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THE FEDERAL TAKE-OVER of the Victorian Labor Party, inspired by rightwing policies, ruling class desires and the ambitions of attaining electoral victory at any cost, has proved a grand failure, irrespective of what occurs in the next weeks.

The interventionists had a completely unreal estimate of the situation in Victoria and have proved quite unequal to the job undertaken. They in no way realised the depth of support for Hartley, Hogg and their colleagues. Estimating that Hartley, Hogg & Co. would have only a handful of supporters faced with strong-arm tactics, they to a large degree were paralysed by the strength and full-blooded nature of the opposition and defiance which they confronted from a membership sickened by the traditional parliamentary antics of a Whitlam and the harebrained, opportunist, power-game manoeuvrings of a Cameron.

The idea of reforming the ALP to enhance its 1972 electoral prospects by eliminating “the madmen of Victoria” in exchange for some curbing of the rightwing dominance in NSW was swallowed readily by sundry opportunistic, unprincipled “left wingers” in NSW and Victoria obsessed with positions and “power” and with achieving the “advance” of electing a Labor Government under Whitlam. The “Mad Hatters tea party” of Broken Hill was followed by the circus-style orgy of the Travel Lodge Motel in the
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full glare of television cameras and the shoddy backroom dealings of the dimly lit Chinese cafes of Sydney.

After the massive intervention in Victoria the whole game was revealed by the Federal Executive's attitude to NSW. Faced with the stark revelations of the Burns' report which either categorically stated or strongly implied the stacking and rigging of Conferences, financial malpractices, unprincipled pre-selection procedures, manipulation of rules, dominance by outside secret organisations, etc., all of which made the Victorian "crimes" pale into insignificance, the Federal Executive, in majority, virtually threw out the findings and suggestions of its Federal President.

Hence the ALP is again in crisis — a crisis of perhaps a new kind — which will unfold in a more advanced political situation requiring thought and analysis by all revolutionaries and radicals. However, the purpose of this article is merely to make some comments on the position of the various leftwing or left of centre (in a broad ALP context) sections of the ALP.

The overwhelming number of Labor Party members and supporters who claim any allegiance to socialism are hooked on parliamentarism and the idea of winning "power" in elections as the road of advance to socialism. This has applied both to the opportunist reformers and to the more militant leftwingers. The idea that the way forward to socialism lies through election of ALP Governments which can take steps, even under such leaders as Whitlam, to weaken the hold of capitalism and gradually enhance the prospects of a new society, holds tremendous sway with socialists in the Labor Party despite the fact that this mirage disappears with every experience of Labor Governments in office. Likewise the view that the Labor Party can be "changed", can become really principled, anti-capitalist and socialist, persists despite all historical experience to the contrary.

In Australia today significant newer forces are emerging as ALP leaders. We have people such as Hawke, Dunstan, Young, Holding and Burns who while perhaps varying in their political approaches, ambitions and degrees of sincerity, have a general concept for the ALP. They desire a modernised, larger party, left of centre, in the Australian political context (but not too left of centre) projecting a somewhat radical image, manned by more capable and younger people. While regarding rank and file control as something of a political joke they desire a democratic party but not so democratic as to "get out of hand". They want a party which will appeal more to the youthful majority who may not be unionists so much as in the past; a party which fits into
the bourgeois scheme of the two-party system; a party which could gain office and proceed to “sensibly” and “humanely” set about gradually reforming the capitalist system in the direction of some sort of vague socialism; a radical with-it party yet traditionally social-democratic and therefore thoroughly opportunistic. Perhaps the greatest bulk of Labor Party leftwingers identify in reality with these concepts.

Undoubtedly the most articulate and sophisticated argument for a mass consensus Labor Party as being the vehicle for socialist change in Australia was presented by Ian Turner last October in the article “What Kind of Party do we want?” (Labor Times, Vol. 1. No. 2, Melbourne. October 29, 1970.)

Despite Turner’s praiseworthy motivations, obvious sincerity and ability to present a theoretical view, his thesis amounts to little more than a classical reformist position. In arguing that the ALP must be a “mass” party, rather than a “vanguard” one, Turner is bedevilled by the problem of the ALP achieving office, or “effective political power” as he repeatedly calls it. How Whitlam, Beasley and Cameron straddling the Treasury benches would constitute “effective political power” is not argued. Nor could Turner argue that it would, for election of the Labor Party as at present operative would leave “effective political power” precisely in the hands of those who hold it now.

Referring to the contradictions in the ALP, Turner states that the party has always found it “difficult to reconcile these contradictory interests” and that “it has always had to try to find the balance in the interests of achieving parliamentary office” (emphasis added). This is precisely the point! What kind of policies would the ALP enact? While introducing certain limited reforms in social services and perhaps in foreign policy, it would strive to maintain the status quo and prove itself as being of no serious danger to the interests of the main sections of the ruling class, the middle class, Uncle Tom Cobley and all but the most reactionary forces in this country and overseas so as to ensure its re-election at subsequent ballots. In this connection Turner’s view is not so different from the young reformer section (referred to above) and in part at least conforms to the Whitlam strategy as described by Robert Murray:

He was faced with the choice of leading a united party destined never to win office — and therefore unlikely to stay united — or fighting the left to recreate an electorally successful left of centre party dominated by its Parliamentarians. (Robert Murray, The Split, p.353. Cheshire, Melbourne 1970).

While Turner calls for socialism — “democratic socialism, a decentralised economy and society based on workers’ control and
popular control” — his process of achieving socialism is based on the idea that the ALP MUST get office and MUST present the policies and image which will get it there and MUST more seriously set out to create a “mass socialist consciousness”. How on earth this heterogeneous mass party of consensus — a consensus of non-socialists, anti-socialists and socialists — will promote a mass socialist consciousness is not stated.

Geoff McDonald, hero of the Travel Lodge Motel and the court room, unwittingly emphasises this point as follows:

There are, admittedly, within the ALP varying and different attitudes towards socialism. Some see socialism as a more urgent question, others see it as a philosophy of politics and some see socialism as a question to be introduced piecemeal and some merely look to certain reforms that can be introduced within the system. But within it all they have an idealism and an approach to life which makes them a party suitable to the situation in Australia and reflective of the sentiments and egalitarianism of the Australian people. (Geoff McDonald, The Labor Movement and Democracy pamphlet issued in reply to The Communist View of the ALP Crisis, CPA publication, September 1970 Melbourne).

Can one imagine the Labor Party winning office and Whitlam and Barnard joining with Stone and Ducker to proselytize for socialism let alone attempting to lead and encourage the kind of mass disenchantment with capitalism and mass adherence to the aim of ending its rule? Who in the ALP appear as even remote possibilities to strive to engender socialist ideas and tactics except the very people and forces which Whitlam, Cameron and Co. are trying to eliminate by their intervention in Victoria?

Furthermore, if election of Labor Governments requires maintaining the “consensus” in the party and keeping the “balance”, or in other words holding a nice centrist position, keeping the socialist objective a well-kept secret and sacrificing principle for expediency, how then can one possibly expect it to operate in a socialist position at a later stage?

Hence Turner’s view that the ALP is the vehicle for the advance of socialism in Australia I believe to be quite erroneous. The somewhat different views of Fourth Internationalists, for example those expressed by G. Tighe (ALR, No. 27) likewise fail to offer a solution to these problems. Erroneous, too, are all concepts of socialism lying through the election of Labor Governments or of parliamentarism in general. Lenin, in 1920, referring to the vicissitudes of working class and social democratic parliamentary work wrote that the most shameless careersism, the bourgeois utilisation of parliamentary seats, glaringly reformist perversion of parliamentary activity and vulgar petty-bourgeois conservatism are all unquestionably common and prevalent.
features engendered everywhere by capitalism, not only outside but also within the working class movement. (V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 31, p. 114. Progress Publications Moscow).

The question of why socialists and leftwing activists (who probably number several thousand—variously orientated) remain in the ALP and occupy themselves with the forlorn hope of changing it in a socialist direction is a pertinent one today. The reasons can be set out as follows:

1. Most ALP socialists retain an allegiance to parliamentarism. They state their preference for a “democratic” rather than a “revolutionary” path to socialism, falsely equating democracy with the ballot box and revolution with anti-democracy, hence, despite adhering to socialism, naively placing their faith in reformistic approaches. Many would agree with Dr. J. F. Cairns’ assessment that

“Australians do not need a revolution” and that “the labor movement must adhere to its traditional support for rational and peaceful political methods of securing economic and social change” (J. F. Cairns, *Living with Asia*, Lansdowne Press, Melbourne, p.175).

The remarks of John Saville on the British Labor Party are pertinent to the situation of the left in Australia.

The myths and illusions concerning the Labor Party have an extraordinary tenacity. The first is the conviction that a numerical majority in Parliament is all that is needed given good-will and political purpose, to shift the direction in which society is travelling towards socialist goals; a belief based upon the assumption, whether explicit or not, that the owners of property will allow themselves to be legislated out of existence without a major struggle.

The second is the belief of left wing activists, ever since the establishment of the Labor Party, that the Party can be transformed into an instrument of socialist purpose which, on achieving office, could set about the structural alterations in British society necessary to realise a socialist commonwealth. Party militants have always appreciated the non-socialist origins of the Labor Party, but this has never altered their conviction that continuous effort would bring about the conversion of the Labor Party to a firm socialist commitment. What was needed was more intensive work at constituency level: the winning of positions in the local hierarchies: the acceptance by local parties of socialist aims: the victory of socialist resolutions at national conferences and above all, since the Parliamentary Labor Party was to be the main vehicle for socialist advance, the acceptance of left wing candidates for parliamentary elections.

Despite betrayals by its leaders, the electoral disasters of 1931 and the 1950s, the permanent minority of the Left on the national executive, it has been the renewed confidence of each generation of Labor militants that has kept the Party alive all these years. The facts of life have been against them but their self-sacrificing work has ensured the continuation of the party as a major force in local and national politics. It cannot be too strongly emphasised that faith in the parliamentary road to socialism occupies a central position in the collective consciousness of the British labor movement; and as acceptable strategy it has survived, and is surviving, all demonstrations of its irre-

2. The Socialist left in the ALP, despite its frustrations and disappointments, its severe criticisms of the ALP and the cynicism with which it frequently views the ALP sees NO ALTERNATIVE to working within the Labor Party. As again John Saville puts it in respect to the British Labor Party:

The Labor Party still commands an extraordinary allegiance, even from those who have lost all faith in its socialist potential. There is no easy and obvious political alternative and it is this which holds so many back from making the decisive break. (ibid).

This point is illustrated in Victoria where following the 1955 split in the ALP and the adoption of more leftwing stances by the Victorian Labor Party organisation, and following the various splits and crises in the world communist movement, hundreds of ex-communists found their way into the ALP in dissatisfaction with the possibilities for advance of the CPA, considering that the ALP constituted a more meaningful organisation (whatever its weaknesses) with real mass support and possibilities.

3. Even some of the most militant of the socialist left in the ALP retain the hope that the party can in fact be transformed into a principled socialist party, provided they work hard enough — this hope despite all history and all history of betrayals. Each new situation seems to rekindle that aim and hope.

Many social-democratic parties of Europe originated as marxist parties and evolved to parties of the purely ALP type as they are today. Not so the ALP, which was formed in the 1890s to become the political mouthpiece of a trade union movement faced with a deteriorating economic situation, which wanted to repeal the bad laws. So the ALP has remained, losing something of its “closeness” to and identification with the unions in the process. It adopted its socialisation of industry platform in words in 1921 as a response to the Russian Revolution and the formation of the CPA but has never regarded it as more than an embarrassment to be played down or “forgotten”.

Traditionally the ALP left has been consistently reformist and gradualist rather than lickspittles for the ruling class, vaguely socialist rather than revolutionary, or anti-reactionary rather than socialist. Its principal spokesmen have rarely been more than merely leftwing in the broadest sense.

However the left in Victoria at the present time comprise an interesting and significant phenomenon. The history of the three great ALP schisms of the past with Hughes (1st world war), Lyons (1930s) and the Groupers (1950s) arose on the basis of the above-
mentioned adopting extreme rightwing policies. The present crisis has occurred because of the more leftwing attitudes of the Victorians. Indeed when confronted with Federal intervention the Victorian leftwing rather than capitulating or running for cover, opted for more boldly elucidating their leftwing and socialist positions and fighting intervention on that basis — certainly a qualitatively new phenomenon for the ALP! Furthermore it is receiving mass support from the membership. The Hartley-Hogg forces seized the time of undemocratic and unpopular Federal intervention to promote a struggle for democracy in the party and for a more challenging anti-capitalist, extra-parliamentary, and more pronounced socialist-inclined program than has been witnessed in the ALP for generations — this at a time when there is an escalation of leftwing movements of all kinds and a pronounced anti-authoritarian and anti-capitalist trend among the nation's youth. The fact that the present struggles are exhibiting new features is, incidentally, an additional factor refuting the proclaimed Hill-Maoist view that the more left ALP leaders and members are, the more dangerous they are to the working class.

Why is the current leftwing struggle in Victoria exhibiting qualitatively new features? Several reasons readily come to mind.

1. The 1955 split saw the clearing out of the most substantial rightwing elements from the ALP. This was peculiar to Victoria because the split with the groupers was very much more pronounced in that State.

2. The fact that the groupers had largely controlled the Victorian branch prior to the split in 1955 required a tremendous rallying of the more leftwing and militant ALP members in Victoria to resurrect the ALP organisation and wage the fight against the groupers and then the DLP.

3. This necessitated a greater involvement in ALP affairs of leftwing unionists than had operated hitherto and a vow on their part to the effect that never again would the rightwing gain dominance in Victorian ALP affairs.

4. The split saw the emergence of Jim Cairns as member for Yarra, defeating the DLP man Keon. Cairns has exercised a considerable influence on Victorian political ideology and action. Certainly a man of principle in Federal Parliament is rare if not unique. While Cairns is not a revolutionary, his contribution to the anti-Vietnam war effort and to making politics an affair of the people and of the streets has been possibly monumental in terms of any other approach historically.

5. The aforementioned large numbers of ex-CPA members who gravitated to the ALP, most retaining their socialist leanings and many aspects of their CPA training certainly strengthened the
ALP left. While not all have remained in the leftwing camp most have.

6. A large number of the cadres of the present left in Victoria are products of the Victorian Labor College, an organisation under the patronage of Ted Tripp and under the influence of marxist and trotskyist teachings which has had an inordinate (in terms of its size) influence in the labor movement in Victoria. (Note: These influences and teachings are worthy of a study by some enterprising student of the labor movement.)

Most of these circumstances are not apparent in other States. In addition, the present struggle has developed in a situation when big mass movements of various kinds (Vietnam, conscription, education, etc.) are developing with the mass of participants being outside the ALP and traditional political structures, when there is a growing disillusionment with parliamentarism upon which the ALP is based, and when there is a substantial international challenge to traditional reformist politics and politicking.

The left in Victoria, in preparation for the January 30 meeting of rank and file ALP members, and a future State Conference, have presented a platform which, while being contradictory in many aspects, is an advanced position for the ALP. It emphasises as key objectives peace, democracy and socialism. It speaks of the emancipation of man, the ending of alienation, direct action, workers’ control as opposed to workers’ participation, and opposition to, and direct action against, unjust imperialist wars “in recognition of the fact that the workers of all countries have a common identity in overthrowing exploitation”.

Such approaches, however limited, combined with vigorously expressed opposition to the confining of ALP activity largely to parliamentary manoeuvring, give the current Victorian left a qualitatively new look. There is a genuine and developing socialist trend. Yet what of its possibilities for consolidation and success?

Maintenance and development of their position makes virtually impossible any long period of even bitter co-existence with Whitlam and the rightwing politicians and trade union bureaucrats so powerfully entrenched in the ALP structure. In addition there is the complexity of the ALP power structure referred to by Robert Murray which “covering so many interests and so apt to touch off power struggles” has “a stultifying effect” in that it discourages “change and individuality”. (See The Split, p.6.) Furthermore, the propensities for compromise in the ALP (including the left) are traditional and very strong. Illusions about the “possibilities”
of reformism, as outlined above, are the strongest ideological factors dominating the outlook of the bulk of supporters of the present Victorian leftwing leaders.

