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THE ISRAEL-ARAB WAR has tapered off to an uneasy ceasefire interrupted by armed flare-ups. Israel now occupies almost all Egyptian territory east of Suez, a large part of Jordan, and part of Syria. Moshe Dayan and his mentor, Ben Gurion, are Israel's heroes of the moment. Dayan was also strategist and executor of the 1956 surprise attack, which certainly won a temporary military victory but ended in political fiasco. 1967 is unlikely to have any better result for Israel in the long run unless there is a rapid and far-reaching political change.

A major aim of Israel and imperialist strategy, as in 1956, was the downfall of Nasser, the Syrian government and other anti-imperialist Arab regimes. This failed and the Arab nations are more than ever convinced of the need to take an anti-imperialist path. Their hostility to the United States is stronger than ever. If the Arabs see Israel as part of the United States' attack on Arabs' national independence and aspirations, this is not unnatural.

The Australian press, typically, has tried to cover up the significance of United Nations' voting on the Middle East. Yet every significant Asian and African country voted against Israel; only the United States, Australia and 15 other countries joined Israel in abstaining from the latest UN vote that again condemned the occupation of Jerusalem by 99 to nil.

Hegel wrote that "tragedy consists, not in the conflict between right and wrong, but in the conflict between right and right". The Middle East crisis is certainly affected by the conflict between Israel's right to national existence, and the right of the Palestine Arabs to live in their homeland from which they were driven in 1948. Over a million Arab refugees were driven out of Palestine in 1948; today, their numbers are swollen by hundreds of thousands more forcibly driven out of occupied Arab territories.

However, the basic cause of the Middle East conflict definitely lies in the conflict between right and wrong, the struggle of the Arabs for national independence against Western imperialism. The oil cartels take at least $1,000 million profit annually from the Middle East, most going to the US monopolies. The United States, taking over from Britain and France, tried to maintain political and military supremacy by establishing reactionary regimes and using the Sixth Fleet and military bases.
By 1959, the balance of forces had definitely swung against imperialism; the Bagdad Pact had disintegrated and its successor, CENTO, had proved largely ineffective. National revolutionary movements have arisen all over the Middle East and have succeeded in several of the more important Arab countries. The Arabs' national revolutionary movement has evoked fear and hostility from the United States, which stops at nothing to protect its oil interests. This is why the USSR has helped the Arab countries to protect themselves from imperialist attacks in the past, and is today giving them new economic, political and military aid.

In 1951, Mossadegh of Iran (a Middle Eastern, though not an Arab nation) nationalised foreign oil concerns. A few months later he was overthrown in a military coup now openly admitted as engineered by the CIA. In 1958, the Americans landed in Lebanon and threatened Syria; in 1963, Kassim of Iraq was murdered the day after he announced his intention to nationalise foreign oil installations. Syria's 1967 nationalisation of the oil pipeline was soon followed by American efforts to overthrow the government, co-ordinated with Israeli military attacks and air-raids on Damascus.

Israel's co-ordination with Western, particularly US, attacks upon the Arab national liberation movement, is sometimes justified as a forced alliance with anyone who will help a beleaguered country. However, Israel's ruling policy has been one of decisive pro-Western, pro-American alignment, supporting United States imperialism not only against the Arabs but also in Vietnam, in the United Nations and in opposition to the socialist countries. This whole policy has estranged Israel from its neighbors and its potential friends, and unless it is changed Israel will always be at odds with its neighbors.

The first essential step towards peace and co-operation is immediate and unconditional withdrawal from all occupied territory. The second step is for Israel to accept a non-aligned position, renunciation of support for American policies in the Middle East, and negotiation of Arab recognition of Israel's right to national existence, the right of the Palestine Arabs to choose return to their homeland or receive compensation, and equality of Jews and Arabs in Israel.

Any other policy will lead to growing dependence upon the United States, West Germany and a few other regimes without prestige or capacity. And dependence upon the United States leads to unexpected problems.
EVEN MR. HOLT may be discovering that "All the Way" means a bit further than he thought. When Mr. McNamara returned to Washington from his ninth and gloomiest Saigon visit, he virtually pronounced a death sentence on an unknown number of young Australian conscripts. Those already there must be 'used more effectively', while more men are to be requisitioned from the 'allies', as imperial Rome levied its vassals.

Vietnam has already been the graveyard of many military and political reputations. Generals have come and gone; Harkins, Wheeler, Maxwell Taylor, Sharp. Now Westmoreland is implicitly criticised in McNamara's demand for more effective use of US forces. American political figures have fared no better. Cabot Lodge had two 'tours of duty', to no avail. He and Lansdale were shifted because their 'pacification' failed, but the new 'pacification' measures have virtually collapsed. The Saigon 'government' is in scarcely better shape. McNamara himself may be near the end of the political road; even Johnson is running short of time.

Military failure is obvious, even though the United States has brought enormous power to bear upon Vietnam, including the Seventh Fleet and part of the Sixth. It is using 4,300 modern aircraft, including nearly half the US Army's helicopters; 3,000 heavy artillery pieces, and infantry equipped with weapons that the Americans claim as the most modern in the world. It has dropped more bombs than were dropped in Europe in World War II, and added large-scale chemical and gas warfare.

The Americans have tried many different strategies and tactics. In 1963 they introduced the heliborne tactic; in early 1964 the tactic of attacks with armored cars was used; in late 1964, massed use of the puppet army; in 1965 the US used combined naval, ground and air forces. In 1966 and 1967 the Americans launched a series of 'search and destroy' and 'pacification' operations. One after another, there were proclaimed as great victories — Attleboro, Cedar Falls, Gadsden, Junction City and Tershying. But the nett result is failure. The Sydney Morning Herald's correspondent, Margaret Jones, writes:

"The Pentagon claims its search-and-destroy operations are very successful, but correspondents in the field report that areas like the Iron Triangle from which the Vietcong were swept early this year, are now back in communist hands." (S.M.H., 5/7/67)

The latest assault on Da Nang (July 14th), with its loss of dozens of planes, 200 casualties, and the simultaneous release of 1,200 guerrilla prisoners nearby, showed the impossibility of securing US positions.
Margaret Jones' already quoted article supplies the answer to why the Americans are losing the war. She writes: “Some correspondents in the battle area are calling the war unwinnable, because the roots of revolution are deep in the peasantry . . .” The Vietnamese, by no means foolish optimists, are confident of victory. The *Vietnam Courier* (June 5th) writes:

“The Vietnamese people's struggle will go through difficulties and hardships, but we are resolved to fight until complete victory. One hundred thousand or several hundred thousand additional American troops can in no way save the US from defeat.”

The heroic and expert fight of the Vietnamese people is the main cause for this certainty of victory. A not unimportant factor is the political consequences within the United States of an apparently endless vista of a war that garners neither honor nor victory.

AUSTRALIA FACES THE SAME perspective, even if on a smaller scale. More troops, more casualties, more taxes, more price rises, more crises in education, more decline in social services—and more questioning of the war, the foreign policy behind it, and the wisdom of a government that has sacrificed all independence and freedom of action.

Stresses and strains caused by government policies are profoundly influenced by the Vietnam commitments. Internal contradictions within the government are sharpening, going deeper than personality clashes or Liberal Party manoeuvring to cut the Country Party down to size. They are policy differences that go deep, affecting trade, rural policy and foreign investment.

Controversy over the Basic Industries Group is surely one of the strangest political incidents of recent years. No one will admit to knowing anything about it, except the 'extremely rich' Mr. C. W. Russell. The Prime Minister knows nothing; Mr. McEwen, who started it all off by his blistering attack, is now emulating Brer Rabbit and lying low. Mr. McMahon seems to know more than most, if one follows the old political maxim: Never believe a rumor until it's been officially denied.

The last has not been heard of BIG or of the deep policy differences within Cabinet and the government parties. And the agonising decisions facing the government over Vietnam, the Budget, trade policy and the industrial situation will stoke the fires.

THE LABOR MOVEMENT can turn these divisions to its advantage, if it develops a much more dynamic policy of exposure,
confrontation and action. On the industrial scene, union unrest is rising to new heights. 400,000 metal workers are about to stop work, hundreds of thousands more will protest over the total wage decision, postal workers are acting both for improved conditions and in answer to high-handed government authoritarianism. Predictable government decisions on Vietnam can be answered by vigorous action for a real peace policy, and the Budget could be met by a serious criticism of the government's whole economic policy and advancing a socialist alternative for a new radical program of struggle for reform and social change. These are the real issues of policy that were and will be discussed at the series of Labor Party, communist and trade union conferences that began in June and will end in September.

The Labor Party conferences were inconclusive. In Melbourne, Mr. Whitlam's intemperate attacks strengthened the left rather than weakened it. In Sydney, the right held on to control, though its margin was not always secure despite some dubiously inflated delegations from unions committed to the machine. South Australia was mainly concerned with the problem of maintaining the State government, while in Perth the advances made by the Whitlam group may be more apparent than real.

A curious feature of Labor Party conferences is that the differences are usually fought out on apparently secondary issues. Thus, tickets, positions and organisational questions take first place. The Whitlam probes against Vietnam policy were not pressed, and Mr. Barnard corrected his Saigon 'indiscretion'. A tacit compromise on Vietnam appears possible at the Federal Conference, in which the left will hold more than it concedes, but the right will bargain on having the numbers later on to 'interpret' policy in its own way.

Mr. Whitlam's main emphasis just now seems to be on a new image of a streamlined modern organisational structure, backed up by a youthful, vigorous leadership in parliament and party. From outside, it appears that the plan for reorganisation is mainly concerned with increasing the weight of NSW in the Federal Conference, and so changing the balance in favor of the right. Unfortunately, NSW is scarcely the best advertisement for the dynamic image. Old, tired, conservative, rigid, anti-intellectual are better descriptions of the NSW leadership than the Victorian, whatever the latter's real or imagined weaknesses may be. Mr. Colbourne seems the authentic image of the NSW machine.

The NSW branch earlier this year tried to ban its members from peace activity, and renewed this effort by the narrow margin of 30 votes at the June Conference. The machine's weight was thrown against certain executive members regarded as left of centre not only to assert right domination in general, but also
to get the numbers for the Electoral College that was to pre-select the NSW Senate candidates. It was an open secret that Senators Murphy and McLelland were marked for the axe, in favor of two older and much less talented candidates. This was another example of the NSW machine's preference for yes-men rather than young men of ability and vigor who take Labor Party policy seriously. Since the NSW executive is Mr. Whitlam's main prop, its activities cast some doubt on his image-building. Although the rightwing was supremely confident—a 'victory party' had been organised for the evening that turned into a wake—the electoral college gave McLelland and Murphy the first two positions.

The struggle in the Labor Party still seems evenly balanced, and probably there will be little change after the Federal Conference in Adelaide. The basic policy issues will remain unsettled.

THE COMMUNIST PARTY CONGRESS gave its main attention to policy, although also deciding important proposals on Party structure and rules. Both had been circulated for wide discussion some seven months before Congress assembled. When the 159 delegates took their seats, they knew what the basic issues were, and knew the general views of their electors on these. There was no wide gulf between two groups as have developed in the Labor Party—there was a wide range of basic unity on aims, methods and tasks.

This by no means precluded debate, differences and controversy, of which there was enough to hold every delegate's interest to the end. This basic unity did ensure that differences did not harden into irreconcilable positions, factions or tickets, but that all main decisions were debated out and finally adopted unanimously or by wide margins.

These decisions included endorsement of the Party’s analysis of the significance of technological change and its effects on social structure and class forces, adoption of the aim of working towards a coalition of the left, and the aims and general principles of striving for unity of the labor movement as the centre of this coalition. The Congress reaffirmed the Party’s support for the Vietnamese people’s struggle against US imperialism as the main task in the struggle for peace, and as a vital part of the struggle for social advance in Australia.

Important changes were made in the Party Constitution, all designed to strengthen party democracy and create new conditions for a vigorous Party life. The aim of building a mass Communist Party was endorsed, and decisions adopted setting out the methods of working towards this aim.
Decisions were taken for a vigorous drive to develop and explain the Party's ideas and policies on all the main issues confronting Australians, including a much deeper analysis and research into Australian society. Publication of a book, pamphlets and brochures was decided on, and new methods of promoting marxist study and analysis within the Party and publicity were adopted.

The 21st Communist Party Congress may be estimated in the future as marking an important step forward for the Party itself, the left as a whole, and the labor movement.

TECHNOLOGICAL AND OTHER SOCIAL CHANGES, placing new issues before all classes and political trends, raise the most vital questions for Australian unionism. The Communist Party Congress suggested that modern unionism should assert the rights of employees not only to higher wages, shorter hours and social security, but also to education, individual dignity and democratic control of decisions made in huge and impersonal concerns, run by high paid bureaucrats, in both monopoly and government enterprises. It suggested that unionism needed closer cooperation between industrial and white-collar unions, amalgamation and other improvements of union organisation. The essential feature of such organisational improvement should be grass-roots democracy, initiative of workplace organisation and individual unions, not bureaucratic control by a small body of conservatives at the centre. Modern unionism must be militant, democratic and assertive of the new demands of today's workers. The contention of lines in the union movement, the struggle between right and left, centres precisely on these issues.

The forthcoming Congress of the Australian Council of Trade Unions will debate these issues. While the conservative right may be well prepared in control of votes, it has nothing to advance in the realm of ideas, policy or dynamism in building the unions. Its policy, confined to legalism, arbitration, behind-the-scenes manoeuvring and passive unions controlled by high paid officials, is in deep crisis following the total wage decisions, the prolonged margins case and other arbitration failures.

In these circumstances, only the most determined minority of opponents of action on the ACTU executive voted against a protest action on the total wage, and the whole executive supported the Metal Trades margins stoppage, albeit with as many qualifications and restrictions as the majority could impose.

All these issues, rather than mechanical majorities ensured by AWU affiliation, will influence the course of the ACTU Congress and the future of Australian unionism.
Question: In the current struggle in Vietnam, how much does Vietnamese history determine attitudes?

Answer: One is tempted to say: Absolutely. A point which it seems to me is insufficiently grasped outside Vietnam is that in the minds of the chief actors, the Vietnamese, this struggle is predominantly a national struggle, a struggle for the rights of the Vietnamese nation. The fact that victory for the Vietnamese would enhance socialist and neutralist influence in South-east Asia, and would be a reverse for imperialism, is secondary for them. This is the essential social and political fact which is obscured by such formulations as "communist aggression," or Sir Robert Menzies' "southward thrust of Chinese communism," or a thousand and one other such formulations which not only grossly distort but also grossly exaggerate the international reference of the struggle in Vietnam.

One Vietnamese spokesman put it to me: "This is the last war we will have to fight. War will not be for our children." When he said "the last war" he meant the last of nearly 2,000 years of wars against foreign occupation—by Chinese and Mongols, French and Japanese, and now Americans. That kind of historical perspective is the property of every Vietnamese. For them the struggle now unfolding in resistance to American aggression is "merely" the latest, greatest and most mature of a whole series of independence struggles which have occurred across the history of the country. The experience of this long period is present, one can say, in all Vietnamese policies and attitudes in relation to the war.

Q.: Demands for counter-escalation by the USSR have been made in the West. How are
these demands assessed in Viet-
nam?
A.: The Vietnamese are parti-
sans of a policy of “limiting
the war,” as they put it. They
want to limit the war to Viet-
nam, and, in Vietnam, to South
Vietnam, the real seat of the
present conflict. Hence their
prime demand: stopping the
bombing of the North. Time
and again I was told that they
want to prevent the war from
spreading to China and the
Soviet Union. I was told ex-
plicitly and on several occa-
sions that a world war arising
over Vietnam would not im-
prove Vietnam’s situation, or
anyone else’s. This danger is a
factor always present in their
thinking, and not least in con-
nection with socialist support
and aid. Clearly, their estimate
of the likely US reaction in the
event of the Soviet Union
transforming the Vietnam issue
into a straight nuclear con-
frontation with the US is not
nearly as sanguine as some I
have heard expressed outside
Vietnam.

As things stand, Prime Minis-
ter Pham Van Dong told me
(interview published in Trib-
une, June 14) that “all the
socialist countries—the Soviet
Union, China and the others
—are supporting us and aiding
us with all their strength.”

This is not to say that there
are absolutely no difficulties in
relations with the socialist
countries in connection with
support and aid. But such diffi-
culties, in the view of the Viet-
namese, are secondary factors,
to be dealt with in strictly bi-
lateral talks between the parties
concerned. For example, my
impression is that it was a re-
sult of just such talks as these
between the Vietnamese and
the Chinese that not many
months ago certain difficulties
in the flow of Soviet aid
through China were ironed out.

An important element over-
looked in the argument for all-
out counter-escalation by the
Soviet Union is Vietnamese
independence—that is, Viet-
namese independence in rela-
tions with Vietnam’s friends.
Anyone familiar with the Viet-
namese reality knows that this
is a very important element
indeed. It is the firm view of
the Vietnamese that it is Viet-
namese first of all who have
the right to make decisions on
the conduct of the war, not
Russians, Chinese or anyone
else.

In general, one can say that
of course the Russians could
“do more” for the Vietnamese.
So could all the other socialist
countries. So could we in Aus-
tralia. But in the matter of
aid from socialist countries it
is the Vietnamese who decide
what ought to be done. In to-
day’s circumstances, the Viet-
namese say repeatedly that
they are perfectly satisfied with
the state of affairs regarding
support and aid. There seems
little reason why their friends
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outside Vietnam should not take their word for it.

Q.: Hawks in the USA claim that protest movements, such as those in Australia give North Vietnam an impression that it can achieve victory through the collapse of government in the USA, Australia, and so on. What do the North Vietnamese know about the protest movements and how do they regard them?

A.: I found the Vietnamese very well-informed about the protest movements, especially that in the United States. I also found them entirely without illusions about “winning the war in Washington.” The hawkish argument referred to is a false and wicked one, designed to frighten and to paralyse the action of people in the Western countries who are politically and morally opposed to the Vietnam war. One sees it in its true light when one talks with the Vietnamese leaders about how they actually believe they will win the war. These men are not amateurs or dilettantes of war—they have no mean experience of it. They know that war is primarily a military phenomenon, and that it is in military terms, taken in conjunction with political factors at home and abroad, that wars are won and lost.

It is their military and political successes in Vietnam upon which they count to persuade the Americans to desist from their aggression. International factors can have a beneficent influence (or otherwise) on the struggle. But they are and will remain secondary to the evolution of events on the ground in Vietnam. Indeed, the Vietnamese are acutely aware that the international climate surrounding the war is to some extent conditioned by the course of military operations. One spokesman put it to me: “We deeply appreciate the aid of the socialist countries. But to merit it, and to continue to have it, we must fight well.” No doubt they would expect the protest movement in the capitalist countries to rise as they score more military successes of the kind they have been recording in recent months, especially in the fighting just below the 17th parallel.

Pham Van Dong summed up the Vietnamese attitude on this question when he told me: “To the extent that the people of the United States, white and black come to realise that this war is a dirty war, that it is causing the US losses throughout the world; to the extent that they are worried about it, and see that they must struggle against it, we think this is a good thing. To that extent they are doing their duty as men of progress, working for the national interests of the US, properly understood. If they win, good luck to them. We applaud them. But we have
no illusions about counting on their activities to win the war." In a word, the Vietnamese see the protest movement against the war as primarily helpful to the countries in which it arises, while they value highly the support it provides for them in their struggle.

When I expressed to a representative of the Vietnam Lao Dong Party the view of the Communist Party of Australia that the struggle in our country against the Vietnam war was vital to Australia's national future, and was by no means merely a matter of extending support to the Vietnamese, he was particularly appreciative. He intimated that not all parties at all times had made this kind of appraisal of the significance of the struggle against the Vietnam war.

Q.: A few months ago you wrote on Vietnam in ALR and said that there would be compromises in the course of a settlement in Vietnam. Do you still hold the same view?

