, both young girls, die on the operating table; the second, in fact, because of a mistake on his part. And so the whole situation is paradoxical and tormenting. A couple of years ago, before the development of the heart-lung machine, neither of the girls would have
been operated on. But now that scientific and technological advances have made the machine possible, the operations can take place. But both girls die. "I represent science," writes Amosoff. "I feel terrible."

And it's out of this paradox that we see the Russian surgeon emerge. On the one hand he is the man of science, offering his patients the chance of a miraculous recovery. But on the other hand, he is the man who finds every operation a harrowing experience, as the patient's life throbs at his finger-tips, and as all too often the precision and efficiency of the machine cannot be matched by the surgeon.

The whole situation is well dramatised in the section dealing with the second girl, Maya, who dies after a five hour operation: the work is progressing well; the hole in her heart, which threatens to kill her naturally within a few years, has been found; and though her condition is complicated by an abscessed lung, Amosoff works steadily, hopeful of a large measure of success.

Suddenly there is a geyser of blood which hits me straight in the face. Instantly the hole is found by touch and plugged by my finger.

"Clean my glasses!"

For a second I'm blind. But no matter. My finger knows what to do.

"Keep mopping up the blood in the wound!"

The aneurism wall has burst. In one place I have cut too deep...

The final section of the book deals with an at least temporarily successful operation of a young scientist; and again it is the contrast between the efficiency and objectivity of science on the one side, and the all too human element on the other, on which Amosoff concentrates.

Sasha, the young man, is engaged upon scientific research into the structure of the brain, and especially the mind. He is trying to show that the whole thing works like a super-computer, except for the fact that, unlike a computer, the mind forgets or makes mistakes. If only this can be overcome, then men will truly be able to live ordered and rational lives. Operations too, Amosoff points out, would be invariably successful; but in the meantime this operation, and the immediate post-operative complications, drain all his physical and mental energies for over twelve hours.

In all, Russian Surgeon is an absorbing and important book. And the fact that it has already sold over one million copies in the USSR indicates that it is of a much more general interest than the title perhaps indicates. And as one reads it, one wants continually to relate it to surgical practice and behaviour in western countries, to see in what way medicine in the Soviet Union reflects the different economic ethos. And Amosoff himself is aware of this issue as well, answering it not only indirectly by the extent of his humanity and involvement, but also by his description of an operation he saw in the USA:

"It was a very difficult operation with artificial blood circulation, very complicated, very troublesome. The patient was still in the room barely alive. And in the corner the surgeons and anaesthetists had gathered for a conference, speaking in low voices and writing something on a piece of paper. I asked the interpreter, a very nice fellow, what they were doing. The microphone was still connected, and he listened through his receiver. 'They are dividing the fee for the operation.'"

Leon Cantrell
ALL BRISBANE was at the Osipov concert on May Day, so far as I could see, except the folk-singers. A pity! These latter might have received a corrective shock. The Osipov troupe is not only great in itself; it also exemplifies a socialist approach to folk-music, diametrically opposite to the fashionable USA approach.

Though billed as a balalaika orchestra the Osipov ensemble is really an ‘orchestra of national instruments’, such as has become the recognised medium for public concerts of folk-music everywhere between Berlin and Shanghai. In the socialist world, the singer-with-guitar appears only in semi-private, or as an intermezzo between orchestral items.

Naturally such orchestras permit a lot of regional and national differences. The Chinese give the two-stringed fiddle a big role. The Uighurs, the Uzbeks, the Georgians, prefer their own native lutes. A ‘Volks- orchester’ in Germany uses a lot of mandolins, and shares the predilection of the Russians for free-reed instruments.

The basis of the Osipov orchestra is traditionally Russian: domras and balalaikas plus accordions and percussion; but the Osipovs add their own spices! They have two giant guslis—zithers blown up to the size of harpsichords! They have flutes and oboes, described in the program as Turkestanian and Ukrainian respectively, but ‘symphonic’ in appearance. Just behind the alto-balalaikas sit four players of the rozhok, the Vladimir horn. And, to restore the chronological balance, one of the accordions is electrically amplified!

Does the mixture seem merely eclectic? I assure you that the actual sound, the blend and balance of tone, is superb: quite different from that of the violin-based symphony orchestra, but just as beautiful and just as varied. This folk-orchestra has a snap and precision in staccato passages, and an infinitely dreamy sostenuto that is all its own.