For such a genuine socialist left to survive as a force for any length of time within the ALP it would have to be organised so as to constitute a party within a party—a difficult situation—which would only be the precursor to having affiliation ended anyway. Presumably hope and inspiration for this new leftwing arises on the basis of the new situation in Australian politics—the big mass movements with masses of youth demanding and enacting the politics of resistance, confrontation and militancy in a way unknown before, substantial challenges to parliamentarism as a method to achieve fundamental change, and the need for the ALP to take account of these developments. However within this political context the idea of a genuine socialist left remaining within the ALP and gradually succeeding in transforming it into a fighting socialist party appears as even more utopian than it did hitherto. For the rising storm of youthful radicalism is precisely against the compromises, the manoeuvres and wheeler-dealing associated with the traditional political parties and for a more fundamental challenge to the actions of imperialism and the values of capitalist society.

The ALP as a structure, and in ideology, is a reformist party offering itself as the alternative Government of Australia, the second line administration of capitalism, a role accepted by the overwhelming bulk of the members, as well as by the leadership. Criticising the British Communist Party's *British Road to Socialism*, Bill Warren makes some interesting comments, of interest to Australians, on the British Labor Party. Suffice it to say that far from being a potentially socialist party, the Labor Party is a structure for fighting elections to provide personnel to run the capitalist state at national and local levels in such a way as to integrate the most advanced sections of the working class into the capitalist system. Further, the provision of such personnel has as a quid pro quo a local and national system of institutionalised patronage. Nor is it only a small number of leaders who are right wing—the party down to its lowest levels is predominantly right wing. Neither is the Labor Party democratic since the Government or the Parliamentary Labor Party decides policy. Moreover, the Labor Party operates at all levels to dampen the class struggle as far as this manifests itself in the form of direct action and initiative from below. The role of the Labor left has been to maintain the Labor Party's hegemony over the class-conscious sections of the working class and in doing so it provides necessary ideological support to maintain the electoral success which ensures the continued dominance of the right. A mass movement cannot change the Labor Party except by destroying it. The strategic task of the revolutionary left is thus not to change the Labor Party but to detach it from its working-class support. (Bill Warren, "The Programme of the CPGB — A Critique", *New Left Review* No. 63 p. 96).
Yet Humphrey McQueen is undoubtedly correct when he claims that every socialist must confront the question of the ALP, that the ALP “cannot be ignored in any revolutionary socialist strategy”. (Humphrey McQueen, “Laborism and Socialism”, The Australian New Left edit. Richard Gordon. Heinemann, Melbourne p. 43.)

This piece of advice needs to be learnt by many of the youthful revolutionaries. Irrelevant it may be as a socialist force but from the point of view of support and allegiance from many socialists, potential revolutionaries and militant blue and white collar workers the ALP is by no means irrelevant. These forces have to be prised away from its influence before fundamental social change can be won and this task must be confronted by serious revolutionaries. Snobbishness on the part of youthful revolutionaries is hard to sustain in the light of the many on the student and academic left today who only yesterday were members of the ALP ritualistically handing out how-to-vote cards and working for the return of a Calwell or Whitlam Government! This illustrates that revolutionaries cannot ignore possibilities for change and that masses of people can “become transformed so that instead of merely desiring some greater or lesser reforms they are prepared to take decisive action to change the whole social system.” (Statement of Aims, Communist Party of Australia, 22nd Congress, March 1970, p. 26.)

Therefore the young radical/revolutionary attitude, so prevalent, that the ALP is irrelevant, that revolutionaries should have no truck with it, should not support the return of Labor Governments and indeed should in no way even participate in parliamentary activity, contesting elections, etc., is incorrect and should be combated. Lenin’s references to such attitudes in an earlier and foreign context are still noteworthy today:

The childishness of those who “repudiate” participation in parliament consists in their thinking it possible to “solve” the difficult problem of combating bourgeois-democratic influences within the working class movement in such a “simple”, “easy”, allegedly revolutionary manner, whereas they are actually merely running away from their own shadows, only closing their eyes to difficulties and trying to shrug them off with mere words”. (V. I. Lenin, ibid., p. 114).

Some comments on the Communist Party approach to the ALP seem necessary at this stage. The present split in the CPA centres on this question to quite some degree. The Australian Socialist grouping are increasingly hostile to the CPA on the basis of it being “pseudo-left”, too critical of the ALP. (Note: The Australian Socialist group regard it as commonplace and correct to speak of unity “with the ALP”, i.e. with Whitlam, Ducker and Dunstan and all, yet mention of anarchists, libertarians, Trotskyists, or Maoists evokes responses of derision and anger), and departs
from consistent, principled efforts to build unity between Communist and A.L.P. forces at all levels on all possible issues of common agreement, as the main basis of a wide anti-monopoly front . . . (Declaration, Socialist Publications, Sydney 1970 p. 4. Emphasis added).

This approach continues the generally accepted view within the CPA of the late fifties and early sixties, and reflects both the incorrect strategy involved in such a stance and inability to adjust to changed situations. Twenty years ago nearly all the socialists (and militants) were members or supporters of the CPA or ALP. Today the majority are not. Twenty years ago most meaningful and militant campaigns on living standards, democracy, peace, etc., were initiated by CPA members or policies. Today such campaigns for various reforms so frequently arise spontaneously on a larger scale. This seems to indicate that communists should not see themselves so much as initiators of reform movements (which the past situation made necessary) as being activists and ideologists aiming to exert political and theoretical influence, explanation and direction for these movements in order to advance the socialist and revolutionary potential of them.

Today the problems of the ALP, while very important, are by no means the cardinal question that they used to be, because of the proliferation of leftwing struggle, forces and potential outside the existing political parties. Traditionally socialist strategy (hardly existing outside the CPA) has been built around the existence of the ALP, a large reformist party receiving the support of a majority of the working class, the second party of the two-party system of our brand of parliamentary democracy. This in a situation where the CPA was small, other revolutionary groupings virtually non-existent, the student and youth movement unknown and leftwing academics largely silent — a vastly different situation from today.

In this situation the CPA’s attitudes to the ALP and the united front in general tended to comprise a defensive rather than an offensive position and were frequently designed to avoid or overcome isolation, or to develop in broadest terms, the struggles for reforms and campaigns which were most frequently slow to develop and hard to sustain.

If such tactics were correct before they are not today. Over the years the CPA tended to veer from positions of sectarian abuse and hard-line inflexible confrontation towards the ALP to the extremes of a “soft-line” and only a mildly critical approach. Unity for the sake of developing some campaigns for reforms assumed too great an importance. Andre Gorz has commented:

The fact that social-democratic leaders and socialist forces may find themselves in agreement on the necessity of certain reforms must never be allowed
to confuse the basic difference between their respective goals and perspectives. If a socialist strategy of reforms is to be possible, this basic difference must not be masked, nor dismissed to a lower level by practical agreements at the summit. On the contrary, it must be placed at the centre of political debate. If not, the socialist movement, by seeming to give a totally unmerited "socialist" warrant to the social-democratic leaders through tactical agreements at the summit, will have prepared the rout in ideological and political confusion of the whole of the working class movement and particularly of its avant-garde. (Andre Gorz: "Reform and Revolution". Socialist Register, 1968 p. 113).

While agreement at the "summit" in the Australian context was not a factor, the above assessment could perhaps apply fairly accurately to failings of the CPA particularly during the sixties. In addition the CPA for long years has been particularly remiss in criticising the ALP left. The attitude to this whole problem became one outstanding reason for the CPA's lack of attraction to the radical youth and young socialists.

Perhaps the CPA in its currently more realistic and advanced policies in a new political situation still adheres to a sort of ambivalent attitude towards the ALP — on the one hand holding the view that the ALP cannot be "changed" and on the other encouraging the left in the ALP to make the attempt. For there to be any substantial development of the socialist and revolutionary movement in Australia it would seem several difficult processes would have to take place.

Firstly, the ALP socialist left would have to abandon its habitual yearnings after reformist solutions and possibilities and be prepared for a different and more arduous existence.

Secondly, the CPA's evolution to more revolutionary positions and to rejuvenation would have to have greater success. The attitudes of perhaps a majority of its members seeing it as "a homeland, a refuge and a source of moral comfort" and "the effectiveness and radiance of the party" being "of less account than its homogeneity" would have to be changed. (Andre Gorz, ibid., p. 138.)

Thirdly, the more realistic and less naive and romantic of the youthful revolutionaries would have to realise more deeply than they do now that people have to be "won" to a socialist position rather than "bludgeoned" into it and that this whole process may necessitate varied and complex tactics, campaigning and activities at all levels perhaps over a very long period of time.

Should such processes be accomplished with any degree of success the possibility for some newer and more attractive formation, marxist, militant and revolutionary, may become a possibility.
A Look at Wages in the 70's

IF ONE IS TO TAKE a considered look at wages in the 1970's it is necessary to have a look at the different positions of the employers, the Arbitration Commission and the trade unions at the beginning of the decade.

Take the employers. At one time they adopted the negative, crude approach in national wage cases of flatly opposing the claims of the trade unions, but apparently they came to the conclusion that this was not good enough for the changing times. Consequently, they tightened up their organisation and established the National Employers' Policy Committee to formulate a common policy on national wage cases. The changes this body worked out were demonstrated by ideas they injected into the national wage cases from 1964 to 1969, most of which were accepted by the Commission. First the total wage with the associated abolition of the basic wage. Then the minimum wage. Then some of their guidelines for work value assessment from their wage charter of 1968.

Although the employers have had their successes in the Commission, they have not been so successful in the field. The year
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1968 saw the defeat of their attempt to absorb the increases granted in the Metal Trades Award Work Value Inquiry into overaward payments. The year 1969 saw industrial unrest increase to a higher degree than in 1968, and the defeat of the old penal powers. The year 1970 saw industrial unrest increase to a higher degree than in 1969 and substantial gains made in wages and conditions.

Now let's take the Arbitration Commission and go back to 1969 National Wage Case Decision in order to put the 1970 Decision into its correct context. The 1969 decision was not of interest so much for the increases that it granted as these were a modest 3 per cent increase in total wages, which gave $1.65 to a fitter in Sydney and a $3.50 increase in the minimum wage. The interest was rather in the six pages which the Commission devoted to laying down what it considered to be appropriate wage-fixing principles, particularly with regard to work value assessment. Such a detailed exposition could well be called the Commission's "wage charter", for it appeared to be a determined bid to set down principles for the fixation of award standards which would be valid for some time, by accomplishing two things.

One was to establish a stable award structure by ensuring that increases in national and work value cases would cause little or no disturbance to general wage relativities. The other was to minimise award increases. On the one hand, the national wage cases were to be the main medium for increasing wages, and these would only produce modest increases such as those granted in the 1968 and 1969 cases. On the other hand, the limited movement permitted in work value cases would reduce the increases coming from that area.

Developments in 1970 showed, however, that the prevailing industrial climate was not propitious for the implementation of the charter. For 1970 saw an upsurge in industrial unrest and industrial demands in a number of areas. Substantial gains were made in over-award payments. The coal-mining industry won the 35-hour week. The Public Service Board granted substantial increases which had little to do with work value principles. And, at the end of the year, the Commission itself granted the biggest increase ever in its history in the 1970 National Wage Case, amounting to 6 per cent in total wages, or $3.40 for a fitter in Sydney and an increase of $4.00 in the minimum wage.

Why did the Commission find it necessary to make such an increase at this time? I believe that the answer to this question must be sought in developments in wage fixation taking place in industry. Over a period of years, the stronger and more militant trade unions have gone outside the arbitration system and by
consulting with and involving union members in wage campaigns and struggles, have negotiated directly with employers for wage increases and conditions well in excess of what the courts had shown they were prepared to grant.

There now exists a wide network of hundreds of such directly negotiated agreements, and as their number increases the relevance of arbitration and the Industrial Commission is more and more called into question. In fact, those directly negotiated agreements mean that a new system of wage determination, a form of collective bargaining, already exists side by side with the arbitration system. Criticism of arbitration has grown and more and more trade unionists are relying on strike action and direct negotiation for the settlement of their demands and problems.

The Industrial Commission itself took into account these developments in industry. In the reasons they gave for the 6 per cent wage increase, they wrote:

If we are not realistic in our attitude to wage fixation, then those who look to the Commission as their main source of wage increases, and there are many who do, will be treated inequitably, while more and more those who are strong enough to do so will seek increases in the field.

Obviously, the 6 per cent wage rise would make a big hole in State Government budgets. Moreover, it was to be made the occasion for, as events have shown, employers and business houses to increase prices. In their reasons for the wage decision, the Commission recognised some of the problems that would arise but, faced with the trade union successes outside of arbitration, they obviously felt it was not their job to try and contain inflation by refusing to grant a wage increase. They seemed to regard inflation as a matter for the Federal Government to handle.

However, the Commission cautioned the unions about their drive for overaward payments, and hinted that the employers should stiffen their resistance to such claims. For it said that the state of affairs disclosed at the hearing showing union pressure for wage increases outside of the Commission, which sometimes had been granted too easily by the employers, could if not contained inhibit the Commission in granting increases in future national wage cases.

The squeeze to damp down the wages drive came from other directions too. Shortly after the decision, an article in the Australian Economic Review hit the headlines. And no wonder, because it prophesied that Australia could be threatened with an economic crisis which could be potentially as dangerous as the depression of the 1930's because of the rate of inflation. Measures as compre-
hensive as those adopted in the Premiers’ Plan of 1931 were therefore necessary. The article said that while the unions were not mainly responsible for the emergence of the threat, workers and the trade unions should not be “attracted, fascinated and ultimately bedazzled by the fact that money wages were rising by 8 or 9 per cent a year, and by the prospect of their rising by 15 or 20 per cent a year”. The Federal Treasurer, Mr. Bury, was not slow to move in after this, warning of the serious possibility of an economic crisis, and stating that if wages were not stabilised the Government might have to take drastic remedial action which the community would not like.

The trade unions would be foolish to take notice of the Jeremiahs and damp down their struggle for increased wages at the present time which is most favorable for them. In any case, their members will undoubtedly expect them to carry on the good work. But for the decade of the 1970’s the trade unions require a policy which will wear well over the whole period.

One of the noteworthy features of the present wage campaigns is that the workers are no longer thinking in terms of meticulously calculated small increases of $1.00 or $1.85, but are demanding and expecting increases of $8.00-$10.00 and more, per week—and frequently winning these demands. Unions and militant trade unionists must seriously take this change into account and see that demands put forward are really in accord with the approach of the workers and the possibilities. These successes in Australia and in other countries too are throwing employers and governments into a quandary.

The struggles for such demands will, by and large, take place outside the arbitration system. Outside of the Commission, the approach of the trade unions should be a concentration on direct negotiation with employers in order to obtain the best price for the labor power of their members. After all, what the employers are really prepared to pay is not determined by formulae such as work value, or comparative wage justice, or capacity to pay or what have you, but by the cold reality of the prevailing terms of the labor market, provided the tactical and strategic thinking of unionists is equal to the situation. Again, this approach means the maximum involvement of the rank and file. Unfortunately, it must be said that of the merited criticisms which can be made of the Australian trade union movement, the most damning one is that, in general, it does not capitalise on the potentiality of its rank and file to anything like the extent that it could.

Inside the Commission, the trade unions should vigorously press for the living wage concept using the minimum wage as the
medium. This now ranges in Federal awards from $44.60 to $47.10 as a result of the 1970 National Wage Case Decision. This clearly fails to meet the needs of the low wage-earner. Two major defects in the approach of the unions to the minimum wage need to be corrected. One defect was indicated by the Commission when it said in its Decision that:

However, we find it hard to see how future benches can continue to give him special treatment in the absence of more information such as the actual living standards of people on or near the minimum wage, how many there are, how many would be affected by any future claim and what effect the introduction of the minimum wage has had generally in industry.

This was an obvious invitation to the unions to present such a case. Up to date they have been fumbling with the presentation, but the responsibility is now on them, and not just the advocate, to do a thorough job and so correct that defect.

In relation to this, the Basic Wage Case Decision of the Industrial Commission of Western Australia of the 26th December, 1970, is of considerable significance. Not so much because of the fixation of a minimum wage at $49 as compared with the fixation of the Arbitration Commission, as that was still too low a figure, but for the principles of fixation which were laid down. The unions argued their case on the basis of a detailed examination of what it actually cost a married man supporting a wife and two children to live.

The Commission laid down two principles in relation to this approach. One was that it accepted the approach as being valid for the current and future cases. The other was that it indicated that, in future cases, it expected the employers and the Government to cooperate with the trade unions in providing the factual evidence as to living costs. This approach would certainly be well worthwhile also achieving in relation to the Federal minimum wage. The other defect is that the idea of a living wage has not yet been made by the trade unions to live in the minds of the low wage earners. This is demonstrated by the almost total lack of interest in the national wage cases in the workshops. Again, it is the responsibility on the trade union movement as a whole to arouse the awareness of the importance of the concept and the strong expression of determination to have a living wage.