A.: I agree with Wilfred Bur- chett who wrote in his latest book, *Vietnam North*: "So far neither Hanoi nor Washington has realistically set out the steps that could be taken to end the war." There is a school of thought which holds that even to breathe the word compromise is to betray the Vietnamese people. Adherents of this school of thought display a ferocious readiness to wage war, as it were by proxy, until the last Vietnamese. The approach of such sidelines strategists is a million miles from that of the Vietnamese leaders, who are acutely conscious of the suffering caused their people by the war, and who will not permit the war to go on one minute longer than is absolutely necessary to guarantee the national rights of Vietnam.

The essential condition for a peace settlement is that the US should decide to abandon its project to dominate South Vietnam. As I have said above, the Vietnamese believe this decision will be reached primarily as a result of military-political developments in Vietnam. But the US is still a good, long way from reaching this decision. The Vietnamese warned me repeatedly that the war will become intense in the time ahead, that there will be new steps in escalation. So, the essential element for a settlement being absent, it is natural that each side should still be making as it were maximal demands. That is what diplomacy is like. Present stances on both sides, as Burchett says, are not altogether "realistic."

Once the Americans have made it clear that they are prepared to concede Vietnamese independence, all kinds of new diplomatic positions—say on the how and when of American military withdrawal from South
Vietnam—will become possible. Having said that, it should be added that the Vietnamese official positions as they stand, both that of the Democratic Republic in the North and that of the National Liberation Front in the South, are put forward merely as the basis—the expression “most correct basis” has often been used—for negotiations. And the key to all progress in a settlement of the war remains the American acceptance of the quite limited Vietnamese demand for the unconditional and permanent cessation of the bombing raids and all other acts of war against the Democratic Republic of Vietnam. Once that demand has been acceded to, talks can begin between the US and the Democratic Republic, and a whole new climate created on all questions concerning the war, including to some extent those affecting South Vietnam.

Q.: Some critics suggest that aid from socialist countries is both inadequate and inferior and that Vietnam tries to keep aloof from world communist disputes. What is the real position about aid, and about Vietnam’s view of other communist movements?

A.: I have quoted Pham Van Dong as saying that the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries are “supporting and aiding” Vietnam “with all their strength.” The words, I imagine, were not lightly used. As far as the Soviet Union is concerned, it was borne strongly home to me in the course of my stay in Vietnam that the change from Khrushchov’s leadership in October 1964 marked a radical improvement in relations between the Soviet Union and Vietnam. Prime Minister Kosygin’s February 1965 visit to the Democratic Republic, which was already being bombed by the US, symbolised the new situation. It is clear from what I learnt in Vietnam that the October 1964 changes in the Soviet leadership were at least in part the reflection in socialist world politics of the new stage in the Vietnam war which was then beginning. (It will be recalled that the first step in escalation of the war to North Vietnam was the US bombing of Tonkin Gulf which took place in August 1965).

Concerning quality of aid, the limiting factor here appeared to be not lack of socialist willingness to provide more sophisticated weaponry but the lack of Vietnamese technical cadres to handle this weaponry independently. This side of things is receiving the constant and active attention of all parties concerned.

Rejection by the Communist Party of China of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union’s repeated proposals for unity in support of the Vietnam struggle is a serious and
damaging complication. Vietnam, however, holds “aloof” from world communist disputes in the sense that it makes no public statements openly espousing the viewpoint of either side. But this is as far as its “aloofness” goes. When the record can be made public, I feel sure that Vietnam’s years-long campaign of vigorous and hard-hitting private bilateral discussions with brother socialist countries will be found to have played no small part in minimising the effects of current divisions. As regards present day socialist-camp politics, one of the most fascinating aspects of the Vietnamese scene is that neither in the press nor in discussion does one ever come across the slightest reference to the “great proletarian cultural revolution” which is raging just across the border in China.

Q.: Since it is admitted that the extent of the bombing of Vietnam now exceeds the bombing of Europe in World War II, how is it possible for economic life to continue?

A.: The key weapons appear to be mass political unity for the construction of socialism in war conditions, and to defeat American aggression and correct organisational measures to carry this political unit into practical effect. The mass political unity for the prosecution of the people’s war in the North, as in the South, is greater today than it has ever been. As in World War II, the mass bombing of civilian targets has not demoralised people, but has done the opposite. The organisational steps taken to implement this political unity have been brilliantly imaginative and bold.

Policies of dispersal of industry, schools, hospitals and various government departments from the cities of North Vietnam have cut the urban population to approximately one million (from about three million before escalation began). In other cities, the mass build-up of air raid shelters for those remaining is in itself an achievement of note, reflecting the active and courageous response of North Vietnam to the air war. Industry has “gone regional”, or “gone local”, in marked contrast to the policy of building big centralised plants and complexes which characterised earlier years of North Vietnamese socialism. There is also a sociological base to Vietnam’s power to resist the air war: being an agrarian society, whose industry had barely been born before it was faced with the threat of being bombed out of existence, it is capable of “falling back to the countryside” in a manner which could not be dreamed of in an urbanised, European-type society.

Q.: How are the proposed elections in South Vietnam being viewed?
A.: To be perfectly frank, I don’t know. That is, apart from the fact that I am sure they are not being viewed as an authentic exercise in South Vietnamese democracy. Elections held in the shadow of half a million US bayonets do not commend themselves as being a fair expression of national will. A remarkable feature of my most recent visit to Vietnam is that there was practically no mention of Saigon politics. This is in sharp contrast to my previous time there, 1958-60, when there was constant talk of what the “My-Diem (American) clique” were doing. The difference, it seems to me, reflects a profound change in the Vietnamese scene. Diem was taken seriously as a figure potentially capable of erecting a relatively long-lived, right-wing-based nationalist regime in South Vietnam. So they talked about him. Ky and the present Saigon junta have no such prospects. So they don’t talk about them. It’s as simple as that.

No doubt in North Vietnam they know a lot about Saigon politics, even today, but in conversations with foreign pressmen on brief visits it seems they have more important things to discuss. The war has become what is virtually a nation-wide war against an American expeditionary force of almost half a million men and against a good part of the American air force and navy. Ky and the elections and the rest only exist as a function of this vast foreign military presence. I have no doubt that Ky’s decision at the end of June to step down from the “presidential race” would be put down in North Vietnam rather to the diplomatic expertise of US Ambassador Ellsworth Bunker than to any independent judgment Ky might have made of the situation.

VERY OFTEN we find that science and technology are forcing us to get rid of our short-sighted views. Against our will we find a new behavior forced on us which, finally, we recognise as being in the line of man’s spiritual progress; the fostering of intellectual activities thanks to the take-over by the machine of the greater part of our material activities; socialisation which when properly understood, tears us away from our egoism and helps us discover the fullness which the person can discover in collective realisations; knowledge of nature and its mastery which thrills and enriches us.

NEW WAGE STRUCTURE—THE CHALLENGE

The Research Officer of the Building Workers' Industrial Union in Queensland sees the recent decision of the Commonwealth Arbitration Commission granting the employers' claim for a total wage as a move to impose an 'incomes policy' to the detriment of the Trade Unions.

PRONOUNCEMENT of the Commonwealth Arbitration Commission on the Federal basic wages in the various States and marginal rates for skill, experience, disability and some other matters under the Metal Trades Award affect directly the wages of more than 40 per cent. of all workers in Australia.

As there has been a strong tendency recently for State Industrial Tribunals to apply decisions of the Commonwealth Arbitration Commission to State award workers, the Commonwealth Commission has become the main wage-fixing body in Australia. Federal basic wages, as such, were first declared in 1907 following the famous Harvester Judgment of that year. A marginal rate of pay was first fixed in 1924 after the Engineers' case. The Federal basic wage (and later the States' basic wages) and marginal rates quickly became the basis of wage fixation in Australia. Both appeared inviolable in the system of industrial relations known as compulsory arbitration.

That set-up served capitalism well. Arbitration Courts cut wages and lengthened hours during the depression years of the 1930's. Some marginal pay rates and the Federal basic wages were pegged for periods during World War II and between 1953-56 and 1961-64. Only minimal wages increases were conceded in the postwar boom years when Australian capitalism experienced unprecedented development. Looked at superficially, the methods of wage fixation which had served Australian capitalism so well would have appeared to set the pattern for the future.

However, the recent pronouncement of the Commonwealth Arbitration Commission peremptorily abolished the basic wage and margin components of wage rates in Federal awards and, in their stead, ordered the introduction of total wages. The pronouncement ended yearly reviews of the basic wage and the marginal rates within the Commonwealth Commission's juris-
diction and said that there should be no economic review of the
total wages set by it until August 1968. Approval for what are
known as work values cases was expressed by the Commonwealth
Commission. Doing all this, the Commonwealth Commission in
1967 accepted fully employers' proposals—first advanced at length
in 1964—to abolish the basic wage and margins and institute a
series of total wages in Federal awards.

The 1967 total wage pronouncement highlights one of the
greatest reversals of policy in the long and shabby history of
compulsory arbitration. It invites the sharpest criticism of a
Commonwealth Commission which accepts now what it so firmly
opposed only three years ago.

In 1964, the Metal Trades Employers' Association had asked
the Commonwealth Arbitration Commission to abolish the basic
wage, refuse to reintroduce automatic adjustments to compensate
for rises in the cost of living, and establish a new approach to
wage fixation based on total wages. The trade unions strongly
opposed the application. They stressed the importance of the
basic wage to the lower-paid workers, the historical significance
of the basic wage, and parliamentary recognition of the need for
a basic wage. The Commonwealth Government intervened on
the employers' side, to oppose automatic adjustments to cover
rises in the cost of living, and claimed that it was wrong that
all marginal rates should increase after an increase had been
found to be justified in one marginal rate.

After every conceivable argument for and against these pro­
posals had been advanced in the lengthy 1964 hearing, the judges
said that the Commonwealth Arbitration Commission was
unanimous that the basic wage should not be abolished and that
the employers' proposal for a total wage should be rejected.

Those who determined the 1964 total wage case in this way
were: Kirby C. J., Gallagher J., Moore J., Nimmo J., and Com­
mmissioner Winter. Of these five, four—Kirby C. J., Gallagher J.,
Moore J., and Commissioner Winter—made up the Bench which
pronounced the 1967 total wage judgment. There was only one
Judge (Nimmo J.) who had participated in the 1964 total wage
case but not in the 1967 one. In 1964, Gallagher J. said: "The
case for the retention of the basic wage is beyond argument. The
application should be refused." What happened between 1964
and 1967 to cause the somersault in his opinion? Similarly, what
happened between 1964 and 1967 to influence Kirby C. J., Moore
J., and Commissioner Winter to somersault on statements which
they made collectively in 1964, such as these?:

The role of the Commission was to prevent and settle industrial
disputes and the Commission was neither an economic planning body nor a national commission dealing with all types of income or even all wages and salaries.

The total wage proposal could not be applied by the Commission in a community where there was no consideration of incomes overall and no overall authoritative control of prices.

The Commission not only did not fix all incomes but did not even fix all wages and salaries . . . It could not cause the (total wage) theory to work in Australia in the way suggested by the employers . . .

Application of a total wage would reduce the flexibility of wage fixation and, in particular, wage fixation by the Commission.

Implementation of the employers’ theory would prevent the Commission from increasing wages even when the wages would not be just and reasonable unless increased.

Those 1964 factors on which the Commonwealth Commission refused to end the basic wage and marginal rates are as valid now as they were then. Indeed, with price inflation (now inbuilt in the Australian economy) and growing poverty among sizeable sections of lower-paid workers, they are even more potent today. Yet the Commission in 1967 abandons considerations which it found decisive in 1964.

The abolition of the Federal basic wages and marginal rates and their replacement by a total wage was greeted with glee by employers and the Commonwealth Government. Reasons for this are plain.

When the weekly wage under Federal awards was divided into a basic wage and margin (as has been the case up to now), it was possible for the trade unions to organise national campaigns to bring together many sections of workers around the need for increases in both the basic wage and margins.

Entry of the Australian Council of Salaried and Professional Associations into national campaigns from 1956 on brought new qualities of freshness, vigor and colorful publicity into the trade union movement.

In the past, submissions were made to national wage hearings on behalf of pensioners and fixed-income earners. The need for a modern basic wage to meet developing social needs had been shown and the monopolies’ use of price inflation as a method of cutting real wages and lifting profits had been exposed.

All this activity had made it possible to get national wage and margin hearings out of the cloistered precincts of arbitration tri-
bunals and into the public domain, where they should be, and some improvements in living standards were won on occasions. This joint and spreading activity by the blue collar, white collar and no collar workers had an impact even on the conservative leadership of the Australian Council of Trade Unions. Fear of this development was one reason for employers' fervor for a change to a total wage, and one reason for their joy now at the Commission's decision.

Now there will be yearly economic review—of what and how is not clear—and work value hearings conducted industry by industry and by individual groups of unions, with whatever amount can be won in an industry remaining unchanged until a change can be shown in the value of the work. The new wage fixing policies of the Commonwealth Arbitration Commission are designed, under existing ground rules, to cut across joint actions by workers, and to stir up jealousies between those in different industries and those at different ends of the pay scale. Australian trade unionists have rightly been critical of the wage restraint policy imposed on British workers by the Wilson Labor Government. Some unionists have said it couldn't happen here. Can't it?

In a period of capitalist expansion, such as now, the trade unions could have a decided advantage in bargaining around wage rates. This is why tradesmen particularly have been able to establish over-award areas in some States and many award marginal rates are higher—for example, in Western Australia, the A.C.T., Victoria and Queensland. This also is why the Commonwealth Government, which acts on behalf of monopoly capitalism, and the compulsory arbitration system which capitalism—and not the Labor Party, as believed by many—initiated early this century, have once more rushed to the help of the employers, this time by adopting a new wage fashion—the total wage.

In advocating a total wage, employers were not just seeking to simplify methods of wage determination, as some commentators have suggested. What they were really after was a more effective method of wage control, with the aim of limiting wage increases and restricting the campaigns and struggles of the trade unions on wages. They believe, and with good reason, that the total wage will operate to the advantage of the employers and to the disadvantage of the trade unions. Wages will be more effectively controlled but there will be no controls over prices or profits.

It must be said frankly that monopoly capitalism in Australia—increasingly subject to domination by foreign monopoly eco-
nomic and other influences—has crept up on the Australian trade union movement and is dealing it some heavy blows.

This has been aided by the temporary triumph of rightwing "don't rock the boat" policies in the leadership of the ACTU, the extreme conservatism of the Establishment, and the failure of the trade unions (with some notable exceptions) to take the fight for economic and social needs to the monopolies, and also to (as very large employers) the Governments.

The main content of any wage restraint, wage freeze, guidelines or income policy—call it what you like—is to effect a redistribution of income in the interests of monopoly capitalism by rigidly controlling wages while allowing profits and prices to rise. If in the course of this the trade union movement can be fragmented and a policy of go it alone encouraged, then so much the better for monopoly capitalism.

As against the incomes policy now being imposed on wage workers and many salary earners, and the unceasing manipulation of increase in the cost of goods and services, the trade unions must raise and fight strongly for policies based on a redistribution of income in their favor. The situation is favorable for this and for public demonstrations against price rises and the mounting adverse effect which war expenditure has on wages, social services, public works and employment.

Over the past few years, as now, many trade union officials, including officials of the ACTU, have raised collective bargaining as an alternative to compulsory arbitration, its attendant penal provisions, and its record of nearly always coming down on the side of big capital. Collective bargaining implies direct negotiations with employers at the levels of industry, group, State and national, with union claims backed by the full strength of the trade unions and their members. But to negotiate direct and be successful surely demands the further and faster strengthening of trade unions through amalgamations and the building of industrial unions.

Other necessary measures to overcome the aims and effects of the total wage decision include:

Industry claims—whether based on work value cases under Federal awards, or on marginal rates under State awards maintaining that concept—to be co-ordinated and, if possible, to be lifted to national claims.

Campaigning should continue and be greatly extended around the demand for a family living wage, based fully on needs and
not on phoney "capacity of the economy to pay" formulas. Trade unions should insist that they have the right at any time to make submissions to Industrial Tribunals for a family living wage.

If the ACTU is to hold the respect of unionists, it must do the job its founders intended and lead workers together to win substantial improvements in wages, working hours, leave of all types and other social needs.

Strong industry-based unions are essential in this age of monopoly control, mechanisation of a high order and developing automation—a period which raises so sharply the need to break the political power of the monopolies, whose course is grimly demonstrated by the Vietnam war and the current attacks on living standards.

This article, while not making radically new proposals on the matters raised—tactically the trade unions are still battling to hold much of the old wage policy, and should be supported on this—implies strongly that the trade union movement has reached the crossroads on policy on wages. Left Review could do the labor movement a valuable service by inviting Labor Party members, Communists and others of the Left, concerned with this, to develop in its pages their views on this important and urgent matter.

TAKING BIRTH before our eyes, we see the conditions for the full development of a new subjectivity, of a new humanism, arise. This humanism is fundamentally different from that of the 17th and 18th centuries, founded on the illusion of an eternal "essence" or "nature" of man, an abstract and mystifying humanism. The humanism of our age is carried completely by history: by the very development of productive forces, by the demand inherent in this same development for the break up of the old production relations and the old forms of the State. This new subjectivity is fundamentally different from the existential subject for it is historical and social, through and through.

DISCUSSION:

DOCTORS FEES AND HEALTH SERVICE REFORM

TODAY, the economic position of lower income families and many also in the middle income group is such that any price rise is a definite hardship. In this context, the indignation of most of the general public at the proposed rise in doctors' fees is easy to understand.

To the worker, who traditionally has had to wage protracted struggles in and out of court for his inadequate pay rises, and who faces even stiffer battles in the future as a result of the total wage decision, the spectacle of the Australian Medical Association recommending to its members a substantial wage increase without having to refer to anyone is galling indeed. The fact that local associations of the AMA, and individual practitioners, may reject part or all of the recommended increase if they wish, does little to soften the blow.

Other price rises tend to pass with less comment. For example, in 1955 when a surgery consultation in a major city cost 17/6, the Women's Weekly could be bought for 6d. Today, a surgery visit costs 28/6, an increase of 63%, whereas the Weekly is 15 cents, an increase of 150%.

Of even greater significance are the rises in public hospital fees. Over the period 1958-1967 these range from no charge (and no rise) in Queensland, to a rise of 128% in N.S.W. ($3.60 to $8.20) and 177% rise in West Australia ($3.60 to $10.00)!

Doctors can produce many justifications for the increase. Apart from taxation which takes a very large slice of their gross income (leaving a pretty big slice, too, it must be said), most practices have quite considerable bad debts which will probably never be collected.

A general practitioner on duty travels an average of 12,600 miles a year. A recent comprehensive N.S.W. survey of hours worked by doctors, whose results were published in the AMA Journal, showed that the general practitioner in metropolitan solo practice works 53 hours a week and stands by on call a further 74 hours—a total of 127 hours per week associated in some way with the job. Country solo practice totals 147.5 hours, and while group practice halves the standby time, it does not reduce the hours of work. Such excessive overtime is quite rightly not permitted in industry.

Studies of death rates from coronary heart disease in men aged 40 to 59 years found that general practitioners had twice the rate of other men in the group, and apart from actual deaths, the rate per 1,000 of coronary heart disease was 7.1 for GPs, 3.3 for other doctors and 2.5 for non-medical people studied.

It must also be recognised that the doctors' fees (particularly the GPs') are not the main economically crippling factor in ill-health. With public hospital fees at $57.40 per week in N.S.W. (increased from $42.00 recently) one cannot risk being out of a hospitals benefits scheme of some kind—a constant drain on slender incomes. Few industrial awards (if any) have paid sick leave provisions adequate for any but minor ailments, and the consequent loss of pay in an illness of even a few weeks can be
an economic disaster, so that most bread-winners struggle to work while ever they can stand. Then there is the pharmacy bill, about which, incidentally, you will be grilled when you claim it as a tax deduction. Compensation, of course, means a wage-cut, and compensation cases are notorious for their protracted nature and difficulty of proof in all but the clearest-cut cases.