Repertory is surprisingly wide. Naturally they excel in Russian folk-dances, but they are not limited either to folk-music or to Russia. They expand into opera. They annex tunes from other countries and play them beautifully.

I think that this extraordinary concert left us all feeling a bit dissatisfied with our normal musical diet. After the Osipovs, ‘modern’ music (whether pop or polytonal) sounds so damned bloodless!

II.

The Osipov players make their effect, it seems to me, by uniting two sets of qualities which our civilisation holds apart, and which I shall summarise as ‘professional’ and ‘amateur’ qualities.

Ours is a class society. Its cultures are stratified. The ‘serious’ musician gets one kind of education, the ‘popular’ musician gets another. The two breeds speak different jargons, and do not flock together. They develop different professional characters.

The symphony-orchestra player is (of necessity) technically proficient. He may even be technically brilliant. But he is not required—he is practically forbidden—to be ‘spontaneous’ or ‘individual’. His thinking and feeling are done for him by the conductor. He wears a uniform like a waiter’s, just to remind us that the first symphony-orchestra players were lackeys. In private life, of course, he keeps his soul alive by playing jazz or chamber-music; but while on duty he is still a lackey.
At the other pole of our musical world stand many ‘pop’ musicians and most ‘folksingers’. They are in general self-taught rather than Conservatorium-trained, and consequently short of technique. Yet they are more artisans than wage-slaves; their individuality counts for something. Indeed they sometimes appear to exploit their ‘personality’ as a substitute for technical ability. Their historical ancestors were not lackeys but itinerant buffoons and ballad-mongers.

Paradoxically the two breeds are united in being equally remote from anything like a national culture. The orchestra plays fake-Schönberg: the ‘folksinger’ strains to imitate Dylan or Baez.

In Russia today (and in the other Union republics, and to a greater or lesser extent in other socialist countries) this stratification is far less evident. There is only one kind of musical education: the best. No quacks offer to teach you the balalaika in six easy lessons by post. The Russian music-student, like every Russian school-child, gets his grounding in the musical language which Glinka, Mussorgsky, Borodin, Shostakovich and Shishakov learnt from the Ivans and Katyas of the countryside and from each other. No one goes short of musical education for lack of funds. You may need more of it or less of it, but it is all of the same high quality.

Granting that 100% success is rare in any conditions, and granting that you’ll hear some pretty dismal playing from the bands in Intourist hotels, the system produces results. You find a very high proportion of amateurs and ‘popular’ musicians whose standards of taste and of technique are, in the best sense, professional. And you find comparable numbers of professional and ‘serious’ musicians who retain the freshness and zest of the amateur. The gap between the ‘two breeds’ is small and gets smaller; and the bridge across the gap is the genuinely national quality of the music.

(There is a parallel here with a much broader social phenomenon. Capitalism nurtures two antithetical attitudes: that of the ‘lone wolf’ and that of ‘go with the mob’. Socialism makes possible the synthesis: ‘be one of the team’.)

The Osipov orchestra is the perfect example. The technical level is professional. The spirit is amateur in the best sense; they play ‘for the love of it’. The effect is one both of polish and of spontaneity.

This air of ease, of good-humor, of sharing a joke among friends, while simultaneously giving of one’s musical best, is not easily achieved. There has to be a particular sort of solidarity among the players, a particular attitude towards the audience, and (most important) a particular relationship to the music played.

You do not get the same air of spontaneity from a symphony orchestra trained to give exactly the same care and the same detachment to Cesar Franck as to Richard Meale. You cannot expect it of the untrained amateur, either, who is so intent on getting the notes right that he has no time to think of anything else. You only get it when the players are both technically proficient and totally at home with what they play: as in this case when Soviet-trained musicians are disporting themselves in their natural element, their own national music. They are so much at home with it that they are incapable of treating it with too little seriousness or with too much.

That is genuinely the folk-music attitude; and it is precisely among the ‘orchestras of national instruments’ that you find it at its best today. It is naturally a national thing; but it is a good grounding for internationalism too.
III.

There is a horrible fascination in imagining how we, in Australia, would set about returning the Osipov visit. Just what sort of troupe would we send to give equivalent programs in Russia?

If it were left to musical officialdom, our troupe would consist of the current successor of Gladys Moncrieff to sing *Bless This House*, *The Bells of St Mary's* and selections from *Lola Montez*; a violin-piano-and-cello team to play some Alfred Hill, Arthur Benjamin and Percy Grainger; and a comic baritone to do *The Road to Gundagai*, *Tie Me Kangaroo Down* and (as an encore) *Click Go the Shears*. Nightmarish, isn't it?