The second approach of the trade unions inside the Commission should be to increase the involvement of the rank and file in issues which are, for one reason or the other, brought to the Commission for settlement. This approach is based on the premise that the Commission rarely grants other than that which has already been won or about which great determination has been shown.
But even if the trade unions were successful in their operations, both inside and outside the Commission, there still remains a difficult and intractable problem to which an answer must be found if they are not to be, in effect, just a bunch of well-meaning industrial boy scouts. The problem is that up to date no matter how profound the knowledge of wage theory, no matter how effective the industrial tactics adopted, no matter how resolute the industrial action taken, the employing class has been able to contain the wage demands of the trade union movement.

This is clearly demonstrated by the official statistics. These show that over the past fifteen years the trend of the share of wages and salaries of the national product has been downward. More striking still, although there was a big increase in the rate of increase of average earnings from 6.6 per cent in the period from 1965-69 to 8.9 per cent in the period of 1969-70, the share of wages and salaries of the national product still declined slightly from 61.8 to 61.7 per cent.

The matter of containment in general has been analysed excellently in the last issue of ALR in the article by Bernie Taft entitled “Post-war Industrial Policy.” It is not therefore necessary for me to go over the same ground as he has beaten me to it, and I urge that the article be re-read. But a few points from this article should be emphasised here: the need for greater consciousness of the fact of containment; the rejection of the view that revolution can only be generated by a great economic crisis, which will inevitably take place; an intensified search for a socialist strategy adapted to the modern reality with its new contradictions; realisation that, particularly today, militancy on economic issues is not the sole prerogative of revolutionaries; and extension of the range of issues taken up by the unions, with particular emphasis on demands for workers’ control, rank and file activity, and opposition to the Vietnam war.

The only comment I make is that the formulation of a solution to the intractable problem of containment will be a searching test of the quality of the thinking of any section which aspires to the ideological leadership of the trade union movement. If an answer cannot be found, the trade unions will remain running energetically around in the squirrel cage of containment and be, in effect, a medium for making capitalism work by taking the squeaks out of its wheels. Union officials have, in fact, been described as being essentially “managers of discontent.” Surely they are required to be more than just this.
Anti-war Perspectives
—A Communist View

PERSPECTIVES for the anti-war movement have to be considered against the background of the perspectives of continuing war and preparations for war by the Australian ruling class and the imperialist system of which it is part. Since the second world war, Australian armed forces have taken part in wars in Korea, Malaya, Vietnam and Indo-China. More or less continuously, Australia has been involved in military operations for 20 years. These have all been imperialist in character and of a specific type—wars fought in Asia, wars fought to maintain colonialism, even if in new forms.

Why is colonialism so important to imperialism? The answer to this question is vital in estimating the future perspectives for the anti-war movement. If colonialism is not decisive for imperialism, then those people may be correct who say "The Vietnam war was an error of judgment, a mistaken policy, by US administrations". It would be possible for more enlightened administrations to avoid similar mistakes in the future. Indeed, this is official ALP mythology, in which Mr. Whitlam casts himself as the best Australian friend of the United States, a counsellor to the sane, humanitarian part of the US Establishment, which accidentally and with the best of motives somehow slid into the Vietnam morass.

This article's thesis is that colonialism is essential to imperialism, a condition of the latter's existence. Since Australia is part of this system, we confront a continuing future of involvement in

Laurie Aarons is National Secretary of the Communist Party of Australia.
This article is based on a paper submitted to the National Anti-War Conference held in Sydney February 17-21, 1971.
colonial wars and counter-insurgencies. These can be both “other’s” wars and “our own” — a possible war against the developing national liberation movement in New Guinea.

Sukarno once described Dutch imperialism as a giant snake whose head devoured the resources of Indonesia, digesting and shitting them out as gold in Holland. This is a valid description of the world imperialist system which devours an increasing share of the world’s natural and human resources. The United States alone consumes nearly half of the non-socialist world’s raw materials — its oil, its metals, even its food. Japan, West Germany, Britain and a few other capitalist powers together consume most of the rest.

Excretion from this consumption produces pollution, destruction of the environment in the consuming countries. This is punishment for depletion and destruction of the environment in the neo-colonial areas from which resources are extracted mercilessly and with ever-increasing technological skill (as Conzinc-Rio Tinto is doing so efficiently in Bougainville). As though this were not enough, the imperialist powers develop new techniques of war which destroy the environment, as in the defoliation, burning and mass bombing of Vietnam.

Imperialism and exploited countries, as the dialectical opposites within the unity — the capitalist world — have, of course, far more complex relationships. These include export of capital; partial industrialisation of the colonies; political, cultural and ideological relationships. But their sum total, their essence, is an unequal relationship, in which one dominates, the other is oppressed; one profits, the other is exploited. This relationship is vital to one side, to imperialism.

Because colonialism is so decisive for imperialism, new forms of colonialism, dependence and exploitation have developed over the past quarter-century. But underlying all these is the same open, naked brute force by which the imperialist system was established and maintained over the last 300 years. And this force is always used, whenever it appears to have a remote chance of success. Forms of this force may vary, from economic pressure, bribery and flattery to coups engineered or utilised by the CIA or its equivalents. The last resort is war, whether declared or not, usually one that begins as a civil war for liberation of the country from a pro-imperialist ruling group.

Since 1945, the struggle between imperialism and its opponents has not ceased. It has been bitter and bloody; it has not ended and gives no sign of ending. Analysing its results is not just a
recital of facile victories for the “progressive forces”. The Chinese revolution was victorious, the greatest strategic defeat for imperialism; the Democratic Republic of Vietnam was founded; in Korea, the American armed forces suffered the deep trauma of their first unsuccessful war, foreshadowing the greater blow they have taken and are still taking in Indo-China. In Latin America, Cuba has decisively broken with imperialism; Chile, Bolivia and some other nations are moving towards confrontation of US domination.

As against this, imperialism has also scored successes. Their biggest was Indonesia — others were, for example, Iran, Guatemala, the Congo, Ghana, Brazil, Dominica, and there are others, too. Besides these successes planned and won by imperialism, the anti-imperialist struggle has been affected by the serious differences between the socialist countries, in the international communist movement, and within other anti-imperialist forces also.

Just the same, the world-wide struggle clearly runs against imperialism. This is most dramatically shown in Vietnam, and now the whole of Indo-China, where the United States’ extension of the war has only worsened its military-political strategic situation. We have perhaps become too familiar with the amazing truth that all the might of US imperialism cannot win victory in Indo-China. Indeed, the opposite is true; US aggression there has been counter-productive, accentuating all the internal contradictions and antagonisms of American society, including growing moral and political disintegration of the US armed forces in Vietnam.

The astounding fact of the US failure in Indo-China is one of the great realities of world politics today. It is striking proof that the world-wide national liberation revolutions are an irreversible historical feature of our times, affecting the whole course of world development. It is also true that the Vietnamese and Indo-China national revolutionary wars are succeeding only against great odds. Imperialist barbarism, both technologically refined and also directly mediated by a total war policy which differs little from Nazi or Japanese “kill all, burn all” strategy, is inflicting a dreadful cost upon the people. There is no moral difference between Lidice and My Lai; even the inhuman theory of racist superiority is no less strongly operative.

The heroic achievements of the Vietnamese people, their strategic and moral superiority, must not cause any relaxation of action against the war and support for their struggle. It is precisely the imperialist character of the US and its war which leads to the stubborn search for new US strategies and tactics, the latest being the so-called “Vietnamisation”. This is an effort
to reduce US casualties while still searching for victory; it is the latest in a chain of strategies which have had to be discarded. This one, too, will lead to failure; but only given continued and rising world-wide action against the war, in co-ordination with the Vietnamese people’s fight.

Stubborn persistence with aggression in Vietnam cannot be explained only by efforts to “save face”, whether by Eisenhower, Kennedy, Johnson or Nixon, except insofar as face-saving is understood as essential to maintaining imperialist domination. From this flows the further conclusion that even ultimate defeat in Indo-China will not end the policies that led to the war there. For these, too, are the product of the nature of imperialism, its inner laws of development and its dependence upon world power and capacity to exploit beyond the boundaries of the imperialist powers.

Continuing US reverses in Indo-China have forced an agonising reappraisal of imperialist policy; and not only in the United States. Japan, Britain, Australia and other imperialist countries are also forced to develop new policies. In these, every imperialist power pushes its own interests as well as joining against the threat of revolution. The shape of these policies is already forming. Japanese monopoly capitalism, already embarking upon an economic imperialist expansion, is fast re-militarising. Urged on by the United States, it is searching for political ways of dividing and smashing popular opposition to all-out militarisation, to force through necessary changes in the Constitution.

A new imperialist strategic concept is emerging — the US-Japanese alliance to dominate the Pacific and maintain imperialist influence in Asia. Using Japanese economic power and investment, along with already-established American economic influence and political power, Australia is to be integrated economically and militarily in an imperialist “Pacific Triangle”, Singapore and Malaya are to remain imperialist bases, and military-fascist Indonesia is to be built up as another part of the imperialist chain. The already close economic ties between Britain, Australia and South Africa are to be gradually developed into a political-military alliance, starting with British use of South African naval facilities. Using as a pretext the alleged Soviet “penetration” of the Indian Ocean, the real objective is to hold back the national liberation revolutions in Asia, Africa and the Middle East. The hope is to retain within the imperialist system all those countries whose resources and markets are so vital to imperialism.

The Australian ruling class is vitally concerned in these plans, economically and politically as well as ideologically. Gorton’s
puerile posturings at the Singapore Commonwealth Conference are explicable not just because he is a white supremacist, fearful of the colonial races. This is certainly true, but the causes lie deeper, in the nature of monopoly-capitalist Australia. Australia is an industrialised capitalist country; it is a colonial power and it also has imperialist economic aims (while at the same time it is dependent upon the vastly more powerful Japanese and American capitalisms). Australian capitalism's economic and political aims have inevitably developed in the context of Oceania and Asia; they also have inevitable limitations of economic, political and military power. These have produced a specific Australian ruling class ideology — racist, at once fearful and arrogant, and always dependent upon a great imperialist power.

It is this dependence which has already led Australia into wars and aggression in Asia; it has caused a wasteful and inflationary military expenditure which amounts to some five thousand million dollars over the past 20 years. This dependence has resulted in establishment of secret American military bases directly connected with aggressive war plans. It has reduced Australia's already very limited capacity for independent initiative in foreign policy, preventing, for example, recognition of the People's Republic of China. In 1964, this theory of dependence brought the Menzies Government to the decision to intervene in Vietnam, first reintroducing conscription to get the force needed. This decision, announced in 1965, was made quite blithely, without any forebodings of its results — because it seemed absurd to think of anything but an easy victory once the United States was going all-out.

From that fateful decision has come a purposeful move towards militarisation of Australian society, towards increased authoritarianism and repression of opposition. The point is that this militarisation and this repression are not accidental, but the result both of the general ideology and deliberate policy of the Liberal-Country Party Government. Not that the government expected the opposition they got, to which their authoritarianism is the classical response. Nor, for that matter, did most activists in the anti-war movement expect as much either, when they began the first demonstrations and propaganda activity against the Vietnam war and conscription.

The anti-war movement has come a long way since 1965; yet it still has its main task ahead. This is true of the Vietnam war, whose impact transformed the existing peace movement into the more militant anti-war movement which opposes not the general threat of war and nuclear weapons, but a particular war in
which its own government is accomplice and participant. Yet the war and the killing still go on, and even beyond Vietnam the pattern of a continuing imperialist strategy is emerging more clearly. The anti-war movement is a response to this imperialist strategy, and its breadth and vigour is an encouraging fact of Australian political reality in a country where consciousness about imperialism is neither high nor widespread.

The character of this anti-war movement needs sober analysis and thought, if its immediate and future tasks are to be tackled and fulfilled. It is a coalition of social classes and political trends. Its main mass base is among students and youth, but it also draws important forces from industrial and white collar workers, from middle and even upper class groupings. Co-existing within the coalition, co-operating in big actions like the Moratorium campaigns, are different political and ideological trends. Along with Christian and other pacifism, there are various revolutionary marxist tendencies, and there is also a strong liberal-bourgeois influence. Labor Party activists, left and centre, are involved in the movement, and so are those of the Australia Party. There are communists, maoists, trotskyites, anarchists and libertarians. All of these contribute, in varying degrees, to the organisational and propaganda work of the movement; all bring their ideas into the movement and seek to influence its actions.

This diversity of ideas and influences give the movement its breadth and its strength and its new quality as a vigorous, democratic and genuinely non-exclusive movement. Diversity also raises problems and issues of great importance for the movement's future, which needs to be examined and resolved in the course of action. The following are views on some of these questions.

The anti-war movement must be broad and non-exclusive.

In its very nature, which is its strength, the anti-war movement must be open to all who oppose war and its consequences. The motivations for this opposition may be (and are) varied, ranging from those who are opposed to all wars in principle (and this means to national liberation wars, too); to those who are opposed only to imperialist wars; those who think that the US war in Vietnam is just a mistake in policy, an aberration inconsistent with the rest of American foreign policy. All these views have a place in the movement — objectively, since they are actually there, and also subjectively, since they can play a part in the struggle against the actual war policy of the government. It should also be added that people holding different views are also capable of changing them under the impact of experience and
action. This has in fact happened; the movement has reached new levels of understanding and broad consensus about attitudes to the National Liberation Front and the Provisional Revolutionary Government of South Vietnam.

A new question has come to the fore: should the movement be confined to those who are consciously and directly anti-imperialist? This paper has argued that the anti-war movement is the result of imperialism and its policies, and that the whole logic of its action is towards a conscious anti-imperialist stance. However, the movement should not exclude those who have not yet reached this realisation, for this would reduce its sweep. Here it is not primarily a question of leaders, ‘important people’; it is above all a matter of masses of people, whose action is decisive and whose ideas have to develop before they will act.

Still another question is discussed: should not the anti-war movement be open only to revolutionaries, since the main cause of war is imperialism and only revolution can destroy imperialism? Only those with a rigidly schematic view of both revolution and of internationalist responsibility to the Vietnamese revolution would advance this proposition. The anti-war movement is a powerful force in capitalist societies like Australia because it unites people of widely differing views in forms of action against war, with objectives that fall short of social revolution. It may be that experience of the struggle against war will lead a movement to revolutionary action. One probable approach to an Australian revolutionary situation may well be through future defeats and calamitous results of the imperialist policies followed by the Australian ruling class. A great deal of experience and action is necessary before this can be envisaged as possible.

Concretely and urgently, the fight to withdraw Australian troops and oppose the Vietnam war is part of this experience. Revolutionaries who seek to confine the anti-war movement to those who agree with them do no service either to the movement itself, or to the Australian revolution.

Connected with this whole area of difference but spreading across the spectrum of protagonists of various ideas, are differences about the movement’s tactics. These are wide and varied, but they may be generalised into the following: advanced or broad actions; within the “law” as interpreted by the authorities, or confronting the “law”; violent or peaceful; should all action be directed towards changing policy through parliamentary elections, or are these quite irrelevant? The movement’s experience has thrown light upon and even answered some of these questions; others remain. Since the authorities unleash violence when facing
mass peaceful confrontation, the theory of “provoking” violence is somewhat irrelevant, though still advanced by some.

The movement has reached a general agreement that its character is essentially extra-parliamentary, a movement of challenge, seeking to impose its will upon governments from outside, through demonstrations, strikes, mass involvement. There are still varied attitudes to parliamentary elections, whether these are seen as the final answer (simplified, “elect a Labor government to end Australia’s part in the war”), or as an area of anti-war propaganda. The test for the theory of a Labor government as the way to end the war still lies ahead; this paper suggests that extra-parliamentary action would remain decisive. It also suggests that participation in elections to make the war a political issue is necessary for the anti-war movement, both as an entity and by the political groupings which are part of it.

The argument about “advanced” and “broad” actions continues, with some from either side sticking to the exclusive view of “either or”. In practice, the movement has developed both forms more or less successfully, and practice proves that advanced actions do not detract from breadth. Indeed, were it not for advanced actions the movement would not have developed, for the first demonstrations, five years or more ago, were all “advanced” in the light of mass opinion then. Those who argue against advanced actions “because public opinion is repelled” in fact condemn the movement to lag behind mass consciousness, when its task is above all to lift mass consciousness.