We can correctly say that an adequate health service should not be the subject of buying and selling, but an obligatory call on public funds. This is the case in the socialist countries, where the good health of the people is a prime concern of the government, and all health services are free. The accent is on prevention of ill-health, but the income is guaranteed for the entire period if one is off sick.

In our society where fortunes are made out of ill-health by the drug monopolies, and to a lesser extent by a few doctors and private hospitals, some immediate reforms are urgently needed, and some longer-term projects should be commenced without delay.

The frequency of complaints about difficulties in having claims settled, rejection of valid claims apparently by junior clerks, lapsing of coverage after 12 months in long-term and permanent illness or injury, plus the high cost of contributions, point to the most urgent need as the taking over of hospital and medical benefit funds by the Government. This would reverse the present basic principle that "registered funds are left to conduct their own affairs with a minimum of interference" (Senator Dame Annabelle Rankin on behalf of the Minister for Health).

There is immediate need for an investigation into the activities of the funds, which appear to place more emphasis on accumulation of reserves (for what purpose?) than service to the public. They need to be under the light of public scrutiny instead of shrouded in mystery as at present.

Since contributory schemes are the present basis of a national health service, these should be Government-run schemes conducted possibly through the Government Insurance Offices. Under these circumstances, the doctor could well be paid a fee in line with the wage standards of the day, having in mind his considerable knowledge and skill, long hours, unique responsibility for human life, and often heavy financial commitments in the establishment of his practice.

This should not be made the occasion for a rise in contribution rates. Rather, Government administration should facilitate a steady reduction in contribution rates, to the eventual, not-too-distant introduction of a completely non-contributory health service.

Legislation to curb the advertising and sales of drugs, and to limit the profits of the drug houses is also an urgent necessity.

Payment of adequate salaries to hospital specialist and junior medical staff would attract large numbers of applicants of a high standard, as many doctors would prefer this to private practice if the pay were reasonable. A considerable extension of public hospital out-patient buildings, facilities, medical, ancillary and lay staff is needed to provide a satisfactory medical service. No means test should be applied to patients.

Industrial health is all but ignored in Australia, so that in Victoria the Meat Industry Employees' Union, by building and financing a clinic has had to show the Government what it should be doing in providing facilities for investigation and treatment of occupational diseases. Of even
more significance would be a vast prevention scheme and obligatory advanced safety measures to be carried out by the monopolies and other industries, instead of radio exhortations to "work safely."

Removal of university quotas, substantial increasing of teaching staff, and payment of special student allowances would help overcome the real shortage of doctors. Medicine is still a difficult profession for a poor man's children to choose—the long course is too great a financial burden without extended financial aid. This is essential if the lag in numbers is to be overcome.

These measures would help to ensure adequate medical services and a reasonable return to the doctor for his years of study and heavy responsibilities, without financial burden to the worker.

**KATH OLIVE.**

**WORKER, INTELLECTUAL AND SOCIALISM**

DOUG WHITE'S comments in your last issue may indicate that the differences between us are not as great as appeared from our earlier articles.

Among the main criticisms made of his original article was that, in essence, it appeared to contain three unsupported propositions—first, that the intelligentsia as such was developing into a political class with a distinctive ideology differing fundamentally from that of the industrial working class; second, that these two ideologies were competing for hegemony of the anti-capitalist movement; and third, that marxists might well, for this modern world, prefer the ideology of the intellectuals.

From this it followed that marxism 'old' industrial working class and its ideology have 'had it'.

Neither the concept of the intellectuals as a distinct class nor that of competition between its ideology and that of the industrial workers do, in my opinion, reflect objective reality, either as already established facts or developing trends. Nor can the propagation of those concepts assist the movement for a socialist Australia.

Doug White takes as his theme the change in the composition of the work force—occurring at an increasing rate in this period of our history—and he sees it, correctly in my opinion, as in essence of a qualitative character. But, despite his quotations from Richta, he appears to see all these changes as occurring outside the ranks of the industrial workers, outside even the ranks of the working class or any other of the 'old' classes.

Richta speaks of "researchers and technicians (as) an indivisible part of the working class which, while growing in numbers, changes in character".

But, for Doug White, these changes appear to constitute the emergence of a new class on the political scene—the intellectually-trained elite—distinguished solely by the fact of its higher education and not at all by its relationship to the means of production. ("Norm Docker's quite true statement that some intellectually trained persons are self-employed or even employers of labor is beside the point.")

The point to be emphasised is that changes are occurring inside the ranks of the industrial workers in that they are achieving a higher level of intellectual training, mainly, but not solely, as a result of more young intellectually-trained and highly-skilled workers entering their ranks. But the basic relationship of these intellectually-trained workers to the means of
production is the same as that of the non-intellectually-trained.

Doug White does not agree with this—"... newer sections of the work force stand in a different relationship to the productive process". Please, my friend, be specific! What precisely, in a fundamental political sense, is the different relationship?

I would readily concede that a skilled or highly-trained worker—a planning engineer, if you like—could have different points of view and attitudes on various questions from a totally unskilled manual worker. But these matters are related to the problems of working class unity rather than to fundamental class differentiation. They have always existed to some extent or other, e.g., in the sometimes different attitudes of craft and industrial unionists.

The task of Marxists, including those with intellectual training, is to assist the working class (with growing intellectual content) better to master the real changes occurring in objective reality, forge a greater internal unity, improve organisational and political techniques and provide a better attractive force for those emerging forces which can make common cause with it against capitalist policies and ultimately against capitalism itself. Marxists can also assist those emerging forces outside the ranks of the working class to a recognition of the value to them of such an alliance.

Political opportunism, to which I certainly share Doug White's antipathy, has many aspects, one of the most fundamental being that of tailing behind a spontaneously developed ideology or movement.

The ideology of the industrial workers was reformist, anarcho-syndicalist or narrow trade unionist, but was only considered by most revolutionaries to be 'working class ideology' insofar as it embraced socialism and marxism. Is it not this same ideology which we need to find the ways to have the intellectuals approach, even if from a different starting point?

Doug White invites me to agree with him that we should not "restrict thinking to minor tinkerings with the grand scheme laid down in the past". In return, I am sure he will agree that correct Marxist analysis and understanding still postulate a socialist form of society as the solution to the problems of the Australian people, that the more firmly the Socialist movement embraces the working class and particularly the organised industrial workers, the more soundly based it will be, and the more it attracts to its side the growing number of intellectuals, the more effective it will be.

Norm Docker.

LAWSON IN W.A.

FROM THE FOUNDATION of the Sydney Bulletin until the turn of the century its impact was both popular and nation-wide. The Bulletin's influence in Western Australia was striking. With depression in the east and discovery of gold in the west there was an exodus, and with the diggers went the Bulletin. And with the Bulletin, Henry Lawson. But even apart from the goldrushes Lawson was already known in Western Australia. The democratic provincial newspaper the Victorian Express (later the Geraldton Express) was reprinting verse from the Bulletin in the early eighteen nineties—including Lawson's verse. The conservative Perth press was slow to recognise the upsurge of our national literature. It regarded Australia as "one of the worst places in the world for poets". It liked to refer to Lawson as "the laureate of the larrikin", or "the fervent laureate of the swag and apostle of the ethics of the Push". But the independent provincial newspapers, which were numerous, thought otherwise.
The most discerning tributes to Lawson were made by Andree Hayward, an Oxford graduate who was a journalist and literary critic in Western Australia from 1894 to 1922. In an address to the Cue branch of the Australian Natives Association in 1897 Hayward described Lawson as "the poet of the people—the Australian people". Again, in an article published in the Kalgoorlie Sun in 1901, he wrote of Lawson:

"...there are not many of the ordinary bush experiences which he has not plumbed to the depths... His works are marked by a graphic power, a quiet insight, a humour often sardonic, a bitter scorn of sham and hypocrisy, a gnawing sense of injustice against social conditions. You may find him in varying moods, sometimes petulant to the verge of childishness, but he is always reflecting something faithfully. The world has not used him overwell and he complains bitterly or laughs goodhumouredly as the mood takes him. There is a grim realism in some of his word pictures that eats into the mind like acid into metal."

Once again, in 1909, in the Sun, Hayward praised Lawson as the author of "the best and most vivid and realistic bush sketches and stories of Australia".

"Were it not for the resistance of the workers, the capitalist would prefer to swell his profit by such "simple" and "cheap" methods as cutting wages and lengthening hours. Not only competition but also the persistent struggle of the working class for the protection of its own interests, to a great extent forces the capitalist to seek other sources of increased profit, such as introduction of new machinery, improvements of technological processes and adoption of inventions."

Is this true? Life might give an answer.

After the war American car manufacturers, with highly mechanised and even partly automatic factories in the USA, transferred some of their capital to West Germany to build factories to make cars. But here they turned back the clock, for the factories in Germany were less mechanised than their US factories, and production per head was only three-quarters of production per head in the USA. The decisive factor in the lower rate of mechanisation was not the lack of science or technology in Germany, nor the lack of skill of the German workers, but the much lower wages in Germany that made it more profitable to use German workers than expensive US machinery. The main reason for the lower wages, nominal and real, in Germany was the more successful class struggle of the American workers around wages than of the German workers of that period.

The handling of bulk sugar by mechanisation has recently been introduced into North Queensland ports, replacing the previous method of bagging and loading by slings. The expensive machinery was introduced because the CSR decided that in the long run it was cheaper than paying high hourly rates to waterside workers. But when the bulk sugar is sent to Hong Kong it is discharged there by cheap labor bagging the sugar down hold and sending it out by slings.
The grabs, tip trucks with metal trays and possible storage bins to handle the bulk sugar at the refinery would not be very expensive but the labor is so cheap that despite the slower turn-round of the ships the old method is preferred.

Does the drive of the capitalists for profit inevitably mean a drive for greater mechanisation? Fundamentals of Marxism-Leninism writes, "Bourgeois economists extol capitalist profit as the greatest stimulus to technical progress ... They gloss over the fact that the subordination of production to the principle of capitalist profit is not only a stimulus but also a limitation of capitalist production ... It not infrequently happens that capitalists, especially under present day conditions, restrict production, hold back technical progress ... Monopoly hinders the growth of the productive forces and technological progress ... If super profits can be obtained as a result of the monopoly of the market, then the stimulus to technological improvement is naturally weakened ... Retaining old equipment in which enormous capital has been invested also hinders technological progress."

It seems to me that the class struggle is the main driving force of the development of an exploiting society; that the great amount of mechanisation and automation in different countries in the world today is an acknowledgement by the capitalists of that country and industry of the strength and organisation of the working class; that they have temporarily abandoned the hope of cutting wages and lengthening hours.

Peter Symon, by failing to show that the successful struggles of the workers are the main driving force behind mechanisation, does not fully show the role and strength of the working class in today's world. He does not combat the widely held view that the drive for profits by the capitalists consistently drives to mechanisation and that mechanisation is inevitable and out of the hands and control of the workers.

I feel it is essential to show workers how their strength does influence events, and to convince them that this strength and organisation can and must be used in a political as well as an economic direction. First, it can ensure that big changes in industry and the cutting down of jobs can be compensated by higher pay and shorter hours, and where necessary, pensions and severance pay. Finally, knowledge by the workers of what they have achieved makes more realisable and possible the socialisation of the major industries that are being transformed by science and technological advances.

The plans of the British shipowners to use 29 container ships to carry 80% of the cargo Australia-England, and their control of containers from factory to ship to factory are a far-reaching challenge. While they have the money to do it, they may not have the power. But the proposals of the WWF, endorsed by much of the trade union movement of this country for an overseas national line and the nationalisation of the stevedoring industry is more of a challenge, for with organisation we have the power to enforce them.

VICTOR WILLIAMS

WICKED WASTE

THE ARTICLE by Richta (ALR No. 3, 1967) deserves close study. Briefly the argument is that capitalist production to date has had two main elements, capital and labor power, but now we are on the eve of a radically different situation in which production will have three main elements, capital, labor power and science, with science increasingly supplanting labor power.

Thus an increase in production in the new technological age will come
not so much as in the past by reinvestment in more machinery of a similar though improved type and the labor of more workers (i.e., 'extensive factors'), but rather by the application of science to technology, management and the training of new-type skilled personnel (i.e. 'intensive factors'), which will "more and more replace the simple labor power of man with his limited physical and emotional powers and memory".

I do not feel equipped to enter into debate whether it is useful to regard the modern production engineer, scientist and technologist as a special case of a worker selling his labor power, or whether such persons are becoming so different, so numerous and so decisive that they should be classed as a 'creativity factor' and thought of as 'human capital', as distinct both from capital and labor-power.

But the significance of the facts on which this theory is based seems to me so enormous, that we have hardly started to grasp it. The article quotes estimates that in America the share of 'intensive factors' accounted for as much as 68% of economic growth in the period 1953-57. The decisiveness of such changes is put in a startling way:

"The intensive growth . . . brings with it important social consequences because, as distinct from the earlier industrialisation, the accelerated 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 less, to accumulation. It is this type of economic growth that meets the intrinsic requirements of socialism."

It seems to me that if this idea can be taken out of the realms of statistics and concrete facts found and allowed to speak for themselves, people would be amazed at the reckless waste of capacity of the giant monopolies which prove capitalism to be far more obsolete than leftwingers dream in their wildest dreams.

Just two illustrations, which I hope may 'start the ball rolling', one from America, the other from Australia. According to the American communist economist Hyman Lumer writing in 1961: "The drive to modernise is vividly illustrated by the steel industry. Here, despite protracted operation far below capacity, outlays for plant and equipment were raised from $939 million in 1959 to almost $1.5 billion in 1960."

"It is estimated that today the big steel companies can operate at a profit of as little as 30% capacity. For example, in 1960 US Steel, though operating at half capacity much of the year, recorded its highest yearly profit. The main purpose of investment in steel industry is not expansion but the cutting of unit costs and the raising of profitability (World Marxist Review Sept. 1961, p. 78.)

In a world half of which is starving for modern industry based on steel to overcome their backwardness, what moral right have the world's largest steel producers to operate at 50% capacity?

No wonder, with such profitability coupled with monopoly, the trend is away from the old-style economic crisis of too many goods on the shelves, unsold. The waste of capitalism tends to take another form: acute undercapacity production, potential goods not reaching the shelves but remaining unsold because unmade. Whatever economic mistakes socialist governments may make, they pale into insignificance compared to such wicked although hidden waste.

Now for the Australian example. Mr. Taft in his article "Exploitation
in Affluent Society" reasons from general Australian statistics that from 1949 to 1965 about 80% of the extra wealth produced has gone to the wealthy employers and says "The inescapable conclusion is that the Australian worker today, despite his higher real income, gets a smaller share of the total wealth of the nation—his exploitation has grown—he is relatively worse off." (ALR No. 2, 1967, p. 14.)

Most workers do not yet realise this, and probably even Mr. Taft, who is in the forefront of those who readily embrace the significance of the new, would gasp if they had read Petroleum Gazette for December, 1966. Talking of the ‘Five-year-old Giant’, petro-chemical industries in Australia, in which $178 million have been invested, it gives a theoretical example of the economics of the modern chemical industry.

"A plant of 10,000 tons a year capacity might cost $2 million to build. One of twice the size would cost only $3 million. A plant ten times as big, with a capacity of 100,000 tons a year, would perhaps cost about $8 million. All three would require only about the same number of operators, since process control in most modern chemical plants is highly automated."

Because of this some Australian plants have been deliberately built to serve a larger market than existed initially, so that later they can enjoy the resulting economies of scale. But, unfortunately, Australian plants, giant size as they are, are still small by comparison with plants in Japan, United States and West Germany who can thus, despite freight and customs duty, undersell "us" on our own market on some lines.

Estimates by the Tariff Board hearing a claim for higher barriers to protect our infant giants show that Australian Synthetic Rubber Co. Ltd., one of the Altona (Victoria) Petro-

chemical group, could not operate at full capacity for 1965/66 unless it commanded the whole of the Australian market.

But according to John Lloyd (Melbourne Age 3/2/66) the new Botany (NSW) ICI-Phillips Complex should have at least an equal capacity for synthetic rubber when it comes on stream so that "both plants working simultaneously would be able to provide more than double the Australian demand"!

It might be argued that even this is justified because the car population will increase and with it the demand for tyres and synthetic rubber. However, the Wilbur Smith Transportation study predicts only a 63% increase by 1985, so that the second factory has been built some 20 to 30 years too soon from any sensible economic point of view. And we stand little chance of export if the US, Germany and Japan are so much more efficient that they can already export to Australia.

What sort of crazy thievery is this? Allowing the monopolies to spend millions of dollars building plant that can operate at only half capacity?

Could we not instead have tyres at half the price? Or one plant twice or three times the size instead of two, that would have been so much more economical and given a chance for export? Why couldn’t the underdeveloped countries where much of the oil comes from have their own plant?

Capitalism is patently failing fast. Should we not have socialism?

M. CROW

PROF. ROSE ON ENGELS

I READ with interest the review by A.H. of my book Wind of Change in Central Australia, ALR, No. 2, April-May, 1967. He writes that:
"Although Rose's theories may yet prove to be correct, he advances a personal theory under the banner of the 'materialist view' as shown by a comparison of Rose's statement (quoted in the review) with that of Engels."

Here A.H. cites a portion of the 1884 foreword to the *Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State*. This comparison of the views I expressed with those of Engels shows that the reviewer has appreciated the essential difference between the approach I took and that of Engels. I would not, however, accept the view that I advanced a "personal theory".

As you are aware, this passage from Engels (or, more exactly, the sentence beginning "on the one side . . . ") has been subjected to criticism from various quarters over the past 70 years. Amongst them was one from J. Stalin, as a result of which a footnote was added to the editions of *Origin of the Family . . .* published in the Soviet Union after about 1937. This footnote in part read as follows:

"Engels is here guilty of inexactitude by citing the propagation of the species alongside of the production of the means of subsistence as causes determining the development of society and of social institutions . . ."

After the XXth Congress of the CPSU, this footnote was dropped. In fact, the criticism in the form given did not stem from Stalin at all, but originated from the German Marxist Heinrich Eildermann in the foreword to his book, *Urkommunismus und Urreligion* (Primitive Communism and Primitive Religion), Berlin, 1921, dealing chiefly with the Australian Aborigines. Eildermann's book was translated into Russian in 1923, and I assume that Stalin plagiarised the criticism.

Eildermann published a further book, *Die Urgesellschaft* (Primitive Society), Berlin, 1950, in which his original criticism was extended to cover the first two-thirds of the chapter dealing with "The Family" in the *Origin of the Family . . .*

Some of your older readers may recall the discussion that took place around this "Stalin criticism" in the 1940s and 1950s. I originally took the standpoint that Engels was not "guilty of an inexactitude", and I considered that my anthropological field work demonstrated this. However, after a period of some years (in fact, just before the XXth Congress) I grasped the significance of the criticism and at long last accepted it. I still hold the view that the criticism is valid. Perhaps here I may refer to the article "Political Economy in the Soviet Union" appearing originally in the Soviet journal, *Under the Banner of Marxism*, in 1943, and then translated into English and appearing in the *Communist Review*, Sydney, in December, 1945, and January, 1946.

My approach to the question of marriage relationships in the book under review was intended to conform with the criticism of Engels mentioned. I should not class it as a "personal theory". In other words, the marriage relationship is simply one part of the production relationships: that is, it is essentially a part of the basis of the society. That is not to deny that the marriage relationship, whether in Aboriginal or in our own society, is not tangled up or overlaid with various parts of the social superstructure. But it is ultimately material factors that are decisive in determining the marriage relationship.

It would take more than a letter to argue this matter. But before I close I would mention that this whole question is at present being given considerable attention here by scientists in the German Democratic Republic, and some important publications can be expected in the not-distant future.