Or conceivably we should send a dozen 'folksinger' soloists; many of these would be quite good, mark you, but the lack of variety would cripple the show.

But the limiting factors on what we could send are not absolute; they have nothing to do with the individual abilities of Australian musicians, and they have very little to do with our surviving folk-culture. Given the right government, the right educational policy, the right kind of official support for the arts, we could do a lot better.

We could send, in time, a 'national-instruments orchestra'. The existing ones—German, Chinese, Polish, Russian, etc., etc.—grew from small beginnings; so would ours. Ours would be a magnified 'woolshed band', and there would be a lot of happy argument about its exact make-up. My own notion is that it should be basically a band of fiddles, accordions, and guitars or banjos, plus a double-bass (? home-made), plus soloists on tin whistle (doubling bamboo flute), mouth-organ and gum-leaf, plus percussion and effects, including bones. Add a tiny choir of singers, and an even smaller component of dancers.

Where are they to come from? Well, the company must include dark-Australians as well as paleface-Australians; and in existing circumstances we do not find the dark ones at the Con. So let us do some recruiting 'in the field' first, and approach the Con later. As some great man said—was it Gorki?—'the countryside is the guardian of nationality'.

The gum-leaf soloist that I have in mind is a Stradbroke Island boy. A fine whistle-player, capable of doubling either on bamboo flute or on double-bass, lives at Stone's Corner; his understudy comes from Border-town, SA. The solo mouth-organist was in the *Reedy River* cast, and works for the PMG. The purest, least contaminated guitar style is probably that of the Cairns region. Accordions? Meredith has trained some good young ones around Sydney. I think we should use Con students in the violin section, but they would need coaching by one of the real old hornpipe-fiddlers. We shall not find the right sort of dancers in the ballet-schools, though; we'll look at the national-dance clubs in Ipswich and Newcastle for those.

A year's training in ensemble and repertory would cost a good deal less than the upkeep of a bomber-squadron. Once the band was on its feet (using a purely traditional repertory) it would become a medium, a vehicle, for the work of young composers and arrangers; a nucleus of genuinely national culture. It would tour, and begin to earn its keep. It would go abroad. It would play *Charley Sailor's Woman-Song* to the Muscovites, and *The Cunnamulla Stocking Jig* to the chaps in Kiev.

Only a few details to attend to first. A decent deal for the Aboriginals. A peaceful foreign policy. More money for education. Socialism. Oh well, back to the political grindstone!

JOHN MANIFOLD.
Karl Marx—the man, the philosopher, the economist, the historian, the politician.

A Symposium on Marx

To mark the centenary of the first appearance of Capital, the main scientific work of the great revolutionary thinker and fighter Karl Marx, Australian Left Review is sponsoring this public symposium. Those wishing to attend should forward the symposium fee of $1.00 to Australian Left Review, Box A247, Sydney South Post Office.

Adyar Hall, 25 Bligh Street, Sydney.


Papers will be read by J. D. Blake, C. Manning Clark, M.A., J. P. Richardson, B.Sc. Econ., and Bernie Taft.

Concerning the publication of Capital

April 1867, Marx takes the manuscript of Volume 1 to the publisher, Meissner of Hamburg.

July 25, Marx completes his preface declaring “The work, the first volume of which I now submit to the public, forms the continuation of my A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy published in 1859.”

September 14, Capital, Volume 1, published in an edition of 1000.

The first Russian edition appeared in 1872, the French in 1875, and the English in 1886.

Volumes two and three, prepared for publication from Marx’s manuscripts after his death by Frederick Engels, appeared in 1886 and 1895 respectively.

Theories of Surplus Value, which was to have formed the fourth volume was published in Stuttgart in 1905-10.
FULL RIGHTS FOR ABORIGINES

A detailed program of the Communist Party entitled: Full Rights For Aborigines and Torres Strait Islanders has been published for discussion and amendment. This program is one of the documents for discussion at the 21st National Congress of the Communist Party.

Copies may be obtained, free of charge, on request to 168 Day Street, Sydney, and at all Communist Party offices.

SUBTLE FLAME

by Katharine Susannah Prichard

Australasian Book Society. Price $3.50

This novel from one of Australia’s greatest writers examines the vast, complex pattern of contemporary life. It is a story about peace and of the poor, the fearful, the down-trodden, the brave, the self-sacrificing who live out their lives in present day Australia.

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.