The main test of advanced actions is whether they help to develop broad and powerful mass actions. While there is room for debate about whether this or that advanced action helps or hinders the movement’s breadth, the principle should be established that advanced actions are essential and effective. Seamen’s Union refusal to work Jeparit and Boonaroo was an advanced action, at the time viewed by some as too far out in front, although it was a limited action. It is now seen as a turning point in the struggle, an example which should be repeated in other industries, adapted to their particular conditions and situations.

Workers’ movement decisive: Stop Work to Stop the War.

Advances made by the anti-war movement are real and even inspiring, given its starting point. Yet only the complacent and easily satisfied can be content with what has been achieved. This is true for all areas of the movement, even for students and youth, where the best results have been recorded. The really decisive area for concentration is the workers’ movement, where the prob-
tems are great and the need is for patient, persistent and studied work to grapple with the obstacles to advance. These obstacles are ideological, political and also tactical, and come to the heart of the tasks which have to be tackled if the movement is to make a big new step forward in a mass way. Time and space allow only brief comments on some major questions.

First, what are some of the main features in people’s thinking which allow the country’s rulers to pursue the war of aggression in Vietnam, and its general strategy of militarism and hostility to the national liberation revolutions in Asia (and in Africa and Latin America too, though these do not so directly impinge on Australia)?

In my opinion, the main ideological weapon is racialism, mixed with anti-communism. This is expressed in a more or less “refined and subtle” manner in the slogans “Stop China’s Southward Thrust” and “Fight them over there instead of fighting them here”. These are the main catchcries of reactionary politicians, whether they are Liberal-Country Party, DLP, or some in the Labor Party. They are also the stock-in-trade of the Nazis and other extreme right groupings. What has to be understood is that these slogans have some appeal to all social strata, including the working class, playing upon the most backward prejudices and fears, the result of integration with values which have been inculcated into people’s consciousness for generations and centuries.

Much more effective ideological work and campaigning, and particularly more consistent effort, is needed to confront and defeat these ideas. It becomes clear, from the mouths of politicians like Dickie and Gorton, that preservation of “White Australia” and condemnation of “multi-racialism” is going to be more and more the trump card of the imperialists. The United Nations has designated 1971 as a year of action against racialism and the anti-war movement and its component parts should be active in developing activity against the Vietnam war, which is a racist war of genocide against an Asian people by the US and Australia (and its racist character is not hidden by the use of some Asian puppets as auxiliaries in the war).

It is easily seen how closely connected with the anti-war movement are other issues about which movements are developing: support for the Aborigines’ struggle for their rights as a people (they are indigenous “non-Caucasians” who would be debarred from immigrating, but since they are here and extermination has failed, the rulers hopefully want them to be “assimilated”); the developing New Guinea liberation movement which could become a central
issue for the anti-war movement and for all anti-imperialist Aus­
tralians; real support for the anti-apartheid struggle in South
Africa, which is certain to become a key issue in Australian
political life.

This conference should discuss the actual experience of anti-war
activists in factory and workplace, analysing it and suggesting
ways to lift its level. Structure of the unions and realities of
leadership in many, demand creative and democratic methods
of work, based upon conviction, not relying upon top direction or
formal decisions. The concept Stop Work to Stop the War will
not be realised unless there is a deeper conviction about two
things: that the war is wrong and deeply opposed to workers’
interests; that stopping work is an effective means of protesting and
forcing a change.

Experience shows that only relatively few unions and workplaces
have adopted majority decisions to stop work in the two Morat­
oriums. But in many decisions were taken to support the right
of workers to leave the jobs, and to defend this right. Perhaps
this should be extended further, working for a broad united appeal
from union activists for this type of limited action, as a step
towards full industry stoppages.

The anti-war movement should aim at building a wide network
of anti-war and anti-conscription committees in the workplaces.
These should be serviced by specialised publicity directed to issues
of concern to workers, linking the anti-war struggle with the eco­

tomic, industrial and democratic issues which workers face in
their work and struggles. These include war as one cause of
high prices and inflation; taxation; the effects of war, war prepara­
tions and militarisation upon all areas of social life, material and
moral. Special publicity should be issued to immigrant workers,
in various languages.

Those industries directly related to the war could be selected
for special concentration, all the more because these are so often
offshoots of multi-national corporations, usually dominated by US
corporations. While actions from outside are useful, the main need
is to develop activists within. Persistence and patience are impor­
tant in this, as in the industrial field as a whole. Creation of a
substantial core of anti-war activists in industry and the unions
should be first priority of the movement, if it is serious in moving
to a new stage of mass involvement and challenge to the war
policy.

The main responsibility for tackling this task must certainly be
shouldered by the anti-war activists within the workers’ move­
ment, and this means first the left. The left in the workers’ movement has a proud tradition of fighting for internationalism. This tradition must be updated and developed in the new conditions of a permanent direct and growing involvement of Australia in imperialist wars and strategy. A bolder, more fearless and principled stand has to be taken by everyone who stands on the left in the workers’ movement. Otherwise, all the struggles for improved conditions and workers’ demands will be swamped in the militarist offensive.

Specific problems bringing the workers’ movement directly into the anti-war struggle raise some general issues for the movement as a whole. One is the need for grass roots activity wherever people live, work, are socially active or can be reached. Central demonstrations, big or small; meetings, rallies, speeches, talk-ins, debates; publicity, posters and newspapers—all are essential features of the movement. Equally important are the less spectacular and apparently humdrum actions of talking to people individually, through canvassing or other ways; decentralising the movement’s activities and bringing them directly into the lives of people everywhere.

Two other issues advanced for discussion are: establishment of close relations with the Japanese anti-war movement and development of a mass campaign against Pine Gap and other secret US military bases in Australia. Enough has been said here about the special significance of Japan for imperialist strategy and for Australia. The two anti-war movements should come closer to fight against full-scale revival of Japanese military imperialism. This is probably more important for the Australian than the Japanese, but the Japanese movement is also interested in cooperation and co-ordination, against the Vietnam war as against Japanese militarism. Pine Gap, other existing bases and possible future installations should be vigorously opposed and campaigned against, by public exposure, advanced actions and working towards a mass demand for their removal.

Perspectives for the anti-war movement, to sum up, are a probably long and certainly bitter struggle against a powerful and entrenched enemy, imperialism, which generates and needs war. There is no short or easy path to victory in the struggle and all possible forces must be drawn into the fight and many-sided tactics and methods of action employed. Yet the past few years have shown that the anti-war movement is advancing to the centre of Australian political struggle and can generate mass enthusiasm and commitment in face of its opponents, despite their apparent superiority in control and material power.
Discussion:

THE EARSMAN REPORT

I WAS INTERESTED to read the Report of W. P. Earsman to the Central Executive on the 3rd Congress of the Comintern in issue 27 of Left Review.

The year 1921 is important to me as it was in this year that I began to take a more than casual interest in the labor movement, both political and industrial, and one of the things that quickened my interest was the letters published in the Railway Union Gazette from Bill Smith, who was then the Federal Secretary of the Australian Railways Union and who is one of the Australian delegates referred to in the Report.

In publishing a Report almost 50 years old there is a particular need for explanation, particularly in the way of footnotes, and more so in this case where W. P. Earsman does not use Christian names, which would have made identification more easy. There are 27 footnotes, but more could have been used to advantage.

I have already mentioned that the "Smith" referred to in the Report was William (Bill) Smith, the Federal Secretary of the A.R.U. at that time. "Casey" was Bill Casey, of the Seamen's Union, a former member of the I.W.W. and their chief song writer, who wrote, among other verses, "Bump Me into Parliament".

Bill died less than 10 years ago and was Secretary of the Brisbane Branch of the Seamen's Union at the time.

"Kelly" was Barney Kelly, also a member of the Seamen's Union and a lifetime close friend of Bill Casey. "Lamb" would be Paddy Lamb of Broken Hill.

I was surprised to read in the Report that "Comrade Howie was not a member of our Party, which means I had to keep a close watch on all that was being done". If he wasn't then, he certainly was soon afterwards and I thought the footnote identifying him could have said so.

Bill Smith, as I recall it, after nearly fifty years, worked his passage to England on a boat in order to attend the Red International of Trade Unions Congress; also on the same boat working their passage in the stokehold were Bill Casey and Barney Kelly.

As I recall them, some of the letters published in the Gazette refer to the discussions on political and industrial matters that were held wherever the opportunity arose, in the ship's forecastle, in which, no doubt, the three Delegates would take a prominent part.

I am not endeavouring to be too critical of the way the Report was presented, but I am sure there would be quite a few Communist Party members, and former members, who would have been able to supply information about the period and the personalities referred to had they been given the opportunity.

STAN WILLIS.
WOMEN'S LIBERATION
AND THE CP.

WHILE it is heartening to see some new attention being paid to the problem of women's liberation, it is disturbing to note that much of what is being published here is highly generalized and largely derivative from overseas writings, while most attempts to deal with the Australian reality do not meet the elementary requirements of Marxist analysis: concrete examination and interpretation of concrete facts.

Issue 28 of _ALR_ illustrates a curious feature of a current trend: apparently only women (and selected women at that) are regarded as competent to speak about a major revolutionary task concerning both men and women, though some men may perhaps qualify if, like Marx and Engels, they are dead or if they are non-Communist.

Despite the sweeping charges made by the joint authors of the article “Paternalism and the CPA”, there have always been, and still are, not a few male CPA members who have given a lot of attention, both theoretical and practical, to the problems of women's liberation, and the CPA's constitution has always explicitly accorded equal rights to all members, male and female.

Paternalism (or male chauvinism) has been and remains a major barrier to the realization of full rights for women in the Australian actuality, including the CPA, but it is not the only barrier. Women's acceptance of inferior status, both passive and active, is also a tremendous obstacle. The dialectic of human development in class-divided society is much more complex and protracted than the authors appear to believe. Mass resistance to change, whether it comes from men, from women or from both together, cannot be overcome by mere rhetoric. It demands long-sustained, patient work around practical issues.

The article contains a number of statements about CPA attitudes to women which may or may not be true in the particular experience of the two authors, but are certainly not true of the CPA as a whole. We shall not get the kind of analysis they call for if we proceed from their rigid, unqualified and inaccurate premises.

In an effort to substantiate what appears to be their main argument—that the Party should not have committees specializing in work among women—they present a most uncomplimentary picture of the part played by women in the Party. If we are to believe them women Party members, with few exceptions, are spineless, unintelligent creatures. My experience is the opposite. Women have always played a major political—not merely menial—role in the Party organizations of which I have knowledge, often displaying broader understanding and more stamina than men.

This, together with CPA insistence on complete equality of male and female members has, I think, been one of the main reasons why the Party has attracted so many women to its ranks. If women play a major part in “such issues as peace, the rights of children, provision for child care facilities” does this necessarily “hamper and entrap” them?

Women are not and never have been organized within the ranks of the CPA on the basis of sex, as the authors assert. Nor has the Party thought that “the task of educating women, and raising their conscious-
ness, was the task of the women themselves”. Party classes, cadre discussions, conferences, etc., at all levels have always been open to all members. A great amount of organizational and financial effort has gone into ensuring that the right of women to participate in these has not been merely formal. Many male members (including myself) have been happy to work and study under the leadership of women members.

Not only women but also — and, on occasions, especially — men have been involved by the Party in organized discussion and decision-making on how to help raise the consciousness of women and secure greater participation by them in the broad spectrum of struggle for revolutionary change. Male as well as female tutors have conducted study courses on this, with the active organizing assistance of District and State Committees — at least in Queensland.

All this is not to pretend that the CPA has solved the problem or even that there is not still a great deal of backward thinking and practice about it among both male and female CPA members. But I think we will get further away from, rather than nearer to a Marxist solution if we accept either the authors’ description of the actuality of the CPA or their view that specialized committees for work among women are not needed.

“Are there any ‘men’s committees’” they ask, as if a negative answer to this would automatically dispose of “women’s committees”. This approach denies, in essence, the fact that women in capitalist Australia are doubly oppressed, as Mavis Robertson’s article (correctly, to my mind) indicates.

Informed — and hence inspiring — work around the particular problems created by this particular condition of half the Australian population demands specialized attention. This, of course, is a duty for men as well as women revolutionaries and men, because of their relatively better opportunities, should be expected to assume much more responsibility than most do. But it seems almost inevitable that the main burden of the direct work among the mass of women will fall on women, who are more intimately involved and more acceptable to most women. It is the masses of women who have to be aroused, not just an elite few.

If there is no need for specialized work among women, is there any need for specialized work in the unions or among youth? What of Aborigines, migrants, pensioners and other particularly oppressed sections of the people?

In none of these spheres can we feel contented about our work. But to forsake specialized attention (together with general effort to involve the whole Party) means, I think, to head for a Party without any relevance — an elite Party of magnificent generalizers about every problem but without expert knowledge of any. Such a Party would quickly end in the sectarian bog which has swallowed up far too many brilliant, impassioned but impractical revolutionaries in recent years.

I trust that, in the CPA’s projected 1971 discussions about a programme for women, real effort will be made to involve the whole Party, not just those who can be got along without much trouble to occasional discussions, leaving the final formulations to a few.

TED BACON.
The Last Domino

“If you cannot define freedom in your own country or in the Territory of Papua-New Guinea, I doubt very much if you can contribute to freedom in Vietnam.”—John Kaputin, Sydney, 16/9/70.

THE AUSTRALIAN AUTHORITIES cut their teeth, in terms of foreign affairs, on New Guinea when, back in 1883, the Queensland Colonial Government attempted to annex all of New Guinea east of the present border of West Irian. By the end of World War I, a modest measure of political, military and economic hegemony had been established there by Australia’s rulers.

Post-1945 development, particularly since 1949, has produced a new era of Australian foreign policy focussed on a deliberate involvement as junior local partner of neo-imperialist great powers, in a strategic attempt to deny control of the South East Asian region to the revolutionary people of its component countries. A concept of foreign-led military and police action which came to be known as “counter-insurgency” was developed by the concerned western powers. The British in Malaya, learning from the failures of the French in Indo-China and Dutch in Indonesia, refined it with the help of Australian Army units in the 1950’s. Counter-insurgency based on the use of force has remained the core of Australia’s policy towards SE Asia.

Papua-New Guinea, though only recently in the spotlight of Australian political controversy, provides the most comprehensive demonstration of the aims and attitudes underlying the policy of Australia’s rulers towards all our near neighbours. It is the only country outside Australia in which Australian administrators make the main decisions and Australian investors and companies are the dominant exploiters of labor and resources. Australia is the

Alec Robertson is editor of Tribune.
This article is based on a paper submitted to the National Anti-War Conference held in Sydney February 17-21, 1971.
colonialist power in PNG just as was France and then the USA in Indo-China, and Britain in the Malay Peninsula. Just as the historic tides of revolution are squeezing those western imperialist powers out of SE Asia, so pressures are building up against continued Australian overlordship in New Guinea.

The Australian Economic Stake

Until the 1960's, economic development of PNG moved at a leisurely pace. The scene had long been dominated by three Australian companies. The first was Burns Philp, registered in Sydney on April 1, 1883, to begin contesting the known operations of German colonial trading companies around New Guinea. BP, which is thus as old as Australian concepts of New Guinea as a necessary defence bastion, expanded through island trading, shipping, plantations, hotels, retailing, travel and shipping agencies, insurance and trustee operations.

W. R. Carpenter & Co. Ltd. was next, founded 1914. In activities not unlike those of BP, by 1969 ordinary capital was $18m and net profit for the year more than $6½m. The third, Steamships Trading Co. Ltd., is the youngest of the trio, founded 1924 in Port Moresby.

After World War 2, the world upsurge against colonialism became reflected in the United Nations. By 1962, the UN Visiting Mission reported in terms sharply critical of Australian paternalism in New Guinea and urged a crash program of training and progressive handing over the the responsibilities of administration and government. It urged that the Australian Government “should cease its courtship of speculative capitalists who might be tempted to investigate and invest in New Guinea”.

However, the ’sixties saw vast changes that paid little heed to that injunction. An increasing swarm of Australian companies and individuals descended on the expanding urban centres such as Port Moresby, Lae, Rabaul and Madang to establish construction firms, car sales agencies, timber extraction and processing plants, soft drink factories, service industries. Air transport, the only significant form of travel, was integrated into Australia’s two-airline systems. Australian Consolidated Industries, Australia’s biggest glass manufacturers, drew the lesson of high profitability of its big Singapore works and its Kuala Lumpur and Fiji operations, and opened a bottle and container plant at Lae. Carlton United Breweries joined with a Japanese partner to open PNG’s first big brewery.