FREDERICK ROSE
SPOTLIGHT ON A.C.T.U.

THE COMING 1967 ACTU Congress and the ACTU leadership cannot ignore the growing demand from wage earners for positive action in support of demands for increased wages to break new ground in working conditions and attention to the need for improved social services. They demand improvements in the Industrial Acts, including the repeal of the penal clauses and for a more positive lead in support of a policy on international affairs, aimed at peaceful relations with other countries. The excellent policy decisions made over the years should be implemented now.

There are those who see this 1967 ACTU Congress as an opportunity to frustrate the movement towards these objectives by organising opposition by sheer weight of numbers. The hope of the extreme right wing that the AWU's admission will solve all their problems, will be successful only at the expense of the already declining authority of the ACTU as a national trade union centre among the workers.

The introduction of a total wage and the Commission's abandonment of the basic wage places those in the trade union leadership of the ACTU in a difficult position.

The ACTU has now been confronted with the need to establish a new and more substantial basis for a 'family living wage' than has been done to this date.

The rejection of the concept of a $44.00 'family living wage' as a basis for the basic wage claims in the 1965 ACTU Congress was unfortunate. This is highlighted by the failure of the strictly arbitration method adopted for dealing with the basic wage claims. No doubt there will be considerable concern expressed with strong demands for the restoration of the 'basic wage' in the coming Congress.

This will not solve the wage problem, which must be looked at very carefully. If the demand for the return of the basic wage means a return to the old basic wage standard, much below the needs of a family, and recognised as such by the Commission itself as shown by the new minimum wage level introduced into the Metal Trades Award in 1966, then it will be of no avail.

If a family living wage standard is to be obtained then the formal legalistic approaches must be changed and strengthened by industrial activity on a wide national scale. Relying on mainly economic and arbitration argument no matter how skilfully put is not enough. This is now limited further as a result of the total wage decision which allows only an annual review procedure based on economic factors, price movement, increased productivity and the ability of industry to pay, a truly arbitration strait-jacket.

The inadequacy of the approach previously used is highlighted by the fact that $6.40 is needed to adjust the 1953 basic wage for price movement and productivity to what it should be today. If the basic wage had been automatically adjusted since 1953 by the movement of the 'C' Series Index to 1961, and the Consumer Price Index until December, 1966, the $1 granted in the recent total wage decision would have simply restored the 6 Capital Cities Basic Wage to the 1953 basic wage adjusted only for price movement.

Nothing was gained for 14 years' national productivity increases. This emphasises the need for a new approach and vigorous industrial campaigning in wage campaigns.

The struggle for over-award payments, spear-headed by the shop com-
mittee movement in the Metal Trades, for many years has been an example of the rank and file rectifying the failure of the ACTU to provide national leadership in the wages field.

The ACTU is faced with the criticism that it fails to initiate new demands, to plan specific proposals to improve working conditions, social services, etc., and plays the role of limiting its activity around demands to unsupported deputations to Parliamentarians and poorly publicised campaigns on matters of national interest.

The ACTU fails to emphasise its independent role, being content to play a secondary role to the leadership of the ALP in important national matters, whereas in countries overseas national trade unions centres provide the main rallying and organising point on all issues concerning the working people.

This failure to initiate such activities has been counterposed by the workers with the emergence of other trade union centres within Australia within the white collar organisations, devoting considerable time to such subjects as education, social services, automation, etc., and assists the view expressed by some that the blue collar workers’ organisations are no longer able to provide national industrial and political leadership on such important matters.

Trade union officials who make up the majority and who are more centre of the road in their view should see that the price of accepting complete right wing domination by loading the Congress vote for that end is serious in itself. More importantly in the long run, the ACTU has its authority undermined by such actions and this in turn weakens the much needed authoritative central trade union organisation in Australia.

The weakening of the progressive trade union forces is essential to the aims of the Federal Government policies. Their need to divert more money to its war programme requires a lowering of living standards. War requires personal sacrifices for the mass of the people. This is the lesson of history, less wages, more tax, less social services, greater exploitation of labor and more restriction of liberties.

The ACTU must either submit to a reduction in living standards or must break out to provide a centre of opposition to these policies by stepping into its historically correct role of unifier and organiser of the Australian labor movement.

JIM BAIRD

LEISURE AND WORK

READING ALR recently one gained the impression that some contributors believe that weekend recreational pursuits are superseding the daily contacts in the process of production in determining attitudes.

Working in the administration block of an established firm while extensive remodelling is being undertaken one is enabled to renew the perspective of the influence of our occupational environment.

The clerks, typists and non-top managers dine on laminex tables, but the Directorate have tablecloths and glass dishes of fruit of all kinds not available to the lower strata.

When the entrepreneurs dined upstairs in the unaltered building the de luxe atmosphere was not readily noticeable. Under the present temporary regime of three sittings on the ground floor, class distinction is obvious and serves to emphasise that social thinking is determined more by our daily vocational environment than by week-end diversion.

TILLER-TOILER-TELLER.
Lucius, an Australian sculptor, reviews the book "Henry Moore on Sculpture", edited by Philip James (McDonald).

THE RECENT PUBLICATION of the book Henry Moore on Sculpture gives a pretty clear picture of Moore as sculptor—and man. One hundred and twenty-three black and white plates and sufficient in color to show his work to advantage make an armature for a voluminous and meaty text. This text is a discursive collection of recorded talks and discussions expounding many points curious to the layman and pertinent to the sculptor.

Salient points in Moore's comments are those referring to the humanist content of his art: "The great, the continual, everlasting problem (for me) is to combine sculptural form (power) — see illustration page 35—with human sensibility and meaning i.e. to try to keep Primitive Power with humanist content."

"... human experience is the only experience that we have got to work from."

Moore explains simply and clearly what many people innocently believe to be distortion—wilful distortion perhaps. Here is the man, the teacher (Moore taught for many years) prepared to explain much of the elements that compose his work and his aim: to wed a depth of feeling about people to an intense new concept of shape. He is essentially interested in shapes both derivative and suggestive. "The organic shape of the great beech trunk and the shapes of pebbles and mountains". "Mountains are the earth's wrinkled skin." Smooth flint stones with holes have a power of suggestion: "the first hole made through a piece of stone is a revelation" since it is the most satisfying demonstration of the rotundancy of the object. The delicate strength
of bones in shapes of endless variation (see illustration, opposite) and sea shells, all become starting points for sculptural concepts, are all evocative of repeatable shapes in terms of sculpture with never the static preciousness of the thoughtless. And all this is wedded to Moore's humanist integrity — an integrity shown warmly in his famous war-time shelter drawings and those of miners.

Moore explores the field of the abstract, as did Epstein, and takes what is of value: "Sculpture to me must have life in it, vitality." "Purely abstract sculpture seems to me to be an activity better fulfilled in another art, such as architecture. Abstract sculptures are too often but models for monuments that are never carried out . . . the constructivist sculptor never gets around to finding the real material solution for his problem."

The academic dross and trivia of British sculpture had been partially cleared away by Gill, Dobson and Epstein while Moore was young, so that although there was still a strong bias among 'Art Lovers' for the conservative — for what was then considered safe — the resistance to new realities such as produced by Moore was weakened. The powerful tenet of "Truth to Material" and the direct carving practised by these three men were means eagerly grasped by Moore.

"SINCE my student days I have liked the shape of bones, and have drawn them in the Natural History Museum, found them on sea-shores and saved them from the stewpot. There are many structural and sculptural principles to be learned from bones, e.g. that in spite of their lightness they have great strength. Some bones, such as the breast-bones of birds, have the lightweight fineness of a knife blade. In 1961 I used this knife-edged thinness throughout a whole figure, and produced this Standing Figure."
A Rock at Adel
once seen by the artist when about ten years old.

Two-Piece reclining figures

"... I realised what an advantage a separated two-piece composition could have in relating figures to landscape. Knees and breasts are mountains. Once these two parts become separated you don't expect it to be a naturalistic figure; therefore, you can justifiably make it like a landscape or a rock."

Among the many issues that involve sculptors there has been one that could apply to an understanding of Moore's work. Representation is not readily associated with the attractive quality in natural shapes. One gets something like aesthetic pleasure from the sight and feel of smooth river stones, driftwood and similar found objects. There is a power, some elemental vitality, to be recognised in great rocks and the grand shapes of mountains, in worn boulders and the Dolmen and Menhir* that meant so much to our ancestors. The attraction of the natural shapes of the Dolmen were so strong that they were imbued with a mystique—a symbol of cult ritual venerated with as much sincerity as the most sophisticated religion today applies to its representational accoutrements. Then consider the Stone-age 'Venuses' with some slight carving done on a found shape, and the animals, 'suggested' by simple incisions cut into found stones—the drawings and incisions made around convex shapes discovered on cave walls — shapes that suggested those animals. Bear in mind that these found objects did suggest a representation of living things (related to the cults of hunting and fertility).
Mother-Goddess Figure
from the Cyclades. Prehistoric Greek, third millennium B.C.
Marble, height 16 inches.

Stool
Of a chief in the form of a hula dancer. Hawaii, late 19th century.
Wood, height 26 inches.
British Museum.
This figure, which also stands on its feet, has the sculptural strength and formal power which Moore admires in primitive art.
Family Group 1948-49.
Barclay School, Stevenage (England).
To these art-works the most sophisticated mind can respond with aesthetic pleasure. But was it the immediately recognisable sculptural feel of the thing-found that appealed to these early artists? Or was it the suggested power of representation in the object? There was perhaps a dual attraction.

Throughout the ages there have been many examples of sculptors achieving this reality—this union of the natural power of the material and the rich warmth of life. In much Hittite, Cycladic and Mayan work, for instance, there is often the feeling of the stone still having this initial 'found' quality (see illustration page 35). It was this robust vitality that Epstein tried to achieve in his carving. This concept is fully realised in the work of Moore.

Today the charm of drift-wood and pebble is frequently transposed to the rusted engine-block, the debris of the foundry floor and the bric-a-brac of man made rubbish dumps. Such found objects are fabricated with great cunning and often fine craftsmanship. But the subtle aesthetic and the mystique of suggestion of these pieces does tend to lose force considerably on repetition, however transformed and re-shaped. One does not deny that there is a language, however precious, to be recognised in the most abstruse form that can be called sculpture, but if modern man is to realise his urgent need for self-realisation, such needs should be reflected in his culture. Sculpture must contain this reality. Its language must have vitality and power. It must reflect man.

Sculpture today comes in a complexity of shapes and space describing structures that profess to reflect the times. Much of it is confusing to the average person who is daily confronted with a rapidly changing world. “The artist—in the midst of a chaotic world—is subject to many influences. He must choose, reject, accept, that is to say, he has to adopt a position, a standpoint in one way or another.” “The artist’s sensibility, his intense reaction to new situations and realities, makes possible frequent and sudden changes, a development which is richer and more incalculable than that of people with less acute perceptions and fantasy.” (Ernst Fischer, Art and Coexistence).

*Dolmen were huge stones placed on smaller stones to form a table: Dol — table, Men — stone. Menhir: Men — stone, Hir — on end. Mystery surrounds them but it is assumed they were monuments to the dead, or cult shrines of the “Sun-Worshippers”. Stonehenge is one of the best known examples.
The great recent change in sculpture came during the working life of Rodin (1840-1917); Daumier, Rosso and Bourdelle (to mention a few) figured in the change also. These men were instrumental in getting a public to refocus away from the sweet Romanticism and the job-lot masonry of the Neo-Classicists. It was indeed a revolt. Repercussions and reverberations are still strong. Men like Matisse, Picasso, Laurens and Boccioni explored the endless possibilities of three dimensional form and the changes in sculptural idioms were rapid. It was a revolt against the static concepts of figurization. As the system of change gathered force it gave rise to a branch that turned away from subject matter—tentatively at first—and then completely, which has been broadly termed 'Abstraction'.

It will be borne in mind that there has always been an army of mediocrities following the footsteps of innovators, and so much of the sculpture that has been thrown on to the "market" since the revolt has been merely the work of good or indifferent craftsmen. It is this flood of mediocrity with its literary champions of fashion that so confuses the public and has given rise to the abused art-term 'decadent'. "It is not the search for new means of expression, for new realities, which is 'decadent'. What is really decadent is deception, routine reproduction, clinging to what is outmoded as, for example, in abstract painting (and sculpture—Lucius) which is only defended by the art trade against the even stronger urge for a new objectivity." The modern artist must experiment. But if his experiment is suddenly bought up, if he is now transformed into a 'label' and has to repeat it continuously, then a greater danger arises from this monstrous commercialisation of art." (Fischer, ibid).

One is compelled then, to rise above the created fashions and view the peaks, Picasso, Laurens, Moore, Neizvestni (to mention a few) so as to get a clearer vision of the rich pattern of development in sculpture. Cubism and surrealism among a score of other schools have been quoted as convenient labels to sort out artists but the paths of sculptors cross and recross and artists of talent will often work in several 'stylistic categories' (to the horror of art dealers). "God created the world, the devil created compartments."

But the obvious divergence is between abstract and figurative sculpture. Here it is interesting to note that much of the current abstract work often takes on the surface treatment of early figura-
ive modelling and some of the organic forms connected with that category, while many figurative sculptors take freely from the wealth of discoveries associated with abstraction. In such cases the idioms might run parallel and the divergence is a conceptual one only.

But the flood of fashion-created mediocrity remains, with the artist in conflict—an anarchist too often. Sir Kenneth Clark, in the Moore book, states during an interview: "Recent art has shown very clearly the conflict and the lack of unity of purpose in recent society," and it is this unhealthy conflict and "lack of unity of purpose" that is a key to the problem.

In the West the progression of technological achievement does not offer any real security—there is no real sense of belonging. Where man is becoming more and more alienated by the machine or relegated to a component part of the machine it is a shock to hear such fine advice as Moore's "... putting into stone everything that the human figure can teach us and at the same time having just the view of humanity that one warms to."

It is when the artist feels at one with the community that this dedication to his art will be fruitful: "The sense of integration, the feeling of belonging to a great community in which the individual is incorporated, is overwhelming. It is only with the Industrial Revolution and the victorious capitalist system that this unity was destroyed. Alienation of man became dominant. Individual and society confronted one another as alien forces." (Fischer).

ON NOVEMBER 8, 1917, the newspapers of Australia reported: “As a result of the conflict between the Russian Government and the Soviet Revolutionary Committee regarding the control of the Petrograd military headquarters it is reported that the Soviet Committee has proclaimed itself a new Provisional Government.”

Portentous words! . . . and people in Australia paused in their daily activities in amazement and wonder. Sections of the working class had no doubt that something epoch-making was taking place. From the cane fields of North Queensland to the timber mills of Victoria came examples of workers downing tools to celebrate the event. The organisation of Russian immigrants in Brisbane proclaimed themselves an Australian Soviet. Their comrades in Melbourne stormed the offices of the Czar’s representative and occupied them for a period. Red flags were flown from trade union halls and Labor activists extended congratulations to the Russian leaders.

The news came as the reactionary Australian Government led by the Labor renegade W. M. Hughes announced its second attempt to gain the approval of the people for military conscription for overseas service in the First World War, and many leaders of the Labor movement sensed that the triumph of the Bolsheviks would reverberate throughout the world and have its influence on the outcome, as perchance it did. Australia returned a bigger “No” majority than in 1916.

Members of the socialist groups, functioning in Australia since the 1880s, had no doubt of the significance of the developments. Public meetings then being held regularly in all capital cities to conduct socialist propaganda and express opposition to the imperialist war were devoted now to explaining Russian events as a working class seizure of power. But support for the new regime extended beyond the socialist groups. Labor Councils in the big cities hailed it, the Federal conference of the Australian Labor Party recorded its congratulations and men like Frank Anstey and Percy Brookfield spoke out boldly in Parliament in its defence.
The writers and thinkers of the Labor movement saw the October Revolution as in the tradition of the struggle for social justice of the Australian working class, and their enthusiastic support revealed the spirit of proletarian internationalism. Support for the Revolution extended even beyond the Labor movement. Members of the Roman Catholic hierarchy like Archbishop Mannix, then playing a prominent part in the fight against conscription, accepted the change in Russia as having freed the people from Czarist tyranny.

Reaction responded by slandering the Bolshevik leaders, misrepresenting their policies, linking them with "the German enemy", and clamping down on solidarity actions in Australia, and there were many sharp clashes with the authorities, and many gaolings. But the Labor movement remained united in its support of the Revolution and reacted sharply to the moves that developed to crush the new regime by economic blockade, and then armed intervention. And when the news came of the terrible toll in famine conditions of the years of war, counter-revolution and Allied military operations, relief activities on a wide scale were organised with the endorsement of the Labor Councils.

The October Revolution posed with a new sharpness issues of ideology and method that had plagued the Australian Labor movement since its birth, as it experimented with the single tax theories of Henry George, the co-operative ideas of Robert Owen, the utopian socialism of Bellamy and others, the syndicalism of the Industrial Workers of the World (IWW) and the reformism of the Labor Party. Eagerly, now, many of the thinkers in the Labor movement turned to a re-examination of the writings of Marx, sought out the works of Lenin, and began seriously to study the new type of organised power expressed in the Soviets.

While there was revealed a wide range of opinion on the implications of the October Revolution, all agreed on its relevance for Australia, with an acceptance of the position that the success of the Bolsheviks constituted a challenge to the Australian Labor movement to adopt measures to give it a socialist orientation politically and greater militancy industrially. The prevailing mood among the Labor intellectuals was one of criticism and self-criticism!

Prominent in the debate were Ernest Lane, "Jack Cade" of the Brisbane Daily Standard, Maurice Blackburn, of Victoria, Arthur Rae, then editing The Labor News, Henry Boote, editor of The Australian Worker, and R. S. Ross, secretary of the Victorian Socialist Party.

The intellectuals of the Labor Party, generally speaking, came down on the side of the viewpoint that the experiences of the
Russian Revolution could not be applied in any literal sense to Australian conditions, that “an Australian way” must be found, along the lines of the One Big Union providing the backing for nationalisation measures through Parliament. Wrote Arthur Rae—“The issue is whether Labor is to be a middle class party with a platform of palliatives or a working class movement for complete emancipation and reconstruction on a socialist basis.”

While warmly supporting the Bolsheviks, Rae canvassed the possibilities of a non-violent development of socialism in Australia, claiming that “the universal ballot, plus industrial pressure, perhaps organised through soldiers’ and workmen’s councils, would open the way to peaceful, legal and complete change in ownership” (Labor News, 18/1/19).

The viewpoint that the Soviet system, while admirable for Russia, was not suitable for Australia, was most comprehensively developed by R. S. Ross, who, in the booklet Revolution in Russia and Australia wrote . . .

I have no doubts whatever as to the Soviet way being the way—and the right way—for Russia . . . but Australia needs neither violent revolution nor the Soviet system, but may march along evolutionary lines until the hour of capitalism’s collapse.—Then comes Sovietism, if required, then comes Socialism . . . making the industrial “immediate aim” the One Big Union and the political “immediate aim” Nationalisation, with the further aim of blending as the State on the day of the conquest of political power by the working class, with Lenins on hand to dare and do . . . One Big Unionism and the Soviet system are in essence as alike as two peas in a pod.

The impact of this type of thinking was shown at the 1919 conference of the Labor Party, which was noteworthy for a record number of successful motions advocating nationalisation in one form or another, including the taking over of the private banks and the imposition of a capital levy. Reflecting the impatience within the Labor Party to “get on with the job”, A. C. Willis, General Secretary of the Miners’ Federation, led a group of militant trade unions out of the conference to form “The Industrial Socialist Labor Party”, which set out to win support in other States around a program of rejecting parliamentary action in favor of setting up the “Industrial Republic of Australia”.