1 Osmar White, Parliament of 1000 Tribes.
From 1955 and still more in the late 'sixties, oil search companies representing most major oil interests overseas began finding oil and gas. Minerals became very big. First came the giant copper project in Bougainville, from which a subsidiary of Conzinc Riotinto of Australia, after extensive site construction by Australian and American firms, aims to take out 160,000 tons of copper ore a year, worth $200m annual at present, for the next 35 years. America's Kennecott Copper claims to have found even richer ore near the West Irian border, and an associate of Mt. Isa Mines is chasing copper in the highlands. In 1964 a group of Australian banks, insurance and industrial interests formed the Australian New Guinea Corporation Ltd., "to attract and develop investment in Papua and New Guinea". One of its directors, Sir James Kirby, soon had a refrigerator plant operating in Port Moresby.

To keep some rationality in such a wave of investment and to promote foreign capitalist enterprise, there was established in 1965 on the recommendation of a World Bank visiting mission, the Papua and New Guinea Development Bank, wholly Government-owned, its operations being financed from the Administration budget. Though chartered to seek "balanced development" and "the advancement of the indigenous population", in practice "most of the bank's loan money has gone to expatriates". All this was developing on the basis of the most ruthless exploitation of the black workers.

The monetary and banking system of PNG is largely that of Australia. The Australian foreign exchange system is equally applicable to the Territory. The powers of Australia's central bank, the Reserve Bank of Australia, apply to PNG. All trading, savings and development finance facilities are provided by branches of Australia's banks: Commonwealth Banking Corporation, Bank of NSW, ANZ Bank and the National Bank of Australasia. The 1963 Mission of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (Report, published 1965) declared that establishment of a separate monetary system would not be of economic advantage to the Territory. It noted that existing access to foreign exchange through Australia and complete freedom of payments between PNG and Australia were factors "of paramount importance from the point of view of confidence of the foreign investor. The necessity for a central bank will only arise in case of political independence of the Territory and even then there may be advantages to a close relationship, if such could be arranged, between the Territory and Australia".

2 Dr. P. W. Curtin, manager, PNG Division, Reserve Bank of Australia, 12/9/69.
The Mission forecast the need to reduce salary levels in public service and private employment in the future as more and more posts were passed over from expatriate to indigenous employees. (One of the first actions taken in 1964 by Barnes as Minister, appointed at the end of 1963, was to cut indigenous Public Service salaries by 40 per cent.) New land laws for PNG introduce a system of registered land titles which, for the first time, will enable companies or individual white capitalist farmers, industrialists or businessmen to buy land direct from indigenous title-holders. Up to the introduction of this law, such investors could only buy land which the Administration had first acquired from the New Guineans at some time — whether by force, purchase or trickery.

Little wonder that an Australian Financial Review correspondent was able to write (12/8/70) that the new land system “would stimulate foreign investment in agricultural development projects”.

This accelerated rate of development, stimulated by government concessions and subsidies to private industry, has abruptly projected thousands of New Guinean people into an understanding of racial discrimination in wage rates, of resistance to land alienation, of trade unionism and strikes. Displacement of communities from traditional lands (e.g. at Arawa in Bougainville) has stirred others into understanding that they, or their forbears, had been robbed of lands in the earlier colonial period.

Such profound stirrings have, not surprisingly, led investors to hesitate about the future of PNG as a region of super-profitable exploitation. They become more nervous over statements by men like young Mataungan leader John Kaputin that

An independent Papua-New Guinea would have to consider expropriating Australian and foreign enterprises unless there was a change in Australian economic policies in the Territory.3

There can be little doubt that the replacement of Administrator O. D. Hay in May, 1970, accompanied by Minister Barnes’ announcement that he would step down at the next election, was due to the insistence of big modern capitalist interests who were worried by the continuance of old-style, pro-planter policies that had provoked the massive and defiant demonstrations in Bougainville and New Britain (1969). An example of investors’ backlash was the announcement in May, 1970, by Steamships Trading Co. of the abandonment of a scheme for a $4m international-standard hotel at Lae, due to “loss of confidence” by overseas financial backers.

3 Council of NG Affairs, Sydney seminar, September, 1969.
Administrator Hay, at the opening of the ACI factory at Lae, was doubtless voicing an urgent Canberra directive when he told investors that future investments in the Territory would be secure. The business community need pay no attention to rumors that the Government is planning the introduction of a separate currency or some form of exchange control which might impede the remission of money from the Territory to Australia.\(^4\)

This confirmed a 1966 Federal Government stipulation that development of the Territory was “dependent upon outside capital”.

**Political Strategy**

Despite this rapidly expanding and rich stake in PNG, Australian Liberal-Country Party governments have had to cope with the UN pressure to implement the undertaking, under the Trust Agreement, of development of PNG toward self-determination. Whereas on December 4, 1959, the then Territories Minister Hasluck had approvingly quoted Prime Minister Menzies’ earlier words: “Here we are and here we stay”, already by June 20, 1960, Menzies himself admitted he had changed his views and favored self-government “sooner rather than later”\(^5\). In 1963 Menzies said: “We look forward to the time when those Territories (Papua and New Guinea) will be completely politically and economically independent”\(^6\).

It is interesting and significant that in 1965 came clear signs (from the new Territories Minister Barnes) that there were second thoughts in Canberra, and that a search was on for alternatives. “The people of the Territory might seek some closer association with this country,” said Barnes. He spoke of a “variety of arrangements” possible between “self-government” and “sovereign independence”.

Today, at the beginning of 1971, the Government is committed to the process of handing over a limited range of internal administrative responsibilities to departments in Port Moresby headed by indigenous Ministerial Members (of the House of Assembly) while retaining the formal right to intervene\(^7\). This is preparation for “self-government”. “Independence” is quite a different category. Control of police, armed forces and law courts, external affairs and trade, civil aviation and large-scale development projects

---

\(^4\) *Australian Financial Review*, 26/5/70. Interestingly, only seven months later, Administrator L. Johnson had to repeat this assurance.


\(^6\) Jefferson Oration, in the USA.

\(^7\) Prime Minister Gorton’s speech, Port Moresby, 6/7/70.
— all at present retained by Canberra for the indefinite future — would all have to be taken over by a politically independent, indigenous government. No government spokesman has estimated how far ahead that might be\(^8\). The latest formulation of policy on this crucial point came at the end of 1970: “There was no change in the Australian Government attitude to PNG independence. The Government did not intend to impose a timetable on independence. It would depend on the wishes of the majority”\(^9\). At the same time, there have been many signs that the Government secretly aspired to arrange an “independent” PNG that retains a “special relationship” with Australia\(^10\). For example, Mr. Barnes:

Overseas investors will take renewed confidence from the Government’s declared policy that large-scale Australian aid will continue to be made available to Papua and New Guinea after self-government and independence, and from the Government’s offer to selected experienced overseas officers of the Territory Public Service, of a new guarantee of permanence under the Commonwealth.\(^11\)

The Labor Party leadership, on the other hand, has taken a stand for short-term time-tables for self-government (1972) and independence (1975). By this means, ALP Leader Whitlam has in 1970-71 provoked useful controversy in PNG over Government intentions. Exposures of the degree of exploitation of plantation workers (wages as low as 17c a day and “keep”) and of employer indifference to labor laws were also useful. However, his studious avoidance of any criticism of the transcending role of big-scale foreign industrial and mineral capital has made clear the Whitlamite view of “independence” as neo-colonialist in nature and, explicitly, to “do the same” as Fiji (an ex-colony now dominated by Australian capital).

**Forces of Coercion**

Given that the last two years have seen the most serious and politically conscious demonstrations of defiance of Administration authority, what is the substantial basis of the Government’s repeated assurances to Australian and other investors in PNG?

The most important thing for Australians to comprehend about the Royal Papua and New Guinea Constabulary is that this force

---

8 Except when Minister Barnes caused uproar in April, 1968, by assenting to a pressman’s suggestion that independence might not come for “20 or 30 years.”

9 Minister Barnes, quoted in Port Moresby Post-Courier, 21/12/70, commenting on reported statement by Australian High Commissioner N. F. Parkinson in Singapore, that PNG might have independence “by the end of the decade”.

10 This idea was also suggested in the World Bank Report, 1965.

11 Mr. Barnes, at Port Moresby, 6/7/70.
of more than 210 officers and 3267 other ranks\(^\text{12}\) is not so much a police force in the Australian sense as a fully trained modern infantry formation. It grew from forces set up by both British and Germans before 1900. At all stages the constabulary had been fully armed with rifles and bayonets and trained in military fashion. Today, still bearing rifles, they also have modern "anti-riot" training and have used tear-gas against their countrymen both in Bougainville and New Britain. They are quickly mobilised in formations of 1000 or more (e.g. at Rabaul) by means of RAAF transport aircraft. Chartered helicopters are used for patrolling, in radio coordination with motor vehicles. A police dog section is trained in "patrolling and crowd handling"\(^\text{13}\). There is a Special Branch which "deals with the police security aspects of the Territory\(^\text{14}\).

The short history of the PNG organs of coercion, however, is not without internal dispute. In July, 1964, in Rabaul, 50 indigenous police constables mutinied and marched through the town, abusing their white officers and protesting against food and conditions in such terms as "we eat like pigs" (Australian, 27/7/64).

Such incidents perhaps lent conviction to the statement of political philosophy by Police Commissioner R. Cole at the Returned Servicemen's League annual congress, Lae (14/8/65), that the greatest dangers to Papua and New Guinea did not arise from military attack:

\[\ldots\] Rather we must be prepared and watch for a much more insidious approach . . . the greatest danger to Papua and New Guinea is from the creation of discontent and dissatisfaction towards employers and governments . . . 15

The other significant feature of the Constabulary is the Government's evident fear to promote indigenous graduates from Bomana Police College above the rank of Sub-Inspector, and the white racist monopoly of its senior officer ranks\(^\text{16}\).

\(^{12}\) Figures were correct at 30/9/69.
\(^{13}\) External Territories Dept. Journal, May, 1970. Figures given in the House of Assembly have indicated that the weekly ration of a police dog costs more than the average weekly rations allowed to a plantation worker.
\(^{14}\) E.T.D. Journal, May, 1970. The first head of the Special Branch was Deputy Commissioner A. Erskine, who had been imported from the post of chief of the British Colonial Police Special Branch in Uganda, East Africa.
\(^{15}\) For a political activist's view of the police, see John Kaputin, Mataungan spokesman (Post-Courier, 16/12/69): "Do they think we are animals, pigs, that they bring these dogs here to fight us?"
\(^{16}\) See Sydney Sun-Herald (18/1/70): When police reinforcements were being mobilised in Port Moresby in early December, 1969, for the air dash to Rabaul and a big offensive against the Mataungan Association members, "no senior native police were invited to the police conference (in Moresby) at which this was discussed, but seven former South African police officers now in the Royal Papua and New Guinea Constabulary had taken part."
The Pacific Islands Regiment, established in 1951, followed the organisation in World War 2 of two indigenous infantry battalions, quite independently of the police. In 1964-65 (the period when Australia committed combat units to Vietnam) the Federal Government decided on a $40m, three-year military construction program of army barracks, airfields and reactivation of naval facilities. Main expenditure went on the Army. Two fully established PIR units were by 1970 up to 2460 in strength, based centrally at Moresby and Wewak, but with barracks also at Lae and Vanimo. Significantly, immediately following the confrontation of 1000 police with the Tolai of the Mataungan Association in August 1970, it was announced that a permanent PIR camp was to be set up in East New Britain, thus implementing Prime Minister Gorton’s instruction during the confrontation that the Army could be used to back up police. PIR officers are almost all posted for duty from the Australian Regular Army, but a few indigenous men have graduated as officers after intensive training at Portsea (Vic.). There is a militia force, the PNG Volunteer Rifles, totalling about 560 men with HQ at Port Moresby and sub-units at Lae, Madang, Goroka and Banz. Military cadets are being enlisted in PNG schools at a faster rate than anywhere in Australia.

The Royal Australian Navy has a PNG division equipped with modern patrol boats, with HQ at Lombrum, Manus Island. There is a base also at Port Moresby with navy transport vessels and army small ships. Recently two Navy patrol boats successfully cruised 500 miles up the Fly River to a point close to the Kennecott Corporation’s rich copper ore testing concession near the western border.

A flight of RAAF Carabou transport aircraft, used for lifting of troops, police and/or supplies, is stationed at Port Moresby. Since 1965, a new airfield at Boram near Wewak has been built to service standards, and the airfield at Nadzab (near Lae), Daru (on the south-west coast) and smaller strips across the Territory near the western border have been modernised and extended. In general the RAAF regards PNG as part of its normal area of operations from Australian bases such as Townsville and Darwin.

What is the envisaged role of these police-infantry and the regular armed services? A most significant incident occurred on April 16, 1968, at a Canberra press conference given by visiting Indonesian Foreign Minister Malik. He told pressmen that Australia and Indonesia were discussing bilateral “defence” arrangements to cover the whole of New Guinea. He said they could cooperate for such a purpose. “If the threat is from outside,
we can oppose it together. If the threat is from within, we can cooperate to wipe it out". The next day, following agitated advice from the Australian External Affairs Department, Malik called another press conference and said there had been an interpreter’s mistake. There had been no talks on defence — only on a trade, aid and cultural agreement. Nevertheless, Malik’s incautious statement amounted to confirmation and elaboration of an earlier statement by Paul Hasluck as External Affairs Minister — that although Indonesia had said it would not join military pacts the Indonesian Government is cooperating in practical ways with neighbouring countries for mutual security and has indicated that military cooperation with neighbouring countries can develop.

More recent comments on the role of the PNG forces include the following: F. A. Mediansky, post-graduate research student, Sydney University Department of Government (New Guinea Quarterly, Vol. 5, No. 2, 1970):

It is felt that the police force, with about 3,300 members, could not simultaneously handle several civil disturbances on the Bougainville scale. The Government is considering ways in which the army could be used to maintain internal security. It could be used to support the police by providing logistic and transport facilities, or to guard designated areas, or it could be used directly for riot control or armed military intervention.

Mediansky notes that military and military-related projects have been costing $23m a year in PNG in recent years. He considers that few indigenous officers will be eligible for senior military rank in the next 10 years or so. Hence, in saying "perhaps the most far-reaching consequence for the future of civil-military relations in New Guinea would be the use of the army to maintain internal security", Mediansky envisages its use by continuing effective Australian military command, whether before or after "independence".

Dr. T. B. Millar, perhaps the best-known civilian academic military expert in Australia, and a research fellow in international relations at the UN, writes (New Guinea Quarterly, Vol. 5, No. 2, 1970, on Melanesia’s Strategic Significance):

It would make a very considerable difference to Australia’s strategic position if Papua-New Guinea were under the control of a government unfriendly or overtly hostile to Australia.

But what worries Millar most is suggested by this passage in his book, Australia’s Defence (p. 176):

“...The potential situation to which we should give most consideration is not Indonesian attack on Papua and New Guinea but a campaign which some

17 Tribune, 24/4/68.
18 Hasluck to Federal Parliament, statement on 1968 visit to S.E. Asia.
later Indonesian government might launch to 'liberate' the area through subversive operations . . .". He continues:

"Here is a fragile vessel for self-government, independence or nationhood. In determining its relationship with the Territory, Australia must not yield to international clamour or indigenous demagoguery . . ." (p. 180).

Peter Hastings (NEW GUINEA: Problems and Prospects, Chapter 7), writes:

While East New Guinea remains a dependency of Australia, armed rebellion against the Administration for any reason, including that of external subversion, would have the character of sedition demanding Australian military intervention.

Tracing in detail the evidence of Australia's persistent reluctance to describe independence as Australia's sole political aim for New Guinea, Hastings (whose views are not ignored by the Gorton Government or by ALP leader Whitlam) finally tends to favor a continuing "special relationship" between the two countries "after independence":

The arrangement might well cover Australian aid in maintaining New Guinea's army and police forces which will be necessary for New Guinea's post-independence internal security, the greatest of New Guinea's post-independence problems and a matter of great concern to Australia.

It is in conjunction with such concepts and such armed forces that the new Public Order Bill, passed last September in PNG, must be seen. It includes power to exile or confine to his home district a person whose words or actions are "likely to lead to disorder"; up to $500 fine or a year's jail for anyone holding a meeting or procession in a "declared" area without a permit; and many other obnoxious and tyrannous features.

Conclusion

PNG is an Australian colony, in which there is the largest external Australian private and corporate investment, rapidly expanding on the basis of government guarantees of future security. But there is rising internal struggle as the national independence revolution takes shape inexorably. Australians are increasingly coming into violent conflict with the people in PNG, through command of police-infantry and regular armed forces. All Australian armed forces are ready to intervene in a counter-insurgency role.