In October, 1920, the Federal Executive of the Labor Party reacted to the pressures with a move without precedent in the annals of the Labor Movement. Declaring that the time had arrived for “a bold move forward”, the Executive called upon all bona fide trade unions to meet in a conference “to see if they could find a surer and shorter road to the socialist objective”. The upshot was the adoption by the Labor Party of the objective of “the socialisation of the means of production, distribution and exchange” and a detailed scheme of implementation patterned on the concept of the One Big Union (itself a product of the IWW). Labor leaders like Willis, E. J. Holloway (then President of the
Melbourne Trades Hall Council, later MHR), J. A. Beasley (then President of the Sydney Labor Council, later MHR), and R. J. Heffron (later Premier of New South Wales) spoke lyrically of the coming decade as "bringing about the transition of capitalism to socialism".

But it was one thing to praise the Bolsheviks in Russia and quite another to apply revolutionary concepts to the Australian scene! Bitter divisions developed in the Labor Party on the important issue of "methods", with the result that from the first position on the "fighting platform", socialisation was relegated to the position of "ultimate objective", and an elaborate scheme of militant activity around a "Council of Action" effectively sabotaged. The socialisation objective receded further and further into the background in Labor Party politics and, despite valiant efforts by key union officials like Willis, the One Big Union was still-born. However, current trends unleashed by the October Revolution did lead to the growth of trade union unity, culminating in the important unification of the Australian Council of Trade Unions in 1927— in the conditions actually a more realistic approach.

It was in the developments among the socialist groups that the October Revolution, in an historical sense, had its most significant impact. All sincere in their acceptance of the marxist content of the October Revolution, they were also divided on the important question of how to further the movement in Australia in the new situation. The important issue of the future orientation of the socialist groups was resolved with the formation and consolidation of the Communist Party. . . and there began the long and difficult struggle to achieve, operating from that essential base, one united working class movement accepting the theory and practice of scientific socialism.

With the influence of the October Revolution still deep-going, in spite of now sustained right wing counter activity, there were some important initial successes. On Willis' casting vote as chairman, the NSW Conference of the Labor Party in 1923 voted in favor of affiliation of the Communist Party. Although backed by a majority of affiliated unionists, the decision was never accepted in practice by the right wing leaders of the Labor Party and the two parties went their separate ways, with, however, plenty of examples since then of united activity on vital immediate problems.

As a direct result of the October Revolution, proletarian internationalism reached its highest peak in Australia, as elsewhere, expressed in political and industrial links — "ground work" which contributed in a fundamental sense to the development of the Labor Movement internationally.
With the receding of the revolutionary wave in the 20s, socialist perspectives temporarily lost their immediacy in Australia, but in the many other urgent, vital issues that arose the impact of the Russian Revolution not only continued to be felt but, in a sense, more profoundly and more widely, as the life and death struggle with fascism developed.

The concept of peaceful co-existence upon which the new Soviet State had based its relations with capitalist states now gathered new meaning in the call for collective security to halt aggression and while, despite tremendous world-wide support, failing to prevent the Second World War, it did bring its dividends in Allied war time unity that resulted in the defeat of the aggressors.

In all this the people of Australia, and particularly the Labor movement, played their part. True, anti-communist “cold war” policies have since brought further imperialist aggression and conflicts and the ever-present threat of a new world war, but it is a measure of the significance of the historical events of October, 1917, that the Soviet Union today stands guard in defence of peace, with a literally decisive voice on the issue.

The sober fact is that despite the efforts of reactionary circles, their continued provocations, their periodical campaigns of slander, the support for the Soviet Union won in the October days and strengthened particularly in the course of the Second World War have never really been lost, the tremendous impact of the 1917 Revolution never eradicated, but, indeed, it has grown and deepened with the passage of years.

The basic task confronting communists that so clearly emerged in the discussions around the Bolshevik Revolution in 1917 remains... to assist the entire Labor movement towards an orientation of scientific socialism expressed in the “here and now” in the stand to be taken on current immediate questions like the effects of the new technology on living standards, war budgets, threats to national independence, and reactionary Asian wars... in the process creating a movement ready and able to take advantage of objective conditions, as they develop, for decisive socialist achievement.

It is in this context that the concept of the Coalition of the Left is so significant and important. It is, in part, the application to the pressing needs of the present period of the profound socialist thinking in the days following October, 1917, that led to the Labor Party’s socialisation objective, the formation of the Communist Party, and the moves for rapprochement between the Communist Party and the Labor Party.
PROBLEMS of the philosophy of man, and particularly the question of the relationship between the individual and society, become historically important whenever the stabilized social order begins to waver and when, together with it, the socially accepted system of values loses its stability. As long as the social machinery functions without frictions, as long as—in a marxist phrase—there is harmony between the forces and the relations of production, the individual, formed as he is by these social relations, tends to regard them as natural; and in the same way he accepts the prevailing norms of social intercourse by which his relationships with society are regulated. This is a very simple process and in most cases it takes place unconsciously since people, through their upbringing within a society and a social group, receive from society their language, a certain mode of viewing the world and of thinking and a system of values with its habits, customs and morals. It is only the collapse of the social order, the rise of objective conflicts within the base, and, consequently, in the superstructure, the upsetting and disintegration of a traditionally accepted system of values that makes the individual start considering his identity and asking about his relationships with other individuals, with society.

What makes a decent life? This is a question which, in various forms, has always faced human beings. But at times of revolution or of transition from one socio-economic system to another, when there is a breakdown in the traditional relations between the individual and society and the arduous formation of new ones, this question asserts itself with particular force. People become acutely aware that they are no longer able or willing to live in the old way, without yet knowing how they should live. Such periods encourage the individual to reflect on his status and his destiny; and they stimulate the development of a philosophy of man. Historically, these have been the periods of an 'explosion' of this kind of inquiry, when the Socratic current, for which man is the primary object of philosophy, has driven out the Democritean trend, a philosophy of nature for which the over-
riding task is to investigate and formulate the general laws governing reality.

That historical conflicts play an important role in the conflicts of human consciousness—and this turns men's minds inwards—was clearly seen in the past, and is seen also today, by those thinkers to whom man and his problems are the main subject of inquiry. The doctrine of an unhappy, torn consciousness was the work of Hegel; today, in quite different conditions, his thoughts are approvingly repeated by Jean Hyppolite:

But critical periods in history are those in which the old order is already no more than semblance, and the new one has not yet emerged. These periods of transition which precede revolution are also periods of spiritual dilemma. The dialectic reaches the mind only as a negative dialectic. Its positive side, which is the opposite of the negative, has yet to be perceived. Since the time of Hegel attention has been repeatedly drawn to the crises preceding the great changes in the field of accepted values. But Hegel's analysis seems to us particularly original for its time.*

More than a century ago, in 1845—when Marx was working on his first writings—Soren Kierkegaard observed in his diary that periods preceding great changes see the appearance of men who, like certain birds which announce the coming of rain, are capable of predicting the imminent social storm.* According to Hans Schoeps this can apply to many thinkers of that period (and, let me add, certainly to Marx), who, long before their contemporaries, correctly foresaw the crisis of the age and the breakdown of the existing system of values. These sentiments were surely expressed most forcefully and with an admirable clarity by a contemporary observer of events, Alexis de Tocqueville:

It is obvious to me that those who for sixty years have been predicting the end of the revolution, are in error. It is quite clear today that the waves are still rising, and the last dams are threatened by the sea; that not only have we not seen the end of that powerful revolution which began before we were born but it is also probable that a child today receiving his first glimpse of the light of the day will not see it either. What is involved is no longer a change, but a complete transformation of the social system. Where is the world heading? Frankly, I do not know and I think that this is beyond the minds of all of us. We only know that the old world is drawing to an end. What will the new world be like? Even the greatest minds of our time are unable to tell, just as the minds of the ancients could not foresee the end of slavery, the advent of the Christian world, the invasion of the barbarians and all those things which have changed the face of the globe.*

These words—written by Tocqueville to a friend in 1850—vividly convey the state of mind of those people who were then concerned with the question of the individual and his relationship with a rapidly changing society. And their name was legion.*

It was precisely this problem, under the comprehensive name of humanism, which was the dominant note in the circles in which Karl Marx moved and which in a sense fashioned his attitudes. Feuerbach, Moses Hess, Bruno Bauer, Max Stirner and many others, including the young Marx, are all preoccupied with this question which they regard as of the utmost importance: how can man who has been turned into a slave of his alienated products be made the independent creator of his destiny? how to ensure a full and unrestricted development of his personality? how to create the most favorable conditions of human happiness and to transform human existence into something in keeping with the ideal of man, with his 'essence' (or, in the language of those days, to transform the real man into the true man)?

On closer inspection the problems then tackled by the proponents of humanistic tendencies prove to be still extremely relevant. Here is man faced by an alienated world in which his products—in the field of economy, politics, ideology (particularly religion) and social life (particularly the family)—are acquiring a certain independence; they no longer submit to the individual's power and will, but, on the contrary, begin to dominate and subjugate him. Like the devil's disciple, man has unleashed forces which he is unable to control. Hence the need to transform this inhuman world, in which things are masters of men, into a human world—a world of free human beings who are architects of their destiny and to whom man is the supreme good. A humanism of this kind is a theory of happiness. The prime objective is to make people happy, to make them capable of happiness.

In taking up these problems Marx was in no way breaking new ground: nor was he isolated in his endeavors. On the contrary, in Lenin's fine phrase, he was following the broad highway of the issues and thoughts of his age. This was one of the reasons for his greatness and one of the sources of his relevance today; it explains why he seems so close to us when we ask these questions in our own conditions. For while the problems studied by the young Marx and his contemporaries had a wider historical validity, reaching far back into the past, it was then that they made themselves particularly felt. It was obvious to everybody—and the memories of the French Revolution were a painful reminder—that the old world was drawing to an end. The new world was still emergent, revealing and aggravating the basic contradictions in the process. The old system of values had collapsed and the new system was in a formative stage, asserting itself amid a host of conflicts. The problem of the individual—lost and craving stability, oppressed and pining for freedom, exploited and longing to live a full life, rent and thirsting for happiness—stood out more sharply than ever in clear and vivid relief. It became the salient question of an age of change and revolution.
And it is this which makes these issues touch so sensitive a chord today, in a situation which is different but similar, in an age of incomparably sharper conflicts and contradictions which are, however, analogous to the old ones.

Marx and his contemporaries—Kierkegaard among them—asked questions about human existence and advanced various humanist programs because this existence was clearly threatened and because society obviously demanded answers to certain problems. Hegel wrote that no philosophy can go beyond the limits of its age—an idea which can also be phrased differently; each philosophy, and certainly philosophy which is not without response, provides answers to some topical questions and problems. This is why problems of the individual are also tackled by us today in a variety of philosophical guises and why the young Marx's work seems so much in tune with our own reflections.

The domination of anthropological themes in modern philosophy arises out of the demand for answers concerning human existence at a time when this existence is in danger and when, at the watershed between two formations, the traditional system of values has been undermined. On this point there is a consensus of opinion among all students of the subject who are otherwise very far apart, if not diametrically opposed, in their philosophical convictions.

Here is the view of a communist, Roger Garaudy:

The two world wars have had a decisive influence on the formation and development of the philosophy of existence. Above all, it was largely due to them that all philosophies—atheist existentialism; Christian philosophy, marxism—had to become philosophies of existence because the foundations of human existence had been questioned and the answer could no longer be delayed. There is no modern, living philosophy which does not reflect this situation of man, the situation of all men, enmeshed as they are in general conflicts and unknown destinies, facing a continuous threat of death, experiencing a fear generalised on the scale of the events which engender it.*

And at the other pole of philosophy we find Martin Buber who, in my view, has provided one of the most interesting analyses of the subject—all the more interesting as it was formulated before the outbreak of the second world war, and thus before its consequences for man’s situation in the world today were known. In *Le probleme de l’homme* Buber speaks of ebbs and flows in anthropological thought which depend on man’s sense of isolation. If an explanation were added of the source of this isolation and the reason why man feels ‘without hearth or home’ in a rapidly changing world in which human relations and their underlying
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systems of values are subject to revolutionary changes, one could fully agree with this diagnosis.

But it is only in our times, says Buber, that the anthropological problem has fully matured. He thinks that—apart from the evolution and crystallization of philosophical thought in general—this is due to two factors.

First comes the sociological factor: the disintegration of the traditional forms of human society, such as the family, the rural and urban community, etc., which are a result of the bourgeois revolution.

Secondly—and this is in my view the most interesting part of his argument—man has lost control over the world he has himself created—the phenomenon which Marx once called, after Hegel, alienation.

The concerns the relationship between man and the objects and relations which arose out of his activity or with his participation. Man lets himself be overtaken by his own works—here is exactly how I would describe this particular feature of the modern crisis. Man is no longer in a position to take in the world created by his own activity; this world is getting the upper hand of him, slipping out of his hands, opposing him in all its elementary independence, and man no longer knows the magic word which could cast a spell over the man-made Golem and make him harmless.*

His wording may be different, but Buber is referring to the same developments that preoccupied the young Marx and his contemporaries when they analysed the status of the individual in relation to the great upheavals of their age. And he is discussing the same things when speaking of technology, economics and politics as the main domains in which the ascendancy of man-made things and relations over man is revealed.

In Buber’s analysis the problem is placed in particularly sharp relief in the case of politics—in the light of the experiences of World War I. Naturally, his words take no account of the appalling experience of the second world war and its aftermath, or of the atomic sword of Damocles now hanging over mankind.

And so man found himself confronted with a sinister fact: he was giving life to demons which he could not then subjugate. What was the meaning of this power which was at the same time powerless? The problem was reduced to the question about the nature of man, which was acquiring a new, supremely practical significance.*

And this is surely where the essence of the problem lies: in our days philosophical anthropology has acquired a practical meaning. It explains why such inquiries exploded after the first world

* M. Buber, op. cit., p. 60.
war, and even more after the second—an interesting socio-psychological phenomenon emphasised by both Buber and Garaudy. In the twenties Martin Heidegger summed up the position in these pointed words:

In no age before has so much knowledge about man been accumulated and never has it been so diversified. But in no age before have we known less about man. In no period before has man been the object of so many questions as in our time. *1

Symptoms of alienation have long been present in society—probably ever since the inception of social life—but never have they been so drastic and powerful as they are today in all possible forms: economic, political, social, and ideological. Human existence has always been, throughout history, subject to various dangers, but never before has this threat acquired such tremendous dimensions and never has it been fraught with such terrifying consequences for the existence of mankind as today.

And, naturally, in the past, too, systems of values have been rocked. But never before has this been so universal and far-reaching as today when in one part of the world the conviction is growing that the old systems of values, though publicly venerated, have outlived themselves and are no longer of use, while in the other part men are harassed by a situation in which new systems have not yet been consolidated and thus are not yet as useful as they should be.

Small wonder then that the individual feels threatened, insecure, frightened, that he does not feel organically united with society and, consequently, feels lonely and isolated. These are normal things at a time of change and of a weakening of human relations. But it is also normal that in such periods man tends to wonder about himself and to ponder questions which are otherwise hardly noticed; it is at such times that the role and importance of philosophical anthropology grows considerably. In Buber's fine words:

In the history of the human spirit I distinguish ages when man has a home and those in which he is homeless. In the former he inhabits the world like a house, in the latter he lives in the world as in an open field, sometimes even without the four pegs necessary to put up a tent. In the former anthropological thought is only part of cosmological thinking, in the latter it becomes profound, and thus independent.*

It is precisely at such a historical juncture—when men live in society not as in a house but as in an open field—that our world has found itself today; particularly since the second world war and the beginning of the atomic age.

*Martin Heidegger, Kant und das Problem der Metaphysik, Verlag Fr. Cohen, Bonn 1929, p. 200.
THE UPSURGE of new writing about what some people call the 'Sexual Revolution' has yielded at least one very fine booklet, *Sex and Morality*, a report presented to the British Council of Churches.

This is a Protestant body, so its pamphlet doesn’t deal with the world-wide controversy shaking the Roman Catholic Church over the use of the contraceptive pill. But its arguments will reinforce those trying to bring the Catholic hierarchy down on the side of the humanist approach.

The Australian press widely publicised and, on the whole, welcomed *Sex and Morality* when it was published last year, without apparently realising its implications as to the non-religious basis of ethical judgments. We can be sure that if these were missed on earth, they will not have escaped the notices of Heaven, which can seldom have been treated with such scant ceremony by religious people.

The growing, and highly welcome, dialogue between Christians and Marxists has been conspicuous from the start for the courageous willingness of the Christian side to modify positions which have been thought by many people, Christian and non-Christian, to be basic to them. This movement in recent times has been led by the Bishop of Woolwich, whose book *Honest to God* showed a willingness to depart from the conception of God as a supreme personal ruler. And, last year, there came to Australia the beautiful, smiling Mother Gorman with her cheerful formula, God = X ('if you like').

For the authors of the Council of Churches pamphlet, God certainly seems to exist as a person, but a person with modern ideas whose wishes, or commandments, it would be a pleasure to carry out since he wants for us nothing that we would not want for ourselves. Turning these pages we get scarcely a glimpse of the elderly bachelor of uncertain temper, who, if he thought some-
body's moral conduct was open to criticism, had a way of saying so with thunderbolts; who thought nothing of annihilating whole populations on account of sexual and other deviations. The new pamphlet boldly suggests that God "wisely adjusts his requirements to our changing needs". It rejects the "dualism in which the interests of the body inevitably conflict with those of the spirit. This dualistic view, which has powerfully influenced Christianity in the past, is now seen to have no warrant in the Old Testament or in the Gospels; it is therefore natural to emphasise the value of the body as God's creation and as good in its own right".

Having given us these bodies and no doubt being proud of it, the God of the new pamphlet is yet able modestly to refrain from claiming any exclusive say as to how we should use them. There is bound to be a conflict between Christians and non-Christians on the formal definition of morality, says the pamphlet. However, this conflict need not necessarily extend to the content of morality. Christians believe in a God who is personal and loving and who wills for each man and woman the most enduring and complete happiness of which they are capable. But many humanists also take as their fundamental axiom the promotion of human happiness, and it may be that their ideal of human happiness coincides more or less closely with the Christian one.

It follows that a non-Christian is as likely as a Christian to contribute ideas useful to the promotion of happiness.

The Ten Commandments had a mixed reception from the audience to which they were addressed, both immediately and through the centuries. But about a proposed eleventh, which emerges from this new book with the same imperative force as the earlier ten did from Sinai, there will be few if any complaints. Making the essential point that the "coital relationship is not a separate entity but is the final expression of the whole marriage relationship", the book says:

Those relational acts of coitus between husband and wife which cement and deepen their love . . . such coitus is directly beneficial to the whole family. It cannot too strongly be stressed that the well-being of the family depends to a greater extent than has perhaps been realised hitherto on the well-being of one flesh—and, to that well-being, regular coitus makes a profound contribution.

Not the decrees of God but the welfare of man is the standpoint from which these authors answer every query about sexual conduct. Even from this standpoint, they are elastic both in formulating rules and in suggesting what the rules, if any, should mean. Out of the window goes St. Thomas Aquinas with his immutable 'Natural Law'. In comes Aristotle, with his verdict that 'morality can never be an exact science'.

It follows that, while believing in marriage and in sex within marriage, the pamphlet authors are not prepared to say that, before or outside marriage, it is invariably and absolutely wrong-
Further, if casual, extra-marital sex is wrong, it is wrong because of its effect on humans and human welfare—not because of anything Moses said:

People can, of course, have sexual experience which is trivially pleasurable or mildly therapeutic; no heaven or hell about it. But it is the nature of the experience that you don’t know which it is going to be, for yourself or the other person . . . what is an agreeable recreation for one may be a consuming fire for the other.

The different meanings it may have for the two sexes is also stressed; the advent of the liberating ‘pill’ has failed to redress the balance of risk to the emotional stability of the partners. Biological processes, the working party claims, condition a woman not simply for the act of intercourse but for the adaptation of a large part of her life towards child-bearing whether a child is expected or planned at any single act of intercourse or not.

For many women the act of intercourse has its chief significance in her readiness to become the mother of her partner’s child.