In this sense, PNG — a country very well suited to guerrilla warfare — is approaching a state of crisis already seen in SE Asia and is a potential theatre of large-scale counter-revolutionary war by Australia's rulers. Each step in that direction should be opposed strenuously by the Australian anti-war movement, for it is essentially the same issue as Vietnam.
Interview with Jiri Pelikan

Could you tell us something of your background, how you became a communist, your experiences and what led to your present position?

I was born in Olomouc, a small city in Moravia with a mixed Czech-German population where, already before the second world war, a threat of fascism was felt very strongly. Therefore, as a secondary school student of 15, I entered an anti-fascist youth organisation “Svaz Mladych” (Union of Youth) in 1937. Together with some friends we founded, at our school, a newspaper under the name No Pasaran*, in which we explained to our colleagues that the only way to prevent Hitler’s aggression against Czechoslovakia was to stop him and Franco in Spain. Because of this I was expelled from the school, but reinstated after protests.

After the Munich agreement and the occupation of our country in March 1939, both teachers and students understood that we were right, and we were able to launch a large movement against the fascist occupation. We established relations with workers and with the underground communist party organisation, to which my brother belonged. When Hitler launched the war against Poland in September 1939, I saw the need to strengthen our resistance movement and I joined the Communist Party.

In April 1940 I was arrested by the Gestapo, together with many other comrades including my brother, and spent five years in prison. Immediately after the war I entered the university and, convinced that socialism was the only solution for our country, was active in the party, working with enthusiasm for the realisation of our ideals.

My first conflicts and doubts arose at the period of the break with Yugoslavia in 1948. We knew the Yugoslav comrades as good communists, and such people as our then General Secretary, Rudolf Slansky, who suddenly were branded as enemies. But at that time we suppressed all doubts, putting all our confidence in Stalin and the Soviet Party, which we regarded without hesitation as the “supreme conscience”. But we could not avoid the consequences: demoralisation of the party; its growing isolation from...
the masses; more and more power to the bureaucracy; de-politicalisation of the working class, which was asked merely to produce more and not interfere in politics; mistrust among old comrades and people in general, and imposition of the Soviet model of socialism as the only one, although so removed from our own reality, traditions and outlook.

In 1952 I was unable to talk to the people and was searching for the explanations. It was then that I was proposed as General Secretary of the International Union of Students to which I was elected in 1953. I accepted this work with pleasure, since it brought me back to the revolutionary traditions of the student movement and I had the feeling that I could really help once again to realise my ideals. These ten years (in 1955 I became President of IUS) were among the happiest of my life. I met many wonderful people and was able to participate in the fight against colonialism in Algeria, Sudan, Indonesia, Guinea, etc.; in democratic and national revolutions like in Iraq and Cuba, and in China after the victory of the revolution. I was working with young people, who followed their ideals despite persecution and without any personal ambitions, and this was such a contrast with the line of development in my own country.

At the same time I realised there were many contradictions between the reality and the official propaganda which revolted me. I was particularly upset with the fact that we were protesting against fascist persecution in Spain, Portugal, Greece, Iran and elsewhere — something I did with full conviction — but at the same time we were obliged to keep silent about the lack of freedom for the student movement in socialist countries or about known facts of trials and persecutions. For me this was not just a formal problem, but the source of moral weakness, since I felt that we were losing the moral right to condemn persecution elsewhere.

All these things brought myself and others into conflict with the leadership of the Communist Party in 1961, when we demanded rehabilitation of Slansky and other victims of the trials, restoration of normal relations with the Yugoslav CP, and criticised the methods of Novotny. We were punished for this, but were rehabilitated in 1963 when I was appointed Director General of Television and elected to Parliament.

At that time the struggle for the renewal of socialism had commenced in our country and I was fascinated by the great possibilities of such a mass medium as television in the activisation of the people. I was working with enthusiasm, starting such programs as "Res publica" and others, in which members of the
government or party were invited to answer questions from the people. But again, very soon I met the resistance of conservative forces and was obliged to fight for many programs against the censorship. But, despite the difficulties, we had the feeling that it was possible to achieve real changes, the more so since we hoped to be supported by the changes in the Soviet Union and other socialist countries and in the international communist movement. In fact, it was all this that led to the “Prague Spring”, to that wonderful period when we were again feeling proud to be communists, when we had the support of the majority of our people, and the conviction that now the chance had come to overcome all past mistakes and build a real socialist society, which would give socialism its real “human face” and wide attraction in the country and abroad.

The more terrible then was the impact of the Soviet occupation on the night of August 20. I was in the building of the Central Committee and saw the distress of Dubcek — his tragedy was our tragedy, the tragedy of all communists who had been always faithful to the Soviet Union and were therefore unable to anticipate anything like this.

Then a new hope awoke in me when I was among the 1,300 delegates to the XIVth Extraordinary Congress of the Party on August 22 in the factory of CKD. The discipline and enthusiasm of all these people, who came in the course of a single day to Prague and gathered in a secret place, their commitment to the cause of socialism, the support given to the congress by workers and the country as a whole, the consciousness that the communists were expressing the feelings of the people and were recognised as the leading force — all this was a great encouragement in the first days of the occupation. But then came the so-called “Moscow Protocol” and it became clear for me that one phase of our life had ended and a new one begun — that of the occupation and the fight against it.

Briefly, that is my background. When I was dismissed from my job as Director General of Television, under “normalisation”, and appointed Counsellor to the Czechoslovakian Embassy in Rome, I declared openly in Prague that I assumed this position only so long as the party maintained its position of not recognising the occupation as “legal” or as “fraternal help”. And immediately after the decision of the CC in September 1969, revoking the stand of the Presidium on August 20 and the XIVth Congress, I resigned my post and made a public statement about the reasons. Frankly speaking, I did not like the idea of staying abroad, but considering the campaign against me in the Soviet Union and
in the “normalised” Czech press, I was sure I couldn’t do anything useful at home, but would only complicate life for my friends. And since, as a communist, I was not able to accept silence or resignation and was convinced that we must continue our fight, which is an integral part of a world-wide movement for the renewal of socialism, I took this decision. Only the future will show whether it was right or wrong.

How would you describe the present situation in Czechoslovakia?

From the point of view of the relation of forces, after more than two years the occupation has achieved its main original aims; destruction of the popular movement for “socialism with a human face”; restoration of a bureaucratic regime which depends only on the occupation army and the local police; and installation of a party leadership following strictly the line and orders of the CPSU. But this achievement still remains in a political vacuum, since the majority of the population, including communists, rejects the “new reality” and is still attached to the ideas of the “Prague Spring”. The process of “normalisation” is still not finished and is going on with many contradictions which reflect the permanent fight between different factions in the Soviet leadership. On the one hand, Husak and his group is being supported by Brezhnev and his group in the CPSU leadership. This group is anxious to develop new contacts with Brandt, Pompidou, Heath and with other western countries (including Madrid and Athens), in the hope of achieving economic agreements which would help to solve the considerable economic problems existing at present in the Soviet Union. This group would therefore like to avoid new political crises in Czechoslovakia and other socialist countries, and consequently opposes political trials and blatant oppression.

On the other hand, the “ultras” or stalinists in Czechoslovakia are being supported by the command of the Soviet Army in Czechoslovakia (the so-called “central group”), by certain influential figures in the Soviet Embassy in Prague and, through them, by some important circles in the Soviet Army and Security and the party functionaries in Moscow. This trend demands a stronger fight against all forms of “revisionism”, “trotskyism”, “zionism”, etc., and considers the present “normalisation” as only formal and presses for political trials and repression and the continuation of the purges in Czechoslovakia. On the international level, this group opposes the “detente”, refuses any compromises over the Berlin issue, encourages the intransigent groups in Arab countries and is involved in a great effort to achieve the “revision”
of the XXth Congress of the CPSU and further restoration of Stalin and his theory of the "strengthening of the class struggle with the growth of socialism". Further developments in Czechoslovakia depend on the result of this struggle in the Soviet Union. The results of the last session of the CC in December 1970 in Prague indicate a strengthening of the "ultras" and the growing isolation of Husak, who previously liquidated all who might be able to support him against their pressure.

But this fight for power at top level cannot change the essence of the situation which is characterised by the foreign occupation, the demoralisation of the Communist Party by extensive purges, and the continuation of political repression, together with return to the old centralisation of economic, political and cultural life. According to official figures, during the last two years the Communist Party has lost 474,000 members (327,000 have been expelled and the rest, mainly workers, have left the party). The average age of CP members is 47, which indicates the loss of young people. Workers who, in the past, constituted more than half the membership, now comprise only 26 per cent. Ninety members of the CC have been expelled from the CC and from the party and others have been "co-opted" although there is no provision for this in the party's constitution. The same situation applies in other party organisations as well as in trade unions, student and youth organisations, and in parliament, where more than 100 deputies have been expelled and others installed without any elections!

Thousands of university professors, journalists, intellectuals, teachers, etc., are being sacked without the possibility of getting anything else except laboring jobs. Leading personalities of the "Prague Spring" are being publicly branded "imperialist" or "zionist" agents without any possibility of defending themselves, and political trials are still being prepared. A group of 30 young students and workers, accused of being "trotskyists", have been in prison for more than a year without being put to trial.

At the same time, the resistance of the people is growing; at present it is mainly passive resistance, but recently, more active steps, such as distribution of leaflets and documents, have also been adopted.

Some revolutionaries wonder why the people of Czechoslovakia did not resist the occupation more forcefully and they believe that if this had been done the situation would be different today. Can you give your view on this?
I have expressed my point of view in the conclusions about the results of the XIVth Extraordinary Congress of the CPC mentioned above. Despite my great respect for Alexander Dubcek, I consider it his shortcoming that he underestimated the danger of foreign intervention and refused to discuss any alternative should it happen. He had such a deep confidence in the USSR that he excluded any consideration of this kind and, consequently, took no practical measures. I am still convinced that it was possible to avoid the military intervention if Dubcek had declared openly to the Soviet leadership (for example on the last occasion at the Ciemna meeting at the beginning of August 1968), that we were for friendly relations, that we had no intention of leaving the Warsaw Pact, etc., but that if an attempt was made to impose other solutions by force, then socialist Czechoslovakia would defend itself. Such a clear stand, together with the mobilisation of the masses, the distribution of arms, and the alerting of other socialist countries like Yugoslavia, Rumania and China and the international communist and democratic movement, would have halted the neo-stalinist forces in the Soviet leadership in their intention to invade the country, since that would mean another Vietnam in the centre of Europe. This opinion — shared by many of our comrades — is strengthened today by our knowledge that in the Soviet leadership there were forces which had doubts about this policy or which opposed that decision. There can be no doubt that the overwhelming majority of the communists and of the population would have supported such a firm stand, that the prestige of the Communist Party would have been strengthened and also the international support could have been only stronger.

But this problem remains for continued analysis. What is more important today is the question of what can be done in the present situation and in the future. Those who are defending the necessity of the acceptance of the diktat from Moscow of 1968 are convinced that we must wait on changes in Moscow. We are of the opinion that the changes in the Soviet leadership are very important, but that they will not come automatically but only through the pressures of all democratic forces in the socialist countries, including that of the Soviet people, and of the international communist movement. Consequently, we must struggle and act, despite the present unfavourable conditions, in order to contribute to this general change.

What do you hope to achieve in exile?

We communists and socialists in temporary exile consider ourselves an integral part of a movement, the base of which is
and will remain inside the country. We are only the external expression of this struggle, enjoying more possibilities of expressing our ideas than our compatriots at home. Therefore we consider it our main task to inform the world about the situation in our country, and our citizens about developments in the world, which are being distorted and falsified by the official censorship. At the same time, we aim to defend the ideas of the "Prague Spring", analyse its achievements and weaknesses and place our experience at the disposal of the international movement.

To realise this, we publish leaflets and newspapers at home and abroad, and the main documents of 1968, such as the "Moscow Protocol", documents of the XIVth Congress of the CP and the report of the commission of the CC on the political trials. (These will appear in English this year.)

You have been called a traitor by the Soviet press, yet you are personally well known to former student leaders, some now in high positions in many countries. How do they react to you now?

In general, I find a great sympathy and understanding for our struggle among those who know my political convictions and activities. Many of them regard my present stand as in full accord with my previous work and share the same opinion. This is true, not only of my friends in Western Europe, where I must now live, but also of those in Africa, Asia and Latin America, with whom I have good contacts and a mutual solidarity. Because they know me, they don't believe in stupid accusations of this kind.

You may know that the Communist Party of Australia opposed the intervention in Czechoslovakia and continues to oppose the results of that intervention. You are probably aware that recently Rude Pravo singled out the CPA for attack. Do you know of reactions of Czechoslovaks to the position of the CPA and to the attacks on the CPA?

The attitude of the CPA is well known in Czechoslovakia and appreciated by communists and patriots. In the situation where a strong censorship exists, Rude Pravo plays the role of the "negative truth" — people read the newspaper with the understanding that what is criticised is good and what is praised is bad. The positive role of that article in Rude Pravo consisted in the fact that its readers were able to know the position of the CPA.
The same is true of similar positions of the communist parties of Italy, Spain and other countries. Such clear stands as that of the CPA are considered by our people as great moral encouragement and as a real expression of international solidarity. We have recently published in our newspaper LISTY — which goes to Czechoslovakia.— an article about the policy of the CPA, written by Mavis Robertson, and its message, sent in November 1970, to the international meeting in Paris.

How do you think communists and other revolutionaries in countries like Australia can best help the struggle for socialist democracy in Czechoslovakia?

A partial answer to this question was already given by the above-mentioned example: to oppose the “normalisation” in Czechoslovakia and in the whole international communist and progressive movement, to support people’s struggle like that in Poland, to reject such oppressive measures as the persecution of communists in Czechoslovakia or the trial in Leningrad, together, of course, with strong protests against similar trials in Burgos, Los Angeles, Athens, Teheran and elsewhere in the world — to oppose any attempts at revision of the XXth Congress or for further restoration of Stalin and his theories and practice and, first of all, to develop in their own parties and movements the critical spirit of scientific socialism and real socialist democracy: this is one of the lessons of the events in Czechoslovakia in 1968: the deformations of socialism in one country weaken the whole communist movement and discredit socialist ideas throughout the world. On the other hand, the elimination of stalinism in one country or party increases the chances for the victory of socialism in the world.

Do you believe that the causes, social forces and ideas which led to the changes and events of January to August 1968 are still operating in Czechoslovakia? and do you think similar processes are operating in other Eastern European countries and in the USSR?

The events of 1968 did not come suddenly; they were maturing over many years as the result of contradictions between the ideals and the practice of socialism. The “Prague Spring” posed problems which exist in all socialist countries, of course with different degrees of urgency and possibilities for solution. The great advantage of Czechoslovakia in 1968 was that, due to the democratic traditions of the country, the maturity of its working class,
the progressive links of its intelligentsia, the high degree of industrialisation and other favorable aspects, it was possible to solve these contradictions in a democratic way without any violent explosions such as occurred in Hungary and Poland in 1956, with the Communist Party playing the leading role and with the support of a large majority of the population.

But this possibility was destroyed by the foreign intervention in August 1968, through which a real counter-revolutionary threat was created. At the same time, as the past two to three years have shown, it was possible to crush the "Czechoslovakian experiment"; but not one problem which gave rise to the crisis has been solved. Today, the country is in a deeper economic, political and moral crisis than it was before 1968, and it is only a question of time and favorable international circumstances before a new explosion will come. The great problem is that the foreign occupation has fostered nationalism and, because of the discrediting of the Communist Party, the clash with the bureaucratic-stalinist system may take on a violent character, with all the dangers that can bring.

Despite certain differences, the same problems and contradictions exist in other Eastern European socialist countries (with the exception of Yugoslavia which broke with stalinism in 1948, but is threatened with other internal contradictions and dangers of external intervention, and Rumania, where Ceaucescu has united the country around his independent policy in defence of national sovereignty, but with other compromises in internal policy). Thus, similar crises exist in these countries and their parties are either striving to find new solutions or strengthening oppression. The problem is that the present Soviet leadership refuses these countries the necessary political elbow-room for their own solutions or experiments and threatens to crush all genuine efforts by military intervention. But the recent uprising of Polish workers in December 1970 has shown that even in a country with a Soviet military presence political demonstrations by workers supported by other sections of the population can result in considerable concessions from the leadership. And this process will continue according to the pressure exerted by the working class — in Poland and in other socialist countries as well, not excluding the USSR.

When speaking of this opposition in the socialist countries, I would like to stress that its aim is not to overthrow the socialist system, but on the contrary, to liquidate its bureaucratic deformation and to give to it its real human face, corresponding to the original socialist ideas of Marx, Engels, Lenin, Rosa Luxemburg and many other revolutionaries.
The Greek Left in Australia

I

THE GREEK LEFT IN AUSTRALIA is an important topic about which much more ought to be said and written than appears in this article. It naturally concerns Greeks more than others though it would be difficult for the Australian Left to justify its disinterest in such a movement. To plead more, the Greek Left operates within and strives for the hegemony of Australia’s second-largest ethnic minority — a community of 300,000 people, most of whom are industrial workers.

Like other immigrant radicalism the Greek Left stems from the general alienation of immigrants both from the country of settlement and of origin. Immigrants are aware that they are used as cheap labor, mere ‘factory fodder’ which is located in the inner suburban areas or near industries, and that they suffer all manner of discriminations in a society which still remains anti-foreign, xenophobic and exclusive. Australian society insofar as it is competitive is so only within its dominant Anglo-Saxon section which excludes incoming poor immigrants. Rewards simply go to those with capital, social contacts and skills, including a fundamental skill, the English language. For the non-British immigrant especially, the only way out—a way which fits into the scheme of expanding Australian capitalism—is, and has been, long hours of work and hard saving. After such an apprenticeship the other escape—from employers and unemployment—has been, for many Greeks at least, a shop. There the immigrant may double his income by doubling his hours of work and frequently by using his family and relatives as well.

The second main source of Greek Left radicalism is to be found in the ‘old world’. The fact that Greece has always been the centre of conflicting big power and imperialist interests, the rise of fascism in Greece after 1936, the Second World War and the fierce Greek Civil War (1945-9), the movement for Cypriot...
independence and finally, the re-emergence of fascism after April 1967, were events which radicalised Greeks and which called for action from Australia.

As could be expected the role of the Greek Left has been twofold: one was to help Greek immigrants fight for and assert their rights and solve the problems associated with the involvement of Greeks in the wider Australian radical left movement; the other was to participate in the numerous struggles of Greek people in Greece and elsewhere. In both cases the field of operation was mainly in Greek ethnic communities in Australia and the principal agencies through which the Greek left has acted were workers' clubs, the Greek *focos*. Among these were Platon (1932-8) of Sydney and its successor Atlas (1939-) but also a semi-illegal group known as Spartakos which functioned during the war; Democritos (1935-) in Melbourne; the Greek Educational League (1942-4), Pan-Hellenic Society (1946-7), Platon (1957-) and Aristophanes after 1963 in Adelaide, Regas Pheraios (1943-9), Democratic Union (1949-51) and Palamas (1964-) in Brisbane; and Socrates of Newcastle and Heraclitus of Wollongong from the early 1960's onwards. Other leftist organisations such as 'Leagues or Committees for Democracy in Greece' (after 1947 and again later in the mid-1960's), the Confederation of Greek Organisations (1949-51) and the Lambrakis Youth Clubs (after 1964) were also active along radical lines but much of their activity was supplementary to, often prescribed by, and directed from workers' clubs.

To understand more the role, range of activities and the problems of Greek workers' clubs, it is necessary to look briefly at the structure of Greek ethnic communities. The term 'ethnic community' is used here to mean a Greek community or settlement such as that of Melbourne, which at present contains about 80,000 people or that of Townsville in North Queensland which contains about 200. As ethnic communities grow numerically they fragment organisationally. The principal Greek immigrant organisations to which all immigrants may belong are Greek Orthodox Communities whose main task has been to found and maintain churches and schools, that is, agencies which hope to preserve the national-religious traditions and ethos of Greeks. Also important in terms of ethnic community were the numerous regional or local fraternities, social, cultural and sporting associations, coffee-houses, newspapers, consulates and the church hierarchy. All told, each large Greek ethnic community has been a very complicated social network, though the social and political divisions and issues in each community were not so complicated.

To the left it was a question of continually resisting the power
of the Greek Establishment comprised of the wealthy shopkeeper class which traditionally controlled the most important ethnic institutions: the Church, Greek Orthodox Communities, consulates, newspapers and organisations such as the Hellenic Clubs in Sydney and Brisbane. This resistance arose not simply because wealthy Greeks exploited the few immigrant workers they employed — though this was true — but because the left correctly identified the Greek Establishment with its counterpart in Australia and Greece. Consequently in the pre-war period, the activities of the left included organising the unemployed to demand work and more dole (in the case of the latter, the leftists demanded it come from church takings); verbal and written attacks on the Greek bishops; agitation against dictator Metaxas and his fund-raising campaign conducted in Australia and elsewhere to build up the Greek air force; and organised attempts to influence the composition of councils of Greek Orthodox Communities — attempts which succeeded in Sydney during 1939 and which also culminated in the occupation by a left anti-bishop coalition of the Community’s Holy Trinity church for several months. This particular episode, indicating that the left had made significant inroads into an important ethnic institution, happened under rather exceptional circumstances. As soon as the pro and anti-bishop groups settled their differences the left was ousted from the Community positions it held.

Because few Greek immigrants in the pre-war period worked for an Australian employer and fewer still where unionised labor operated, there was little contact, let alone fusion, between the Greek and the wider Australian left. The only known Greek trade unionist was Andreas Raftopoulos, a kitchen hand, who before he suicided in 1940, was an unpaid organiser for the Hotel, Club and Restaurant Employees’ Union in Sydney. Greek workers were in any case few, most of them worked in restaurants or were itinerant seasonal workers, and as such were difficult to organise. Membership in each of Platon and Democritos did not exceed forty.

The war and postwar years witnessed many changes. The war brought many Greeks into the factories and trade unions, some into the army, and greater profits to the shopkeepers. The postwar brought massive Greek immigration at first from Cyprus and, especially after 1952, from Greece. Australia’s Greek population increased from about 15,000 in 1947 to about 300,000 in 1970. Most of these also went to work in industry and joined trade unions. The overall effect of this great influx on ethnic communities was to sharpen existing social and political divisions. More so since some of these divisions and associated political issues were related, often deliberately by Greek left and right both to
those of the host society and to the world at large. Easily the most important political issue was the Greek Civil War and the wider world conflict which followed, the Cold War.

The response of the Greek left to these new and changing conditions should be noted because it throws considerable light on its policies, action programmes and methods of work. As in the prewar period, their workers' clubs were retained and extended as the most appropriate form of political organisation. Such clubs, did, of course, perform a number of other functions associated with the social, cultural, welfare and sporting life of immigrants, but their importance lies in their wider political role. Within ethnic communities workers' clubs consistently campaigned for the politicising of ethnic institutions, especially Communities, so that such institutions might become involved in the more real problems of incoming migrants; housing, jobs, social welfare, interpreting services, unemployment relief — that is, demands which could be met fully only if Communities along with other ethnic authorities were prepared to stand up and fight. Just as important was the left's policy of opposing right-wing and pro-fascist Greek governments and their representatives in Australia; agitation against oppression in Greece, the gaoling and, as late as 1952, the execution of prominent Greek trade unionists, communists, other left leaders and former resistance fighters; and agitation for Cypriot independence, an issue which was both a national and anti-imperialist one and which, more than anything else, enhanced greatly the left's position in ethnic communities including in Greek Orthodox Communities on whose councils the left began to be elected by the late 1950's. Considering the religious and other functions of Greek Orthodox Communities, the entry in them of the left helped precipitate a fierce religious schism (now in its eleventh year), though the current schism, like others, also stemmed from the very nature of Communities: they are essentially lay bodies through which a hierarchal Church has to function so that there is a perpetual conflict over Community and Church rights, privileges and prerogatives.

Outside ethnic communities the Greek left made important advances in achieving Greek immigrant participation and also representation in trade unions; probably much more so than did other non-British immigrant groups. Two main factors operated. The first was the role of Greek Cypriots whose knowledge of British-type trade unions helped them embrace Australian trade unions with ease and even hold union positions. The second was the ready response the Greek left found among the more militant trade unionists, but particularly those of the waterfront in its political work in the cause of Greek democracy. The Sea-
men's Union of Australia was especially important in that respect: one of its many contributions was to help set up during the war an Australian branch of the Greek Seamen's Union. Yet it is doubtful whether such important inroads would have been made without the constant organisational work of and campaigning by workers' clubs and the bi-lingual political activists these clubs produced. Immigrant representation in trade union leadership (as in other host societal public institutions) is, of course, small and it never corresponds to the immigrant numerical strength. So these inroads by Greek immigrants are significant, for it has been demonstrated that it is possible to achieve some fusion between immigrant and Australian left and radicalism despite the obstacles stemming from different cultural backgrounds and differing aims and motives.

II

From the dual role of the Greek left—to involve immigrants in the wider Australian left movement and simultaneously campaign for such causes as democracy in Greece and Cypriot independence—stemmed a third role or function. This was to impart to the Australian left further knowledge of what in effect were anti-imperialist struggles of Greeks and Cypriots. Considering the issues involved in these struggles (they were against the governments of Great Britain and the US) and the people to whom the Greek left directed its appeals—workers, trade unionists, ALP politicians, communists, churchmen, pacifists and philhellenes—the response to such appeals was decidedly a mixed one. Yet Greek leftist activity and agitation was not ineffective. Together with other factors the Greek left succeeded in prevailing upon Dr. Evatt to intervene (in 1948 when he was president of the UN General Assembly) to help save from certain execution such prominent Greek trade unionists as Tony Ambatielos; in getting the ALP or branches of it to support Cypriot independence in the late 1950's and the restoration of Greek democracy after 1967; and in securing support in campaigns to boycott Greek ships and condemn oppressive measures in Greece. Overall the Greek left did help radicalise and politicise somewhat the Australian labor movement, philhellenes and others, and, more to the point, closer bonds were forged between the immigrant and native radical left movements.

There were, however, a number of factors limiting the fuller fusion or integration of the Greek immigrant and Australian left. These will now be examined in some detail in order to explain a number of the Greek left's features and problems, including its present schism. One of the real obstacles to integration is the
power of ethnic communities to draw inward and retain their members and organised sections and hence circumscribe their activities and roles. This was especially so in the post-1950 period during which ethnic communities grew enormously, for this was the period when approximately 90 per cent of Australia’s Greeks arrived. Being new and large communities and because the cultural and linguistic barrier between immigrant and native was also at its highest point, it was necessary for the left to become concerned with ethnic community affairs. The religious dispute after 1959 further absorbed the left in the complexity of the social network and politics of ethnic communities.

Throughout the period contesting elections in this or that ethnic organisation but particularly in Communities, and fighting reactionary clergymen, laymen, consuls and newspaper owners taxed the resources of the left and was often considered more important than solving the problems of involving immigrants in the left and labor movements. To be sure, questions of democracy, particularly the need to retain the democratic charters and the secular activities of Communities which were constantly under attack by an authoritarian and fiercely anti-communist Archbishop, were important issues to be fought and won. Yet for the left some of the battles won were pyrrhic victories. Greek workers became hopelessly divided in the course of the religious schism: it was not unusual to find Greek workers in a factory disputing the fine points of canon law instead of uniting together with other workers to fight the more oppressive labor codes.

Another obstacle to integration stemmed from the rather broad and fragile alliance that more or less comprised the left, and from certain assumptions that were to guide the movement’s policies and action programmes. The Greek left in Australia was indeed a delicate alliance. The hard core in workers’ clubs were members and sympathisers of the Communist Party and people who were generally sympathetic to the Soviet Union. Yet to the workers’ clubs and related organisations flocked people motivated by reasons other than ideological ones: supporters of the Community cause during the religious schism; people interested in sporting and cultural activities, particularly theatre goers; ordinary immigrants thankful for any practical assistance given by workers’ club members; Centre Union Party loyalists who would otherwise be expected to join and support the ALP; and people who preferred the congenial environment of workers’ club rooms to that of the gambling dens which most other coffee-houses were. In view of all this it is not surprising that both Atlas and Democritos clubs have had no less than 2,000 names recorded on their membership list; yet that neither club has managed to retain more than about 100-150 financial
and active members at any one time is an indication of the uneasiness of the alliance of the forces making them up.

All manner of factors operated to cause this high turnover of membership. A similar turnover occurred in other immigrant organisations indicating a high ‘mobility’ of immigrants that is to be expected in a period when ethnic communities and ethnic organisations are in the process of formation and establishment. Yet much of the loss of membership to workers’ clubs stemmed from their sectarian and short-sighted policies. In the period under consideration it was often assumed to be sufficient (from the viewpoint of building workers’ clubs and fashioning their role as agencies for integration) to applaud socialist gains outside Australia, organise large immigrant contingents in May Day marches, hold successful annual balls under the patronage of prominent trade unionists and ALP politicians, and acquire spacious and expensive club rooms. Rarely, if ever, did the workers’ clubs and the Greek left in general become seriously concerned with an analysis of the role of massive migration in the context of expanding Australian capitalism, the true socio-economic position of migrants and the many forms of discrimination they suffered—that is, an analysis to reveal the true nature of Australian capitalism and thus formulate an immigrant socialist theory and strategy. Even less was done to contact other immigrant groups suffering similar exploitation, and initiate common action. A typical leftist answer to immigrant workers who saw few benefits from well-paid reformist trade union leaders was: the good wages and conditions you enjoy you owe to the trade unions. Such an inadequate answer, it may be noted, corresponds closely with the frequently adopted capitalist approach which insists in relating the conditions of migrants to those of the country of origin (such as war-torn Europe or Italy, Spain and Greece today) and not to what these conditions ought to be in an affluent society such as Australia.

Just as ineffective was the role of the Greek left’s press. While Neos Kosmos became the radical left’s bible in its early years, subsequently the paper compromised considerably in response to competition from other ‘centrist’ newspapers, to the needs of the wider community, with advertisers and with ALP policies.

Finally, several factors for which the Greek left cannot be held responsible operated against integration. Briefly these were the refusal by the Immigration authorities to grant citizenship rights to immigrant leftist political activists, which discourages and frightens potential left activists; the inability of the Australian left and the labor and trade union movements to understand immigrants and their problems and consequently the refusal to implement measures
to ensure the fullest possible participation of immigrants in the various sections and levels of the radical left; and the insistence by the Australian left and labor movement that immigrants conform to the standards of the former.

While it is to be expected and is quite normal for the indigenous radical left movement to integrate and eventually assimilate its immigrant counterpart, the process by which this takes place is never a smooth one. As has been shown in the case of the Greek left in Australia the process is fashioned, hindered or accelerated by all sorts of factors, including factors and forces often remote from the actual scene. This can be further demonstrated by considering the recent split in the Greek left—a split which also illustrates some of the movement's weaknesses outlined so far. Two events which occurred in Europe are especially relevant to and could be said to have been largely responsible for causing the split. One was the military coup in Greece in April 1967, which, among other things, split the Greek Communist Party (KKE) and the Greek left in general. The two sections of the KKE comprise on the one hand the supporters of its leadership which has been abroad in Eastern Europe since 1949, and on the other the supporters of the Internal Bureau of the KKE, based and operating within Greece. The other event was the invasion of Czechoslovakia by five Warsaw Pact powers in August, 1968. Among those condemning the invasion were the Internal Bureau of the KKE and the Communist Party of Australia. The consequences of these condemnations—which were interpreted as a direct attack on the Soviet Union, traditionally considered the mother and leader of the world's socialist system—was to alienate from the CPA many if not most of its Greek-born members and supporters, and with these the workers' clubs. For these condemnations shattered the ideological monolith from which the Greek left especially drew its inspiration and hope.

Being now in a state of considerable flux it is difficult to designate precisely the two main alignments or fragments of the once powerful Greek left and their policies and programmes. What is certain if the Greek left is to survive and play its role is that it must come to grips more with Australian reality. This means grappling with the actual problems of Greek immigrants and their descendants—the second generation Greek-Australians whose numbers are increasing and who, though much more assimilated than first generation Greeks, are nonetheless an integral part of ethnic communities. These problems are, of course, to be found in the factories, in the poor suburbs, and in general at the lower levels of the social hierarchy where Greek and other immigrant workers work, live, strive and are exploited by Australian capitalism.
"Bourgeois" Sociology and the Dialectics of Liberation

DURING ONE OF THE DEBATES at the 22nd Congress of the CPA (March 1970) Pat Clancy, a leading member of the opposition, referred to the currency in the party of the "bourgeois sociologists' false theory of social mobility" (or words to that effect). He was answered (perhaps unnecessarily, except to show that he, like most pro-Russian communists, is a poor "marxist") by a quotation from Marx which showed that Marx himself had recognised the existence of social mobility.