A woman’s responses are “less quickly aroused” but “even more tenacious and forward looking” than a man’s, says the pamphlet.

Also to be thought of is the welfare of a possible third party to the transaction. The pamphlet has not overmuch respect for Moses’ commandments but heartily stresses two of Dr. Alex Comfort’s: “Thou shalt not exploit another person’s feelings and wantonly expose them to an experience of rejection” and “Thou shalt not negligently risk producing an unborn child”.

The pamphlet views divorce from the same humanist standpoint. In effect, marriage was made for the benefit of humans, not the other way round. “Marriage is primarily about human relationships . . . it is at the service of love.” When love has ended—not merely erotic emotion but all feeling of companionship and belonging—then marriage has in effect ended and “can decently be terminated . . . No principle is maintained by refusal to concede that the marriage, as a marriage, no longer exists”. Further, a second marriage should not only be allowed; it can be encouraged, because, if successful, it may make amends for the errors of the first.

From the same standpoint also the pamphlet deals with abortion which the committee would like to see “freed from many of the present legal restrictions”. It does not have a section on homosexuality but a similarly humane approach to this problem seems to be implied in its recommendation that the Government “bring the law affecting sexual conduct into line with informed contemporary opinion”.

The committee writing the pamphlet agrees that it may be “out of step with the main body of Christian judgment” in refusing
to say that "chastity consists in obedience to an invariable rule which forbids sexual intercourse outside marriage". In justification for thus having jettisoned the Law and most of the Prophets the committee effectively replies:

We have not said that all rules are valueless. We have tried to show that rules by themselves are an inadequate basis for morality. No rule can cover all the varied and complex situations in which men and women find themselves.

If the pamphlet's humanist outlook, already endorsed and acted on by the community at large, is accepted also by the churches, thus making it unanimous, what is the future for monogamous marriage as an institution? So far it has been preserved with the powerful aid of a squad of dragons guarding the portals of illicit and extramarital sex.

One of these, the threat of venereal disease, has been slain or greatly weakened by modern medical science; another, the fear of unwanted children by the one and only pill. A third, the social stigma attached to it by ironclad moralists mainly entrenched within the established churches, is now beginning to look distinctly sick and seedy under the assaults of such people as the British Council of Churches Working Committee, authors of this booklet.

If, in these circumstances, marriage remains 'popular', as the Committee says it now is, the reason can only be that people have chosen it because it ministers to their lasting happiness—not because they have been scared or lured into it for any other motive. And that should be the main concern of all who read this pamphlet, in which the humanist will find everything he wants except the formal renunciation of the boasted tie between morality and religion.

But the socialist may ask, with due respect, for something more. He may feel inclined to ask the Working Committee whether Engels' *Origin of the Family* is not still as correct as when published in 1877—in finding the main reason for loveless marriages (and hence the resort to prostitution) in the property-preserving motives of class society. Citing evidence of divorce judges, the socialist may also ask whether a main reason for the break-up even of love-inspired marriages is not the housing shortage, with the consequent problems, rather than the temptations of illicit romance.

The Committee writes as though the economic emancipation of women even in class society was an accomplished fact. It isn't. Only when it is accomplished—and no pill ever dreamed of by the chemists can do this—will proper conditions be created for testing the innate worth of marriage or any other institution.

Engels believed that in such circumstances prostitution would vanish; 'monogamy, instead of collapsing, at last becomes a reality
— for men also!" But he added that this question would be decided by a new generation of men who had never known what it was to buy a woman's surrender and a generation of women who had never had to give themselves to a man for fear of the economic consequences.

When these people are in the world, they will care precious little for what anybody today thinks they should do. They will make their own practice and their corresponding public opinion about the practice of each individual — and that will be the end of it.

It is impossible even to speculate about this without one's thoughts being influenced by the prejudices and preconceptions arising from existing society and existing levels of knowledge. Some of the pamphlet's own statements, cautious as they are, may turn out to have been too sweeping — for instance, as to the nature of women's sexual response.

We can say, however, with Engels, that the rules and practices of the new society will be formulated with little or decreasing impediment due to ignorance and with no impediment at all deriving from class-based prejudice. To achieve a situation where such rules can be framed to govern not only sexual but all other departments of human conduct seems to be not the least important of the reasons for carrying through the socialist revolution.

FROM THE REPORT of the Child Welfare Advisory Council of NSW on the subject of social problems arising in relation to pre-marital intercourse, 1967:

15. There are a number of forces in the community that "militate against a sense of responsibility and chastity" in adolescent relationships, among them:

(a) Adult control. Adolescents have an understandable lack of respect for current adult standards, and this tends to lessen the effectiveness of adult control.

(b) Models for behaviour. The moral code of society and the accepted standards of behaviour have become progressively less clear to the adolescent; the influence of the mass media may accentuate this.

(c) Difficulty of supervision. The mobility and affluence of the contemporary adolescent make chaperoning or its equivalent virtually impossible.

(d) Encouragement of a teenage cult. Having much money to spend on "pleasure", the adolescent is the subject of a campaign by a section of the commercial world to over-stimulate and exploit the "teenager". The personal transistor radio — the voice of exploitation — is powerful.
Dorothy THE JOURNEY OF HENRY LAWSON

Well-known novelist and poetess Dorothy Hewett completes her article written on the occasion of the centenary of the birth of Henry Lawson, June 17, 1867. (The first part of this article appeared in the June-July issue.)

Towards the end of 1892, with £5 from the *Bulletin* and a ticket to Bourke, (or Comeanaveadrink) Lawson set out for copy. He got enough to fill volumes of his greatest short stories.

Hungerford and Bourke were the second great world of the Lawson short stories. It was a world perfectly suited to Lawson's genius, its faiths and its limitations, its innocence, drunkenness, weakness, morality, and horror, set against a landscape in hell.

Sky like a wet grey blanket; plains like dead seas, save for the tufts of coarse grass sticking up out of the water; scrub, indescribably dismal—everything damp, dark, and unspeakably dreary. (*In a Wet Season*).

He and his mate, Jim Gordon, sometimes thought the prototype of Mitchell, joined the General Workers' Union under assumed names. For 18 months they mixed with the ordinary men Lawson would immortalise as the spirit of bush unionism and mateship, of broken lives and tragedy. The spirit of bush unionism was dying away. Lawson caught the tone of that dying fall in the Bourke and Hungerford stories, e.g. *Hungerford, In a Dry Season, In a Wet Season, The Shantykeeper's Wife, Shooting the Moon, The Bush Undertaker, Macquarie's Mate, The Drover's Wife*, all the marvellous Mitchell stories told in Stiffner's grog shanty, and along the track with the moon rising.

The moon rose away out on the edge of a smoky plain, seen through a sort of tunnel or arch in the fringe of mulga behind which we were camped—Jack Mitchell and I. The timber proper was just behind us, very thick and very dark. The moon looked like a big new copper boiler set on edge on the horizon of the plain, with the top turned towards us and a lot of old rags and straw burning inside. (*Our Pipes*).

Back from Bourke, Lawson set off for New Zealand in 1893 with a free passage. For three months he was unemployed in Wellington, sleeping in a sewerage pipe. Then he got a job on the South Island, as a telegraph linesman, work that he loved. Out of
these experiences came the immortal Steelman and Smith stories: outsiders journeying on a discovery of themselves and society.

He left a steady job in New Zealand for the promise of the editorship of a new daily *Worker* in Sydney, but three days after he reached home the daily *Worker* folded up, and "After a deal of shuffling humbug" as he puts it, Lawson was offered a subordinate post on the weekly *Worker*. In a month he was out of a job with a "disastrous effect on his politics and his creative morale." 9

From this experience seems to date much of his disillusionment with the Labor movement and Labor Party politicians.

Lawson was a pretty good hand at pricking the big bright balloons of the nineties. "The sunlit plains extended" were apt to extend a bloody long weary way for the man on foot, as against the man on horseback, and the gilt on the Golden Nineties legend wore very thin for the workless Sydneysider, as against A. G. Stephens editing the Red Page from the security of the *Bulletin* office. Lawson's point of view, criticised by Stephens, was as simple and as basic as that. (e.g. The Lawson-Paterson Bush controversy in verse, and *The Golden Nineties* sketch.)

Already, in 1896, the title of his first book of verses, *In the Days When the World Was Wide*, sounds like a middle-aged man looking backwards, yet Lawson was only twenty-nine.

**DRIFTING AND SHIFTING**

From Lawson's traumatic marriage to Bertha Bredt in 1896 dates a whole period of shifting from place to place, even as far afield as London. To Lawson far fields were always greener, but, although he had some big literary success in the years between 1896 and 1902, (the years of his marriage), he never succeeded in escaping from himself and his problems.

Bertha Lawson encouraged him in these wanderings, mainly to get him away from the bailiff and the drink problem, which was becoming more and more compulsive as the years passed. They sailed for Western Australia in 1896, with an advance of £10 from Angus and Robertson on his first short story collection, *While the Billy Boils*. Back in Sydney, Lawson threw himself into the boozy male world of the "Dawn to Dusk Club" with his bohemian friends, Victor Daley, Jack LeGay Brereton, Fred Broomfield, Nelson Illingworth and Bertram Stevens. Lawson held the title of "Bard of the Tribe."

Bertha got him off to New Zealand and teaching jobs in a Maori school, where it is thought most of the Joe Wilson stories were
written, with Joe Wilson as Lawson's alter ego, and Mary stand­ing in as Bertha.

A sinecure in the Government Statistician's Office in Sydney lasted only six weeks. Lawson couldn't stomach any sort of office routine and this consisted only of signing on at 9 a.m., doing his own writing during working hours, and signing off at 4.30 p.m.\(^\text{10}\) Probably to get him away from Hannah Thornburn (or Thom­burn) an artist's model for Nelson Illingworth, the sculptor, Bertha and their two young children, accompanied Lawson to London in 1900. London was obviously a literary mecca for Lawson. Perhaps he hoped to get the kind of literary evaluation there he had never really had in Australia. In spite of some real successes he was homesick in England, his obsessive drinking began again, and after Bertha's nervous breakdown, an advance from Blackwood's magazine brought the Lawsons back to Sydney in 1902.

There is some evidence to support the belief that Lawson had intended leaving Bertha and living with Hannah Thornburn on his return, but two weeks before the ship berthed Hannah was dead. It had been a mysterious and romantic love affair as many Victorian extra-marital affairs of this sort tended to be. It was never tested by any of the difficulties of brutal reality. No wonder Hannah became Lawson's "spirit girl" and the subject of much sentimental poetry. Later he fictionalised her as "That Pretty Girl in the Army" and "The Lily of St. Leonards" one of Lawson's good bad girls with a past, another typically Victorian point of view.

The marriage between Bertha and Henry, which began as a love match, was soon over. They lived together in Sydney only briefly, and, after the death of their new-born baby, and Lawson's attempted suicide at Manly, Bertha applied for a legal separation and left him.

**ELDER MAN'S LANE**

In his last years Lawson lived in Sydney lodgings, drinking heavily, and writing spasmodically, with a great deal of hack work. He developed paranoic and manic-depressive tendencies, was several times a patient in a Sydney mental clinic, went to jail for 'wife starving', was rescued several times by his old mates, and sent to Mallacoota Inlet to stay with E. J. Brady, and to a sinecure as 'poet in residence' at the Leeton Irrigation Scheme.

It was a quixotic idea. Leeton was a prohibition area. Lawson resented his banishment and made sardonic copy out of it in sketches like *The Unknown God at Narrandera*, but it did
result in a number of stories and the creation of two odd ‘beat’ characters, Previous Convictions and Dotty.

Henry Lawson died penniless in 1922 at the early age of 55. His body was found in the backyard of the little cottage he shared with Mrs. Elizabeth Byers, his ‘little landlady’ or ‘little mother’, 16 years his senior, who had stuck to him all through these last bitter years. Even the names he gave her are synonymous with his dependence.

“Personally, socially and politically Lawson was ill equipped to enter the 20th Century”, writes Frank Hardy. “His decline had already begun in the nineties with the decline of militancy in the Australian Labor movement.”

There is some truth in this but it is too simple. Lawson could never see life in terms of black and white. Life for him was contradictory, diverse and ironic.

One could ask the question, why did not personal tragedy and suffering make Lawson a greater writer? Scott Fitzgerald destroyed himself by compulsive drinking but went on to make creative copy out of his own tragedy in *The Crack Up*. It is interesting to compare Lawson’s last ‘Johnson’ stories with the Fitzgerald stories in *The Crack Up*, particularly Lawson’s first story in the series, *Johnson’s Jag*, (Bulletin Dec. 26, 1912).

*Johnson’s Jag* is a strong story, objective, pitiless and tragic in the best Lawson sense. There are signs in this group of stories that Lawson was moving into a new period in his writing, a new book with a Sydney city setting, that he was struggling to evaluate his tragic experiences, both personally and even politically, although there is little overt politics in these stories and sketches. 12

But worn out with the struggle to live, mental illness, alcoholism and isolation, he could not encompass any longer the kind of feats he managed in the old days. Jack Lang, his brother-in-law, has recounted how *They Wait on the Wharf in Black* was written on the same night Lawson was carted home dead drunk. 13

He knew a lot more about people, mateship, utopian ideas, and himself, than he knew in 1888. If it was a less enchanted vision, in some ways it was a broader, truer one (e.g. his sympathetic Chinese sketches, the prophetic *The Hopeless Futility of the Sydney Streets* (1920), and the tragic evaluation of war in the poem, *Shall we hear the Children Singing, o my brothers*).

Lawson lost the sense of his own identity in *Blues Point Road, Elder Man’s Lane* and *Skull Street*. It had never been very
strong. He is nearly always the shadowy observer in the pub or round the campfire, or else a kind of split personality inside and outside the story.

But in those early days he was sustained by a community of men, usually the outcast wanderers in the lonely savage hell of Hungerford, the pub and the endless dreary flats, the men they might have been and the good Victorian girls who waited, or didn’t, lost somewhere in their past.

Flung finally on his own resources, the lost shadow of the boy from Pipeclay and the man on the tramp back of Bourke, is finally and hopelessly alone. His creation of Benno and the old ‘uns, Previous Convictions, and Dotty, all sentimentalised figures, do little to fill the gap. Lawson creates an alter ego, Johnson the writer, in an attempt to deal creatively with the problem, but Johnson comes out of nothingness, a spook with no roots anywhere, nothing in common with the boy from Pipeclay or the man in the shanty bar with Barcoo, Gentleman Once, Awful Example, The Giraffe, and Mitchell (the apotheosis of the Saviour). Johnson is the sophisticated traveller, world weary, classless, alone and drunk on the horse-ferry, with only a desperate stoicism between him and the city of dreadful night.

Only for a moment, in Darlinghurst Jail, the mental hospital or the Inebriates’ Home (The Boozers’ Home prophesied by Mitchell?) does Lawson get a faint returning tug of the old community of men.

But fate and nothingness has taken over, and there is nowhere further to go. The hell is so complete he can only retreat from it. The grim jokes of Hungerford are too grim now, the irony abandoned for the rags of self pity and the shreds of sentimentality to cover his unbearable nakedness (e.g. Going In, Gentlemen All, His Unconquerable Soul).

Only when the choice was still there to be made could he manage himself with a power that triumphed over chaos. The vision of Sweeney, the drunken wanderer he met at Bourke, in the comparatively innocent world of bush and pub and open road, could once be faced and pre-shadowed . . . “Visions come to me of Sweeney with his bottle in his hand,” but to die in Elder Man’s Lane with a bottle of cheap grog at your foot, and no mate beside you, that was a hell past facing and past creating.

Even Lawson’s jingoism, his conscription doggerel, in the 1914-18 war, could be explained by a pathetic longing to get back to the community of men, to become the spokesman for Australia, a kind of literary ‘Anzac’, even if the people were deluded and united around an imperialistic blood bath.
Lawson had a surfeit of adulation in his lifetime; big editions, a great deal of paternalistic assistance. What he really needed was an agent as hard-headed as Angus and Robertson, and a proper appreciation of his genius.

"His methods were too original," writes Arthur Phillips. "He died of neglect, hopelessly underestimated." Phillips castigates the imperceptiveness of Lawson's academic critics who "patronised his inspired naivete and nagged him to adopt conventional methods". What Lawson is getting across to his working-class readers is the tone and feel of an experience that they will recognise. It is a problem of style created to match the content.

But without a climate of informed appreciation, without the belief that his stories were not just a rich regional lode, soon worked out, but were universal and for all time, the journey from Pipeclay to Elder Man's Lane had something fatalistic and preordained about it.

But in spite of it all he walks the streets of Sydney still, and puts his indelible contradictory thumb-mark on Australian literature . . .

the spook of Henry Lawson, bound for the Lord knows where; with a couple of old magazines carefully rolled in brown paper and carried down Blue's Point Road to give his creditors the impression that he is taking some new stuff over to the Bulletin and will presently return with a cheque. Let me see! It used to be: "I plead guilty, your Worship; and I want to make a statement." How will it be? "I plead guilty, Lord, and I want to make a statement." No, no statement will be necessary then. Or: "I want time to pay, Lord'? But then it will be too late.

At the request of ALR, a leading French communist reviews experiences leading up to the successes of the left in the recent elections in France. (In 1950, Henri Martin, a sailor in the French navy, was gaoled for five years for his opposition to the war in Vietnam. Mass protests secured his release in 1953.—Ed.).

IN THE RECENT ELECTIONS in France, the Communist Party gained a million votes and almost doubled its number of deputies (from 41 to 73). The grouping of left parties exceeded by 1,300,000 votes the number cast for the Gaullist party, which with 38% is in a minority in the country. The most important aspect of these elections is that the union of the parties of the left, approved by nearly 10 million French citizens, appears as the great force of the future, capable of assuring a democratic alternative to the personal power. Already, it is evident that the new composition of the Assembly will ensure a better hearing for the workers in their struggles.

The monopoly power obviously could not practise a policy of social progress, so that year after year all the non-monopolist social groups have been hard hit. Despite a growth of production by 60% and of labor productivity by 50%, purchasing power has fallen for a large number of workers. Moreover the Fifth Plan has led to the disappearance each year of 60,000 families of toiling farmers; while the concentration of capital also hits the workers and the small traders, and compels the small and middle enterprises to subordinate themselves to big capital in order to survive. A growing number of intellectuals find their aspirations to freedom and creative work in conflict with the authoritarian power, and with the law of profit.

In this situation the illusions engendered by the Gaullist power in 1958 have faded and new groups have come into action. The political parties representing these groups have been compelled successively to withdraw support of the Gaullist power and then to come out more and more strongly in opposition to it.

But the solutions put forward by these groups maintained the division amongst the left parties, and our central committee was able to show what the situation was, in posing the following question on April 1, 1965: “Will the outcome of the struggle against the personal power be a reactionary solution under other
forms, or will it be a genuinely democratic solution?" To take the latter path it was obviously necessary to bring about the active and loyal co-operation of all the left parties. It was necessary in particular to secure co-operation with the socialist leaders, who under the pretext of realism, of the need of allies, pursued their policy of class-collaboration. The candidacy of Gaston Defferre for the Presidency of the Republic was openly based on an alliance with the right to assure a reactionary alternative.

It was a question then of helping the socialist workers solve the contradiction which existed between their aspiration to social progress, to socialism, on the one hand, and, on the other, the pursuit by their party of a policy of class collaboration, with no other outcome than to assist reaction to pursue its anti-social policy, and to maintain the capitalist regime. The way to achieve this was clearly stated by Maurice Thorez in December, 1962:

For the forms of the single front the great lesson of the campaign for the referendum and for the elections can be expressed in these words: No cut-and-dried plans, no inflexible demands, or rather one only which is valid both for us and for our eventual partners—to serve to the utmost the interests of the workers, the cause of democracy and peace. We must succeed in proving, little by little, that the fullest collaboration between communists, socialists and other republicans is necessary for the present, but that it will be equally so in the future, to ensure that we undertake the construction of socialism in the best possible conditions.

And corresponding to the effort to find in each situation the form most favorable to unity, our party in its 16th, 17th, and 18th Congresses set itself the task of reaching ideological agreement, of developing new theses on the possibility and the conditions for a peaceful passage to socialism through a plurality of parties.

In this manner we deprived the anti-unity forces of their argument that we wished to pluck their feathers pending the suppression of all the other parties. Similarly our flexible attitude contributed to rebutting another anti-unity argument, that we stood for 'all or nothing'.

Thus, in the referendum of 1962, as we were not able to make a common call with the socialists to vote no, our party launched the order of the day: "Let us march side by side and strike together against the common enemy." For the presidential election our quick decision in favor of a single candidate of the left, in spite of the absence of a common program, delivered a heavy blow to the ideas of a reactionary solution and strengthened the left. The unity brought about on this occasion made it possible to demonstrate the strength of the left, by presenting it as the only serious opposition. The attitude of our Party in promoting unity on this occasion, its loyal efforts to obtain a massive vote in support of the single candidate of the left, made a deep impression on the non-communist democratic forces. Also the efforts of certain leaders of the left federation to reach an agreement with the
Democratic Centre of Lecanuet created a sharp conflict in their own ranks.

The agreement of 20th December gave a decisive check to the trend towards an alliance of the right. The solutions developed by our party to put an end to the personal power, its actions to take at each point the steps forward that are realistic, its active participation in the actions directed against the policies of the Gaullist power, made it more difficult each day to justify anti-communist exclusiveness. More and more often, socialist workers found themselves at first side by side, then together with the communist workers, against the same enemy, an enemy supported on all these essential questions by the reactionaries who were posing as democrats and who were presented to the workers as allies.

This agreement was widely respected, since in 382 constituencies where the left was able to present a candidate on the second ballot, in 367 there was a single candidate of the left (187 Communist Party, 173 Left Democratic & Socialist Federation, and 7 United Socialist Party). Hence it is possible to envisage with confidence the prospect of putting forward a common government program.

These developments clearly illustrate the Leninist theory of compromise: in no case to reach agreements against the interests of the working class, under the pretext of sinking differences; but not to reject an agreement which provides the working class with allies to fight on a part of its program under the pretext that the whole program is not included.

The agreement provides for the nationalisation of armaments and of banks, and the democratic administration of national enterprises. Similarly it provides that in the matter of investment, priority must be given to housing, to national education, to scientific research, to public health. On the political level the common text declares: "The Gaullist regime must be eliminated. It is incompatible with democracy and constitutes the major obstacle to the extension of liberty, to economic and social progress and to the operation of a consistent policy of peace and disarmament." And it forecasts "the suppression or revision of the articles (of the constitution) utilised by the President of the Republic to impose personal power." In foreign policy, it is stated concerning Vietnam: "They (the two delegations) consider necessary the immediate cessation of American bombardment of North Vietnam, and the return to peace in this region by the application of the Geneva Agreements."

Hence, contrary to the allegations of the Chinese leaders, our policy of unity has not led to the abandonment of the heroic
people of Vietnam, but on the contrary makes it possible to throw new forces into the common action against the American escalation, and into support for the observance of agreements recognising the independence, unity and integrity of the territory of Vietnam.

Whatever disagreements there may be, there is evident in the development of these principal themes the possibility for the left to set in motion a government program, entirely logical and corresponding to the interests of the immense majority of our people. It is not, of course, a question of stopping at that point; and commenting on the current situation, Comrade Waldeck Rochet, General Secretary of the Party, declared:

We consider that the problem of the solution—democratic or Gaullist—is posed more sharply than ever, and for a future perhaps nearer at hand than the Gaullist leaders think. We do not consider, indeed, that the present National Assembly with its false majority can last until 1972, that is for five years. That is why our party considers that, while continuing to defend its democratic program, it must contribute to the strengthening of the left forces on the basis of a common program of government.

To gain a majority it is in fact necessary that the left parties do not appear only as a force capable of checking the personal power, but also as providing a durable alternative.

To check the Gaullist power in the immediate future and then to sweep it away, importance is attached to the development of struggles, be they for economic gains, for democratic liberties or for peace. It is indeed clear that in spite of the important role that the new parliament will play, it is the united action of the working class and the popular masses which remains decisive.

These common actions are envisaged by the agreement of 20th December, but they will take place all the more rapidly, as the independent activity of the Party develops amongst the masses. Indeed, recent events have again confirmed that the progress of unity is linked to the progress of our party: naturally enough, because our party is the party of the working class for whose interests it fights without compromise. When our party progresses it is a blow to anti-communist exclusiveness, and to disunity in the working class. In no circumstances then do we concede that unity could progress more quickly through the withdrawal of the party, for the contrary is true, as the facts prove.

The progress of our party is the greater as all its organisations struggle against sectarian trends and appear clearly as the best workers for unity, demonstrating also that our party is above all an instrument at the service of the working class, to assist it to realise its desire for unity. We are taking every possible step to hasten the closer unity which will inspire the masses and lead to a quick victory of the left as it becomes the pole of attraction for all democrats.
A member of the Jewish community in N.S.W. traces the history of the conflict between Jews and Arabs in the Middle East, and points the way to a solution.

THE ARAB WORLD is in a state of continuous social and political revolution, in some of the Arab countries reaching a stage of nationalisation of foreign enterprises and big Arab-owned undertakings. Since 1955 a radical change has occurred in the foreign policy of Egypt and Syria. The Western imperialist powers, to safeguard their enormous oil interests, endeavored to arrest and reverse the Arab revolution, using intrigues, coups, direct aggression and military intervention by the pro-Western Middle East states. These activities have brought an increase of animosity and tensions and could lead to a world war.

This imperialist policy found its expression in the prompting of Israel, Turkey and Iraq to attack Egypt and Syria in 1955, in invasion of Egypt in 1956, in the intervention of the US and Britain in Lebanon and Jordan in 1958 as preparation for intervention in Iraq, and in goading Israel and Jordan to attack Syria in 1966/67. The recent war in the Middle East was basically the outcome of this policy. These plans to topple the revolutionary regimes and to arrest the Arab revolutions have repeatedly failed, due to the actions of the Soviet Union and strong opposition from the Arab and neutral nations.

At the end of the Second World War Palestinian Jewry started a struggle for independence and against restrictions on migration by Britain, the Mandatory Power. The outcome of this struggle was the establishment on November 29, 1947, by decision of the United Nations, of Jewish and Arab states, politically separate but economically joined, a decision fully backed by the Soviet Union and other socialist countries. In the last resort it was the outcome of the struggle of the Israelis, who defeated the Arab armies (armed and officered by the British) which invaded Israel in defiance of the UN decision.

This invasion led to the failure of the establishment of the Arab Palestinian state, and contributed to the creation of the huge number of Arab refugees in areas adjacent to Israel. This refugee problem soon became a stumbling block to establishment of peace between Israel and her Arab neighbors.
Very soon, however, the young Israeli state changed its policy. It received big American grants and loans and entered into close relationship with the United States. In accordance with the philosophy of Ben Gurion and other Zionist leaders that "Israel is situated in Asia only geographically", the Israeli government soon adopted a one-sided pro-Western orientation which at all times supported the colonial powers against the Asian and Arab nations. Thus Israel supported Britain in 1952 against Egypt, Holland against Indonesia, France against Algeria, the West against China and Tshombe against the Congolese liberation movement.

The military attack on the town of Gaza on February 28, 1955 opened a new page in the Israeli policy towards progressive Arab states, Ben Gurion claiming that the attack was an answer to the infiltrations of Gaza strip refugees into the Israeli border areas for the purpose of stealing, sabotage and killing. However, the timing of this and other punitive military expeditions against Egypt and Syria (Gaza February 1955, Khan Yunis September 1955, Nitzana November 1955 and Lake Tiberias December 1955), the depth of penetration into Arab territory, the great number of troops involved and the fact that the scope of Arab infiltrations has increased as a result of these military expeditions, bear witness that these attacks served the imperialist aim of driving the reluctant Arab states into the Bagdad pact.

Ben Gurion's policy aimed at 'seeking a military pact with the US'. In the Israeli parliament on November 9, 1955 he said Israel aimed at solving the Israel-Arab conflict in 'an active way', by military means with the help of the imperialistic powers. This policy eventually led to the (for Israel) disastrous French-British-Israeli invasion of Egypt on October 29, 1956.

In 1955, as a result of their national liberation revolutions, Egypt and Syria abandoned their uncompromising stand against the existence of the Israeli state. Under their leadership, at the Bandung Conference in April 1955, the Arab states adopted a policy of neutrality and coexistence and of 'peaceful settlement of the Palestinian question on the basis of implementation of the UN resolution on Palestine'. (The Facts of the Bandung Conference: D. W. A. Baker, p. 29.) Moreover, in 1956 President Nasser approached Syria, Jordan and Lebanon with a request that Arab demands for reducing Israeli territory to frontiers allotted to Israel by the UN in 1947 should be discarded in favor of a more moderate and practical plan. (Davar, organ of Mapai, 1/6/1956.)

However, after the invasion of Egypt in 1956 the attitude of the Arab states to Israel changed radically, extremists in Egypt and Syria coming out with the theory that 'Israel is a creation of imperialism', that the state of Israel should be eliminated, and
that the Jews who came to the country after 1948 should be deported.

After February 1966, when the left wing of the Baath Party came to power in Syria, the US and Britain again resorted to their old method of using the pro-Western Middle East powers to overthrow governments choosing the non-capitalist path of development. Thus Jordan in 1966 threatened to invade Syria to prevent it going Communist (Hussein's statement of 8/10/66) and organised several unsuccessful coups in Syria. On the other hand, Israel carried out several mass attacks against Syria (the major ones on July 14 1966 and on April 7 1967, when the Israeli war planes reached Damascus) and against Jordan (on November 13 1966 as 'a warning against Syria'). Levi Eshkol, the present Prime Minister of Israel, claimed, like Ben Gurion in his time, that the sole purpose of the punitive military expeditions was to stop the activities of Arab sabotage and terror groups operating in the border territory. However, many facts indicate that the 'retaliatory acts' were in reality a continuation of Ben Gurion's policy.

Firstly, soon after the progressive Syrian Government came to power, the US for the first time supplied officially and directly to Israel much military equipment, including tanks and jet bombers, and it is hard to imagine that this act was an entirely disinterested one.

Secondly, two years ago the Israeli Government suddenly prevented Syrian farmers, who in accordance with the armistice agreement used to attend to their plots of land in the demilitarised zone without any permits, from doing so. (Communist Party of Israel Bulletin, January 1967, p. 16.)

Thirdly, the Government of Jordan took some measures to prevent Arab terrorists from entering the Israeli territory, and the Syrian Government, according to the pro-Zionist Israeli journal New Outlook (October-November 1966, p. 4) was unable to prevent partisan actions by the Al-Fatah terrorist organisation, while it could not, for prestige reasons, attack them or refuse to share their 'glory' . . . and the Israeli authorities were certainly aware of this situation.

Fourthly, high officers and government officials threatened on many occasions to take military action to overthrow the Syrian Government (General Y. Rabin's statements in Be Mahaneh of September 10, 1966 and of May 1967), and on May 9, 1967 the Israeli parliament authorised the Government to carry out military actions against Syria.

However, Arab chauvinism constituted a great danger to Israel and has played into the hands both of imperialists and of reactionary circles in Israel. Both reactionary and progressive Arab states have claimed that Israel is simply a creation of imperialism and
should be eliminated, and that all Jews who came to Israel after 1948 should be deported. This view was peddled at anti-imperialist and peace gatherings, even Israeli communist and progressive delegates being often barred from meetings because Arab delegates threatened a boycott.

The Palestine Organisation and Army of Liberation, whose aim is to 'liberate' Palestine by means of war and terror, were active in the Arab countries, and since the beginning of 1965 the sabotage and terror groups of 'Al-Fatah', organised by the pro-Chinese circles following Mao Tse-tung's ideas, operated in the Israeli border areas. Since 1966 they were joined by the 'Heroes of Return' organised by the Army of Liberation of Palestine, and up to the end of 1966 over 70 acts of sabotage and terror took place, involving 11 killed and 58 wounded.

Following the Israeli raids of July 1966, top Syrian leaders, in their statements, supported the terrorist acts and proclaimed that 'people's war for liberation of Palestine' and 'guerilla warfare to liquidate Israel' had started (C.P. of Israel Bulletin, December 1966, p. 29 and November 1966, p. 8.) So although Arab chauvinism was greatly strengthened as a result of the pro-imperialist policy initiated by Ben Gurion in 1955, it was expressed in such a racist and intolerable way that Israelis and Jewish people all over the world had to oppose it strongly, and rightly so.

Arab chauvinism resulted, as chauvinism does, in something very harmful for the Arab people—it provided a justification for aggressive acts of the imperialists and reactionary Israeli circles. It stimulated chauvinism in return and united the overwhelming majority of the Israeli people behind Israel's policy of retaliation.

And yet there are many people in Israel striving for peace. In 1951, 1952 and 1954 half of the Israeli adult population signed peace petitions. In 1957 the C.P. of Israel, Mapam (left socialists), Hapoel Hamizrachi and Agudath Israel (religious workers and orthodox Jews) strongly criticised the whole system of retaliation.

Dr. Nahum Goldman, President of the World Jewish Congress, has for many years urged the Israeli Government to adopt a policy of neutrality and integration into the Middle East. In the years 1966-1967 the two Communist Parties of Israel, Mapam and a substantial number of intellectuals, have urged that the "Israeli Government give up the system of military retaliation" and "adopt instead a high standard of border control, as an answer to Arab sabotage and terror acts".

The Israeli leaders, however, have paid no heed to this call of reason as the only way to peace with the Arabs. They have preferred to proceed with a policy of co-operating with imperialism and of dealing with the Arabs from 'positions of strength'. They
have refused to admit any refugees to Israel. Some time ago, while, on a visit to Washington, Prime Minister Levi Eshkol declared: "The admittance even of 100,000 Arab refugees to Israel would be an atom bomb for Israel."

On the Arab side, up to 1964, Arab Communists took a correct stand in the spirit of internationalism, at their conference in Prague in 1964 adopting a resolution advocating a peaceful solution of the Israeli-Arab conflict based on recognition of mutual rights of all. Unfortunately in 1966 the Arab Communist Parties reversed their stand and adopted at their conference a resolution supporting the Palestinian Liberation Front, which stands for a holy war against Israel. In these circumstances the call of the Communist Parties and progressive forces in Israel and elsewhere to refrain from the use of force was unable to prevent the pro-American and pro-imperialist policies of Ben Gurion and of the subsequent Israeli Government, which strove to solve the Israeli-Arab conflict by military means and with the help of the imperialist powers, leading to the recent Israeli-Arab war, which resulted in much destruction, suffering and bloodshed.

The war solved nothing. It has increased mutual suspicions and hatreds. It has magnified the economic difficulties of Israel and its political isolation. It has made the solution of the Israeli-Arab conflict much more difficult. Some time ago Israel refused to admit even 100,000 Arab refugees; today it has almost one and a half million Arabs in the occupied territories, half of them unemployed.

Sometimes it is said that Israel, which has a weak economy and is surrounded by a hostile Arab world, has no choice but to pursue a partisan pro-American policy. It is pointed out that Israel gets yearly, in addition to American grants, over 100 million dollars from American Jewry in the form of appeals and individual donations. However, in present international conditions, when substantial differences exist on many questions among the Western powers, when the opposition to US foreign policy is voiced from many quarters, when many nations adopt, with benefit, a policy of neutrality, and when more and more Jews all over the world, including in the US, are beginning to realise how necessary it is for Israel to adopt a policy of neutrality, of no identification with either bloc and of integration into the Middle East, adoption of such a policy by Israel is not only possible but is absolutely necessary.

Soviet policy in the Middle East has been open to criticism because unjustified statements were from time to time made by Soviet representatives at the UN and elsewhere, comparing zionism with nazism. Such statements antagonised many democrats and
progressive people throughout the world, and could be interpreted by the Arabs as the green light for their anti-Israel chauvinism. The breaking off by the Soviet Union of trade relations with Israel after the invasion of Egypt in 1956 and non-resumption ever since, while trading with Britain and France, the main culprits of the invasion, could also be interpreted by the Arabs and others to mean that Israel and not the Western powers is the imperialism of the Middle East and the main enemy of the people. And it is said with some justification that more forthright statements indicating that the Soviet Union is not only for the legitimate rights of the Palestinian Arabs but also for the legitimate rights of Israel, might have helped to moderate the influence of chauvinist sentiments among the Arabs.

Nevertheless it is widely recognised that the Soviet Union played a positive and very effective role in the recent events in restraining aggressive and extremist forces. And in general, Soviet policy in the Middle East has been conducted in accordance with the principles of internationalism and support for progressive social development. The Soviet Union has supported the Arab struggle against imperialism, for independence, social reforms and progress by diplomatic and material means. On many occasions it prevented the overthrow of progressive revolutionary regimes of the Middle East. It stood for ‘mutual respect for sovereignty and territorial integrity of all states in the Middle East’, and ‘for the settlement of international problems exclusively by peaceful means’, (e.g., the Khruslov-Nasser statement in Moscow of May 1958). It stood for ‘improvement of relations with all states of the Middle East’. (Khruslov’s speech at the banquet in honor of Egyptian General Abdul Hakim Amer of 28/10/58, Pravda, No. 14691.)

Mr. Kosygin’s speech at the UN in which, expressing unequivocal support for the Arab states against attack and against imperialism, he categorically said:

Every people enjoys the right to establish an independent national state of its own. This constitutes one of the fundamental principles of the policy of the Soviet Union,

may well prove historic. This speech is greatly assisting the reappraisal taking place among the Arabs, and has already been praised in a statement by the ambassadors of twelve Arab states.

This, together with a stronger stand against chauvinist elements by all progressive Arabs, and the continued struggle of peace-loving and realistic forces in Israel, is the only way in which a stable peace in the Middle East will eventually be realised on the only possible basis—mutual recognition of Jews and Arabs of the legitimate rights of both peoples, and joint opposition to imperialist domination and manipulation.
**Books**

**ORBIT OF CHINA,**
by Harrison Salisbury.
Secker and Warburg. 222pp.
$3.85.

THIS BOOK, by a trained and perceptive, though not deep observer makes fascinating reading.

Harrison Salisbury, life-long journalist and now Assistant Managing Editor of the New York Times, last year undertook with his wife, Charlotte, a 30,000-mile journey, visiting most countries close to, or as the title has it, in the "orbit of" China.

Later in the year he visited North Vietnam, from which his despatches deservedly achieved world headlines, especially his rejection of US claims of "no civilian casualties", and his interview with Pham Van Dong, confirming that cessation of US bombing could lead to negotiations.

Before dealing with his conclusions we wing our way with Salisbury to Cambodia, where he reveals Central Intelligence Agency—South Vietnamese training of the so-called "Cambodian Freedom Movement" used for forays into Cambodia along the frontier.

On to Thailand and the big American build-up—15,000 to 35,000 troops in the first nine months of 1966, six great air bases including Sattahip with 11,500 foot runways, and (when completed) the biggest naval base in the Far East.

In Laos, Salisbury claims, opium is the key, and is in the hands of the Kuomintang troops who had retreated from Yunnan in 1949. These KMT troops were later replenished

with CIA assistance. Perhaps generously, he holds that "although there was evidence of CIA links to all of the participants in the (opium) trade I did not believe the CIA was a direct partner. However it was an indirect beneficiary. Its interest was its intelligence and possibly clandestine operations in China."

From Burma he quotes an Air Force Commander who felt that the Americans had already lost in Vietnam "because they did not understand that the white man could no longer fight in Asia and win." And Premier Ne Win, who looks with horror on what US 'aid' is doing in SE Asia—"This kind of aid does not help. It cripples, it paralyses . . ." he says.

In Japan, many influential people Salisbury records, "still thought in terms of the Japanese dream of an 'East Asia Co-Prosperity Sphere'" (which was to include Australia—E.A.). On the basis of Japan's industrial advance "some are beginning to add up what this means in terms of world power", and to hanker after nuclear weapons—a question which was "on the agenda before China exploded her first nuclear device."

These are matters bearing very much on Australia's future and foreign policy, which have been ignored for too long in this country, including by the left.

Salisbury's observations on the Soviet Far East and Mongolia are also well worth reading, but let us now push on to the conclusions.

What prompts Salisbury's journeying is the consuming fear, shared no doubt by other high-ups on his paper and by a significant section of the US ruling class, that America is on a collision course with China, a course which they feel could only result ultimately in a world nuclear war and universal devastation, but above all virtual destruction of the United States itself.
It is from this viewpoint that Salisbury advances his solution:
Standstill, de-escalation and some approach to a settlement in Vietnam.

By this and subsequent steps, for the US to show its desire, not for victory in Vietnam but for a solution which would place the fate and future of SE Asia in Asian hands.

To help (drag, if necessary) China into the community of nations, instead of isolating her.

To assist technically and in all ways to solve the food and population problem in China.

One could perhaps end a review at this point, and on a very positive note, which the book deserves. But the assumptions, reasoning and ideology behind the author's conclusions, mainly serving the cause of peace though these conclusions do, demand some critical scrutiny.

Salisbury's basic view is outlined on page 193: "When I looked at the dynamics of China—the chart of her rising population, the ineffectual measures being taken to reduce the birth-rate; the relatively ineffective means being taken to increase food production—it seemed to me that one could project on a chart the year when China's rulers would be forced into aggressive action across their frontiers in search of food for the rice-bowls of their people. And that date, I felt certain, must come up within the next decade—possibly sooner if there was a succession of bad crop years."

One can recognise the existence of a population-growth problem, and that disagreement over economic policy is a basic factor in the 'cultural revolution', as this reviewer does, without sharing Salisbury's simplistic view that population pressure is the basic determinant in Chinese policy, and of much of world politics, and will soon result in China acting aggressively.

(A similar basic thesis on population, incidentally, seemed to lie behind the recent "Our World" TV program).

My quarrel is not with stress on the existence of the problem, but failure to recognise that it is the US which is acting aggressively, not China, and failure to even pose, let alone face up to, basic questions bearing on population growth.

In all under-developed countries there is great ferment, having as its aim the changing of social structures in ways which would bring industrialisation and end the stagnation of the village, the cultural and other forms of backwardness which bear down on the country as a whole.

Apart from directly assisting production of food—and the technical means to increase food supply faster than population for the next half century at least are already known—such social changes would begin to create conditions which have resulted in a fall in the birthrate in all technically advanced countries.

The reduction in the birthrate in such countries is probably due to a complex of reasons, but in any case clearly indicates that with social changes bringing rising standards of living and culture, education in birth control would succeed in a way impossible in under-developed countries.

Yet such social changes are precisely what American power aims to prevent in Vietnam, Latin America and other areas. Changes such as cannot be achieved without social revolution in India, where the peasant has little incentive to increase production, even had he the means.
since most of it would be taken in payment for generations-old debts.

Further, the American world-wide exploitation of under-developed countries which the Vietnam war is seen as a key in maintaining, also acts powerfully against those social changes which would bring lower birthrates in their wake.

In Chile it is estimated that the copper deposits are liable to be exhausted by the end of the century. Since the main profits go out, to the US, how will Chile be able to industrialise? Or the oil producing, the tin producing, the banana, the coffee or cocoa producing countries?

These facts contain some of the reasons why those favoring social revolution are less frightened by the ‘population explosion’ though they recognise the problem, than those who cannot see past support for the capitalist system and its world-wide chain of interests.

Perhaps that is why Salisbury is not over-sanguine of being able to avoid the ‘war of races’ on the verge of which he sees the world standing. But we can all support the thought with which he concludes his book:

“The first steps would be the most difficult. Many Americans would think them politically impossible. Yet the choice was clear. America must act or face possible obliteration. Better the political courage to take tough decisions ... than the hesitation or hypocrisy which would doom us all to disaster.”

E.A.

THE SUN KING, by Nancy Mitford. Hamish Hamilton. $7.35.

LOUIS XIV has become almost a fashionable subject for historians. It is not long since we had W. H. Lewis’ fine studies of The Splendid Century; and now Nancy Mitford has worked back from the mid-18th century which she loves so dearly to the late 17th again.

Engels used to complain of the self-styled marxists who fling the phrase “historical materialism” around as a sort of charm to ward off the necessity of actual historical research. Mitford is an excellent antidote to these people. She has genuinely soaked herself in the period, and has all its detail at her pen’s end. Not that she claims to have written a history of the period; she takes aim only at its central figure, the King himself, but she sees him in depth and in his context. She uses the contemporary eyes of the artists who depicted Louis XIV, the diarists of the court who whispered about him, the ambassadors who weighed him up, the statesmen and priests who counselled him, and some at least of the women who slept with him.

What is more, she gives pictures of all these people themselves, as she does of the palaces Louis lived in, the furniture of his rooms, the spurs he rode with and the surgeon’s kit that he was bled with. Pictures in paint by Rigaud, Poussin, Largillière, Bosse and anonymous portraitists; pictures in words by Saint-Simon, Dangeau, Sévigné and nameless diarists and scandalmongers. Every page of the book is pictorial, vivid, glowing, detailed, flavored with affection and malice.

Yet there is not too much detail or too much affection. There are countless little stabbing touches that bring characters and manners into sudden life. One understands the Duc de Nevers a little better on being told that he was once imprisoned for baptizing a pig. One discovers (at last!) why Chamillart was made a Privy Councillor: “he was almost the only courtier who could give the King a decent game of billiards”. Long sermons on megalomania would have been far less illuminating than such details are.
What the details add up to is a lively and highly credible view of an astonishing event: the creation, and then the destruction, of a great, civilised nation-state. Louis was, in a way, a compound of Cromwell and the two Charles's. First, assembling a team of brilliant commoners, he destroyed the power of his rowdy nobles, and set up the state which he rightly saw as himself. Then, over-adulated, feared, lonely, he withdrew himself; and his great creation went to smash. It is by sheer fluke that there was not civil war when he died.

In spite of plentiful recent examples, Louis XIV remains the classic instance of what an individual can achieve while he swims with the tide of history; and of what damage a cult of that individual can do when the tide turns.

Nancy Mitford writes with ease, dash and elegance. She carries her vast load of information gracefully. The book which she has written is an admirable one for the reader who already knows even a little about the period. For the beginner, there are a few traps. Mitford overrates the accuracy of Saint-Simon. She even believes him when he imputes cowardice to the Due du Maine in the campaign of 1695. I do hope that she will have had access, before another edition of this book is printed, to the memoirs of Major-General de Saint-Hilaire—an eyewitness of the facts—who blows this particular bit of ducal slander into thin air.

JOHN MANIFOLD

THE LONG VOYAGE,
by Jorge Semprun. Formentor Prize Winner.
Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 236 pp. $2.25.

JORGE SEMPRUN has written a remarkable novel. In prose as spare and sinewy as an outback stock-rider, it is an intensely personal document that makes one want to know more, much more about the author.

The actual facts I have are very few. Semprun is a Spaniard, a “Spanish Red” of the 1930’s who crossed the frontier into France in 1936 and later joined up with a French Resistance group. Sent to Auschwitz concentration camp, he survived to write this book nearly twenty years later when the long voyage from Compiegne to Auschwitz, the long voyage from life to almost certain death, the long voyage for 160 men jammed into one cattle truck for days and nights on end, could be relived and written about. He still lives in Paris. I believe another novel of his is being filmed.

However, through his hero Manuel I do in fact feel that I know Jorge Semprun quite well. They share a common background and many experiences. The character that emerges is outstanding and, for me, utterly admirable.

Manuel is a political man, one who has fought against Franco and who sees his political activity in terms of freedom. He has never been more free than when he was arrested. What “left” of the thirties and forties will not warm to this passage: “. . . we become identified with one another to the extent that we partake of this freedom. And it is to the extent that we partake of this freedom that we get ourselves arrested . . . I’m not implying that we all partook equally of that freedom common to us. Some people . . . partake accidentally of this freedom which is common to us. Perhaps they freely chose the resistance, the clandestine life, but since then they have been living on the initial impulse of that free act . . . they are not living their freedom, they are ensconced in it.” And how many will feel a shamefaced identification with those who are so ensconced? All too few of us have remained free in Manuel’s terms.
Manuel is a strong, young, vigorous man, a man who loves wine, food and the winter strength and beauty of the countryside. He loves ideas expressed in books, in music and pictures, in argument and discussion.

Manuel thinks sweetly and tenderly of women, although there is not a real love scene in the book, and as sweetly and tenderly of his comrades in the Resistance, with their incredible bravery and heart-warming foolhardiness.

Manuel hates only one thing — fascism. He hates it as many of us did and as a smaller number of us still do, because of the way it degrades, blunts and destroys even those who do not know what is happening to them. I should like everyone who ever felt this hatred and all those who are too young to have known fascism in its most brutal manifestation to read this book and take this long voyage with Manuel and Jorge Semprun.

They would learn or re-learn from it something of the passion and dedication felt by millions during the purest and most unselfish period of their lives.

I have just read this book. It was published in 1963, almost twenty years after the author's Long Voyage, but I feel, with the publishers, that it will continue to be read long after everyone who shared Semprun's experience is long dead.

LORRAINE SALMON.

AUSTRALIAN LABOR RELATIONS READINGS,
Edited by J. E. Isaac & G. W. Ford, 527 pp,
Sun Books, $3.50.

THE CO-EDITORS of this book have earned the blessings of those interested in Australian labor relations. For bringing together the twenty-five readings contained in it, plus four extensive lists of references, will forever save such a person the great amount of time required to make such an essential collection by oneself.

Although the book is primarily designed for the use of students in labor relations courses at universities, the hope is expressed that it will also be of interest to a wider public such as advocates, union officials, industrial officers and public servants.

This hope should be fulfilled, as the book is good value for both bulk and for content. $3.50 for 527 pages is good value for paper, while the contents are good value as they are well selected to cover a wide spectrum of aspects of labor relations. The book would therefore be a worthwhile addition to the library of anyone interested in the subject, not only for study but also for reference.

The title is perhaps a bit misleading, in so far as most of the contents are designed to develop a better understanding of the arbitration system, although this admittedly is a major factor in labor relations in Australia.

In passing, I notice that the book was printed in Hong Kong, and possibly most of those connected with its production would be Chinese. If any of them read it while it was in production, there must have been some puzzlement over the strange ways of those inscrutable Australians!

It is not possible in a brief review such as this to deal specifically with a number of readings ranging over such a wide field, particularly when many of them can open up extensive debate on the aspect they deal with. So only two general comments are made.

The first comment is that the balance of Australian Labor Readings is interesting in the light of
current events. Parts 1, 2 and 3 on Industrial Conflict, Trade Unions, and Employer Associations respectively take up in all about 260 pages, while Part 4 on Industrial Regulation and Collective Bargaining takes up about 225 pages.

This is probably a rough measure of the relative importance of the four matters in the field of industrial relations. But Part 4 is given an added interest now because of the opening era of wage fixation by the introduction of the total wage in 1967, for this new development cannot but intensify the debate within the trade union movement as to which of the two paths the trade union movement should follow.

The second comment is that a striking feature of the book is the almost complete absence of any original readings from the trade union movement. The book correctly points out that they are an integral part of the arbitration system, which could not in fact operate without their co-operation. But of the 16 authors of the readings, 13 are academics, 2 officers of the Commonwealth Commission and one a public servant when he wrote his reading.

The only reading from the trade union movement is a reprint of the resolution passed at the 1965 ACTU Congress on the Penal Provisions. There are also no items in the extensive reference lists indicating trade union material.

This situation is not the fault of the co-authors, but of the trade union movement. It raises the disturbing question in the mind of any thoughtful trade unionist as to whether this apparent paucity of creative thinking by the movement really meets the needs of the present times.

That perhaps this is one explanation for the way in which the employers are making rings round the trade unions. That perhaps the employers' success is due to their ability to engage in creative thinking as to their policies and, if necessary, to abandon time honored concepts that have become outmoded for them.

That the Arbitration Commission, too, has been doing some hard thinking on its part, as demonstrated by its 1967 decision. That this hard thinking in other quarters is not apparently being matched by equivalent hard thinking by the trade unions as to their policies. And will the 1967 ACTU Congress show that some hard thinking has taken place, or will it adopt the same pedestrian attitude of previous Congresses and so leave the trade union movement that much further behind?

J. Hutson.

(Mr. Hutson is a Research Officer of the Combined Research Centre of the Amalgamated Engineering Union and the Boilermakers' and Blacksmiths' Society. — Ed.)


DESpite the attempts of some psychologists to reduce the whole of learning to a single principle (e.g. reinforcement, conditioning) the processes by which people acquire their habits, skills, knowledge and abnormalities remain very varied. Most of these processes, even the simple ones, are not properly understood scientifically even though many good rules of thumb exist to guide the learner or teacher. Borger and Seaborne outline both the scientific-theoretical
problems and the practical consequences in a number of areas of behavior. The treatment is at a non-technical level and, despite the fact that contentious issues have been glossed over, the authors have written a good introduction to the subject. Teachers, high school students intending to study psychology, as well as the layman, will find it useful.

Lowenstein’s book on the structure and functioning of the nervous system is, in the reviewer’s opinion, a book well worth study by Marxists. The central issue which Lowenstein deals with is the mechanisms underlying our knowledge of the external world. Each of the sensory systems (vision, hearing, taste, smell, touch, etc.) is dealt with in much the same way. First the gross structure of the organ is outlined and then details of its functioning are presented. Stress is laid upon the way in which the external stimulus object gives rise to a particular pattern of nervous system response. The final chapters deal with the transmission (amplification and processing) of these responses in the different parts of the nervous system on the way to the brain. The last chapter discusses some of the philosophical issues involved. The reader should not be put off by Lowenstein’s agnosticism. The fundamental test that our knowledge is of the external world and is correct comes from practice rather than from the forcefulness of arguments in panel discussion.

P.D.


DR. MILLAR is concerned in this book with the interactions of the British Commonwealth and the United Nations. He takes several major international disputes of the past twenty years (though Vietnam is a noticeable exception) and examines the reactions of Commonwealth countries towards them, both within the Commonwealth sphere (as for example at Commonwealth Prime Ministers’ Conferences) and at the UN itself. He deals with the Indian-Pakistan dispute over Kashmir, the Suez crisis, the Korean war, decolonisation within the Commonwealth and racial disputes in South Africa.

His main thesis, though only guardedly developed, is that the twenty-one nations comprising the Commonwealth have, up till now, been better able to understand each other’s position and attitudes at the UN by virtue of their being partners in the Commonwealth. He speaks of “an attitude, an idea about international society”, and views the Commonwealth’s role as primarily that of enabling a freer exchange of ideas between its members than would otherwise be the case.

Beyond this, however, he seems unwilling to go, pointing out in his final chapter that those who argue that the Commonwealth is merely a ‘concert of convenience’ have neglected the emotional overtones of the Commonwealth notion of which we in Australia are only too well aware.

Instead, one of the main issues regarding the Commonwealth that Dr. Millar could well have devoted more space to is this question of its nature. What exactly is it that holds the Commonwealth together despite all the shocks it has received, both at the UN and elsewhere, over recent years? It could well be that the answer lies more in the sphere of mass public opinion than in the diplomatic give-and-take of the UN or the Prime Ministers’ Conferences.

In this sense too the book seems already dated (and perhaps any treatment of Vietnam would have dated it even more), talking about an entity which is changing so rapidly that it
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seems to defy any effort to crystallise it or to draw current generalisations about its role. For example, Dr. Millar points out that the UN initially recognised the bloc nature of the Commonwealth by always allowing a Commonwealth country to sit as a non-permanent member of the Security Council. But this practice ceased in 1964 and the implication of this, for us in 1967, is an aspect of UN-Commonwealth relations that Dr. Millar doesn’t discuss.

But the main point here seems to lie more in the inherent difficulties of the ever-developing topic than in any oversight on the author’s part. His book, especially with its Appendix of the UN voting record of the various Commonwealth countries, is a valuable contribution to an almost unexplored area of international relations.

L.N.C


THE FATE of key personnel surrounding the Kennedy assassination comes under discussion in a new booklet just released onto the Australian market.

Bearing a graphic photo of the late President John Fitzgerald Kennedy on the front page, it introduces the topic of the report and, with the aid of one paragraph, leaves the reader in no two minds as to what he can expect to experience.

"An unexplained aftermath of the Kennedy assassination is that at least ten persons, each with some special knowledge of the tragedy, have died violent, peculiar or mysterious deaths," it says.

And the contents of the booklet do justice to the front page promise. The booklet reprints an article that originally appeared in the February, 1967, issue of Cosmopolitan.

The January and March issues of the American magazine were freely available on Australian news-stands. The February issue was strangely absent.

With the knowledge that they have potential dynamite in their hands, the authors put forward definite evidence for their case, bringing into the spotlight blatant discrepancies within the Warren Commission report.

The Warren Commission, the authors claim, "was set up by Lyndon Johnson, was responsible to Johnson and respected a lawyer-client relationship with Johnson. It was truly the 'President's Commission'."

The case is built around the strange and violent deaths of key figures, and the fear engendered in others who could possibly have valuable evidence on the assassination.

The article puts forward this evidence and questions why the Warren Commission neglected to call some of the valuable witnesses.

Truly, for those who are not satisfied with the whitewash given the tragic occurrence by the big-business news sheets, this book is a must.

N.S.

Aug.-Sept., 1967
Editorial Board

The new members, who have been serving on the Board for varying periods of time are:

Jim Baird, Research Officer of the Combined Research Centre of the Amalgamated Engineering Union and Boilermakers and Blacksmiths' Society.

Leon Cantrell, Teaching Fellow in English, University of Sydney.

Theo Moody, Sydney journalist.

Mavis Robertson, Publicity Officer, Communist Party of Australia.

In Coming Issues . . .

In the next (October-November) issue, a number of prominent Australians write their thoughts for ALR on the occasion of the 50th anniversary of the Socialist Revolution in Russia. Contributors include James Aldridge, Marcus Oliphant, Jessie Street and Katharine Susannah Prichard.

Other articles soon to appear include:
The Congress of the Australian Council of Trade Unions.
Activities of the Central Intelligence Agency.
Australia's Water Problem.
Migration and the Labor Movement.
The Art of Daumier.
The Mass Media and Social Change.

Printed and published by D. B. Young Pty. Ltd., 168 Day Street, Sydney at 21 Ross Street, Forest Lodge.
SUBTLE FLAME
By Katharine Susannah Prichard
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.
Australasian Book Society. $3.50

STOP THE BOMBING
by Malcolm Salmon
In this new sixteen page pamphlet Malcolm Salmon Tribune staff journalist describes his recent visit to North Vietnam. He brings you an eye-witness account of the U.S. bombing raids, their effect on the population, measures taken against them, and their failure to break the spirit of the people. He explains the basis of the North Vietnam demand that the bombing must permanently cease if a way to peace is to be found.
This pamphlet is available free from 168 Day Street, Sydney. Phone: 26-2161.

THE VIETNAM PROFITEERS
by Victor Perlo. Price 65 cents (posted 75 cents)
The enormous military bases and airports established by the American adventurers in South Vietnam are a demonstration of far reaching strategic aims of the policy planners of the White House and Pentagon. Not so well-known are the rich economic prizes, the tremendous natural wealth of this region, which American presidents as far back as Eisenhower have vowed to deny to the rightful owners. Noted economist Victor Perlo quotes chapter and verse to expose U.S. economic aims.
Current Book Distributors Pty. Ltd., 168-174 Day Street, Sydney.