However, Clancy’s accusation raises far more important questions than whether he "knows his Marx" or not; in my opinion it bears on the crucial questions of What is Marxism? and what is its future? For implicit in his statement is a simplistic and dogmatic version of marxism and its relation to other bodies of social thought. In particular, it raises the need for a genuine marxist critique of the existing social sciences, freed from all dogmas, preconceptions and, most importantly, the abysmal ignorance displayed by many "marxists" of developments in social science.

I would argue that in the century since Marx’s work, and particularly in the half century since Lenin, developments in the social sciences have occurred which are of crucial importance to marxism: these developments on the one hand have opened up entirely new areas of enquiry and knowledge, some of which imply the need for a modification of marxism, and on the other hand have filled out many areas looked at sketchily by Marx, reinforcing many of his theories and ideas. Further, I would

1 I do not wish to attempt to answer these questions here, although the article itself may suggest some parts of such an answer. For the article itself, I will assume roughly that "marxism" refers to a particular way of looking at the world, especially society, which is different from other ways and which can meaningfully debate with these other views.

Brian Aarons is a tutor in physics at the University of NSW. This is the first half of a two part article examining briefly issues associated with the relationship between modern social science and radical revolutionary theory by way of an extended review of The Dialectics of Liberation, edited by D. Cooper, published by Penguin in 1968. The first article concerns itself with some general questions the second will examine the book in more depth with reference to the issues posed here.
argue that the failure of marxists to be aware of these developments has led to marxism lagging behind, to a low theoretical level of marxist movements and consequently to an inability to provide a theoretical framework for much of the radical and revolutionary activity now taking place in all areas of society.

It would be impossible to list all the areas in which advances relevant to marxism have been made (in a sense, any advance in our understanding of man and society is relevant to revolutionaries) but it seems to me that one very important area, which has been almost entirely neglected by marxists, is the understanding of the individual and his relation to society — i.e. the psychology of the individual, the sociology of collections of individuals and the interrelations between these two. Important advances in the scientific understanding of these areas have generally supported Marx's theory that "It is not the consciousness of man which determines his being, rather it is his social being which determines his consciousness". Moreover, they have explicitly delineated the ways in which this occurs and the sorts of behaviour which individuals and groups exhibit under certain conditions. The implications of these and other studies for revolutionary theory have largely been ignored, at least in Australia.

The main failing which all the "bourgeois" social sciences exhibit is not their particular findings and theories but their almost universal failure to link their discoveries with social practice, which is in turn related to the refusal of many social scientists to take a stand on social issues. This "neutrality" (which of course is not neutrality, as Norm Chomsky, amongst others, has very well demonstrated) is justified on the basis of having a "value-free" social science — i.e. one which starts with no values (such as a humanitarian outlook, or an endeavour to use the findings of social science to improve the human condition) but attempts only to find out "the facts".

Quite apart from the fact that it is impossible for anyone to approach a given subject completely "value-free" (as most social scientists now realise) it is becoming increasingly obvious that values themselves are part of any "scientific" study and moreover,

2 Introduction to the Critique of Political Economy. In a sense, of course, both things are true. However, modern psychology and sociology show decisively that, up till this point in history, individuals' ideas are determined far more by their social environment than by any attempt at rational understanding.

3 In particular, there is a large and interesting literature on the behaviour of small groups of people. a sub-section of which deals with the way individuals will conform or deviate from the social norms of the group. See, for instance, T. Mills The Sociology of Small Groups Prentice Books (1967).

that values will determine what is or is not done with the results of scientific endeavour, which in turn reacts back on the social reality being studied. In other words, values are inextricably bound up with both society and the understanding of society.

What, then, is wrong with the academic ("bourgeois") social sciences is not so much what they do, but rather what they do not do. A fact of itself is neither "bourgeois" nor "proletarian" nor anything else; the way it is used, and the way social scientists see it in relation to other facts and their own world outlook can be labelled "bourgeois" — but only by a careful critique which links the same facts, and others usually ignored by conventional social scientists, into a different world view.

Such a radical critique in the area of psychology and psychiatry has been made by R. D. Laing amongst others. Fighting the conventional psychiatrists in the areas of both "facts" and "values" he has contested the hegemony of much current psychological theory and related this to society as a whole. In another instance, a number of social scientists, philosophers and revolutionary activists met at the "Dialectics of Liberation" conference and the results are produced in the Penguin book of that name. The papers presented here contain by implication a radical critique of social science and more importantly, provide the basis for an alternative world view and a new kind of social science.

It is a function of the cretinism of much social science that a book like The Dialectics of Liberation is not at the top of university reading lists. Those who fail to put it there do so usually out of ignorance and a refusal to even consider the issues it raises, rather than from vindictiveness. Nevertheless, there are significant departments in Australian universities where such books are read and highly thought of. Here and overseas there are radicals in Academia and elsewhere who are providing an alternative to the "bourgeois" sociologists, psychologists and political scientists. Like Marx, before them, they do not reject the findings

---

5 It is of course, no accident that the exponents of "value-free" science usually end up in projects such as those concerned with "psychological warfare" in Vietnam. It is almost as if the term "value-free" was thought up as a rationale for the debased values of such scientists.


7 The Dialectics of Liberation, D. Cooper (ed.) Pelican (1968).

8 Significant departments do consider books such as this. There are radical/conservative differences in most social sciences, which makes labels such as "bourgeois" particularly stupid unless used carefully. For instance, there are big differences in SAANZ (Sociology Association of Australia and New Zealand) between those who want to churn out endless trivia in the shape of surveys, and those who want a more meaningful sociology.
and theories of their more conservative colleagues, rather they use them in developing a revolutionary social science⁹.

This is not to deny that there are actions of individual social scientists which one might label bourgeois. The psychologist who works out ways to manipulate Vietnamese peasants is actively aiding the worst crimes of imperialism; if he works out ways to manipulate western consumers of his employer's goods, he is objectively adopting bourgeois values (the pursuit of profit above the welfare of the people) and if he cold-bloodedly puts people in asylums who are more the victims of their social environment than of actual mental illness, he is caught within the framework of bourgeois values, unable to see beyond them. To balance this, it must also be said that the researches of social scientists often reveal to them facts which radically alter their outlook, thus transforming them from liberals or even conservatives, into opponents of the social system. In this sense, the social sciences are "subversive": the rantings of some of the establishment and its supporters against sociology (see for instance Professor Armstrong's recent categorisation of sociology as a "bullshit" subject) although irrational are not without their own logic.

To give an illustration of the type of critique which is necessary if a revolutionary theory is to be developed out of the findings of social science, I will examine an important concept of contemporary sociology, looking at a typical article by a typical sociologist on this concept, with some criticisms showing its limitations. The concept examined is what the sociologists call SOCIALISATION. This term refers to the process by which the individual acquires the values, outlook and rules of the society around him so that he "fits in" as a functioning member of that society¹⁰.

⁹ For instance, the studies of the American sociologist, Ely Chino1, on the automobile workers provide interesting material for revolutionaries who want to understand the outlook and motivation of the various sectors of the modern working class. Only studies such as these can provide us with the detailed understanding of social forces which is necessary in a complex society. In particular, such studies can provide information on whether, and to what extent, the working class is integrated into the capitalist system. (Many arguments in the left on this subject tend to go on in a vacuum — contrary assertions are made with very little factual proof). Chinoy's studies suggest that, at best, in the case of the automobile workers, the modern industrial worker is dissatisfied and resentful — hardly a revolutionary state of mind, but nor is it symptomatic of the complete integration ("having a stake in the system") which Marcuse suggests. (See, for instance, an article in The Study of Society. P. Rose (ed.). Random House 1967, p. 393).

¹⁰ The way in which the term socialisation is used by sociologists should be carefully distinguished from its meaning in socialist writings: "Socialisation of the means of production" etc. As used by sociologists it is somewhat akin to the term "integration" — referring to the process by which the individual internalises all the rules and norms of his social environment, and comes to accept them as his own.
Peter Berger has described society as “the walls of our imprisonment in history”\textsuperscript{11}. This short definition, though perhaps over-deterministic, describes the process whereby society moulds the individual in its own historically determined image, producing men who are both of the society and for the society’s needs — in short, how the individual is to a large extent determined by the environment in which he is born, grows up and lives.

The description and elaboration of this process — socialisation — in all its ramifications, is essential to an understanding of the dynamics of both society and the individual. However, mere description, no matter how good, of the process is not enough — sociologists should also examine why the process works, whether it needs to work, and to understand the historical role which socialisation plays in the ongoing social process. I will suggest in this essay that not only is such an examination scientifically interesting, but is also becoming a critical need for present day society if we are to avoid some of the very real dangers inherent in the contemporary human condition. These dangers are intensified by the lack of recognition of the need for such a study amongst large numbers of sociologists, who are content to observe and describe the world rather than interact with it in a meaningful way.

An article by Talcott Parsons illustrates the problem well\textsuperscript{12}. This article is an excellent account of the socialisation of the child in its educational phase — as a purely descriptive account of this process it would be hard to improve. It makes frighteningly clear just how efficiently the school system moulds the individual into the existing social system, selecting out those needed for various roles and inculcating society’s values. What the article lacks, however, is an evaluation of whether this process is in the best interests of the individual and hence the whole (or the majority of the whole) society.

Within a purely “empiricist” framework Parsons might claim that he need not be concerned with such questions, but he would be wrong even on empirical grounds. For as Laing has pointed out in the case of the UK, a child born today “stands a 10 times greater chance of being admitted to a mental hospital than to a university”\textsuperscript{13} — a statistic which is surely relevant to even the most “value-free” account of socialisation in our society.

Unlike Parsons, Laing adopts an historical approach to the

socialisation process, asking what function it serves at any given moment and judging whether this function is harmful or beneficial. From the social fact that "we are driving our children mad more effectively than we are genuinely educating them" he is not afraid to make the social judgment "perhaps it is our very way of educating them that is driving them mad".

Too many sociological works have in common with Parsons' article the feature that although they may provide an excellent description of the socialisation process, none of them examines the wider implication in terms of a dynamic theory of society. In particular, there is no questioning as to whether or not socialisation is producing truly human beings who express the full potentiality of our present level of social development, rather than a distorted form of it. As the old saying goes, the proof of the pudding is in the eating, so let us examine the products of the process.

Laing puts it succinctly: "normal men have killed perhaps 100 million of their fellow normal men in the last 50 years". These normal men were the products of the patterns of socialisation in our society. Surely this would indicate a need for something more than descriptions of how it works — we should question whether it should even work at all. As Laing says: "our behaviour is a function of our experience... if our experience is destroyed, our behaviour will be destructive".

Parsons refers to the "selective function of the school class" but Laing actually analyses the effect of this on the individual. He points out the trauma which Boris experiences when he cannot answer a question which Peggy can. "Boris's failure made it possible for Peggy to succeed; his misery is the occasion of her rejoicing". Parsons refers to the internalisation of society's values, Laing shows the destructive nature of that process: "Boris was learning the essential nightmare also. To be successful in our culture one must learn to dream of failure".

Obviously there is a need for a theory of socialisation as part of a wider social context — a theory which will look at the social role which socialisation plays and explain the interaction of socialisation with other social processes and link this to social needs.

14 Ibid.
15 Ibid.
16 Ibid. p.24.
17 Ibid.
19 In an "account" of an everyday school class taken by Laing from Jules Henry's Culture Against Man, which is too long to reproduce here.
20 The Politics of Experience, p. 59.
I would now like to suggest the outlines of such a theory, and elaborate what I see as some of its main areas of concern.

The first need is to understand why socialisation occurs in human society. There can be a fairly clear answer here: the process serves to preserve society against any centrifugal forces within it which may lead to the destruction of society, and hence of the human species. In this sense it plays a socially and biologically functional role, and to that extent it is necessary. However, it is equally conceivable that it may serve to perpetuate an outmoded social system, which itself may come to threaten social and biological survival — i.e. it can at certain times be socially and biologically dysfunctional. Hence at different historical stages it can play a “progressive” or a “reactionary” role, which can be judged as occurring to greater or lesser degrees as society develops. At the tribal stage of human society, the process served to secure the tribe against a return to primitive, biological nature, and helped in the development of social institutions and human consciousness. But as society developed its role imperceptibly changed, until it came to serve as one of the main props of authoritarian structures which may once have been useful but had more and more become outmoded. Often enormous social “explosions” were necessary to blow away these structures and the myths (propagated via socialisation) which perpetuated them.

In the stage before such changes socialisation was producing individuals incapable of coping with the realities of the day — hence the need for extensive social change. It is fairly certain that present-day world society has reached a stage where outmoded structures are being preserved by the socialisation of society’s members to values and ideas which are not only morally wrong, but are also becoming increasingly dangerous for the future existence of mankind.

One of the most outstanding examples of this are the values of obedience and conformity which permeate the consciousness of most people. A frightening example of the sort of people produced by the internalisation of these values was given in a series of experiments conducted by Milgram on obedience. He found that a majority of “normal” people were prepared to administer fatal electric shocks to a “learner-subject” who did not respond correctly to questions, merely on the say-so of the experimenter21. The terrifying implications of this in the era of sophisticated weapons of mass destruction should be only too apparent, yet it

is only too apparent that to most it is not apparent. As Laing points out, our present society generates ignorance of itself, and ignorance of that ignorance.

The above experiment is merely one part of what I believe to be fairly good evidence which suggests that in the last few decades our scientific-technological development has reached such a point that blind obedience to authority, social conformity and the bureaucratic structures which express these are now technically inefficient. Bureaucracies are becoming increasingly obsolete on their own "value-free" grounds (efficiency, production, "getting the goods", etc.) alone, quite apart from any moral considerations. They are, and are increasingly becoming, a brake on social development, even to the point of threatening human existence. For as Laing points out, we "seem to glimpse a total system that appears to be dangerously out of the control of the subsystems or sub-contexts which comprise it" — i.e. the system rolls on in ways that nobody quite intended, and unless changed may get dangerously out of control.

What now has to be understood is that it is not just a question of individuals internalising society's values, it is a question of what those values are, and whether they are socially useful or not. The process of socialisation, and the values which it inculcates, are themselves socially determined, are not inevitable and are certainly not beyond the control of man.

Conformity and obedience are not innate properties of man, but (admittedly very strong and long-lasting) features of all hitherto existing society. Laing cites a remark by Julian Huxley: "He said he thought the most dangerous link in the chain was obedience. That we have been trained, and we train our children so that we and they are prepared to do practically anything if told to do it by a sufficient authority". Huxley recognised the threat implicit in the inculcation of such a value.

One of the outstanding features of present day society is that it socialises people to be socialised, and socialises them to be socialised to be socialised — that is, one of the prime values

---

22 A very good example of the attempt by conservative social scientists to remain "value-free" occurred in a psychology seminar I attended. When we discussed Milgram's experiment such a one refused to allow a discussion of its political implication (e.g. as it might apply to the My Lai massacre) ostensibly on the grounds that he didn't want to upset people with different political views. It should have been obvious that Milgram's experiment had most important implications in the political and military sphere: to him it hasn't.

23 R. D. Laing "The Obvious" in *The Dialectics of Liberation*, p. 25.

24 Ibid., p. 16.

25 Ibid., p. 29.
which is inculcated in people is the value that it is right and necessary to conform and obey, and that it is right that it is right.

The present day possibilities are otherwise, and it is even the case that rational non-conformity is becoming a necessity. At the present level of social complexity, blind conformists cannot operate in useful ways, and this fact is leading to failures and the build-up of social tensions, not to say outright crimes committed by "conformists" on all sides. Naturally, people have to internalise some set of values. I would suggest that a set of values, relevant and necessary to present social needs, should include the values of rationality, not irrational obedience to authority, and humanism and respect for one's fellow man.

Berger asserts that "every social structure selects those persons that it needs for its functioning and eliminates in one way or another those that do not fit". Quite apart from the frightening implications of the last part of the statement, it should also be pointed out that in one sense the first statement is not complete. For there can be a contradiction between the perceived and the actual needs of society and if this is so then the men produced may be more dangerous than those eliminated: "the perfectly adjusted bomber pilot may be a greater threat to species survival than the hospitalised schizophrenic deluded that the bomb is inside him".

Hence in examining many theories of socialisation we should bear in mind that they do no more than interpret a world which may be in drastic need of change (to paraphrase Marx). Socialisation in our society may be the "clamping of a straitjacket of conformity on every child that's born" which would prove Laing's contention that "the specifically human feature of human groupings can be used to turn them into the semblance of non-human systems". Marx said that the dominant values of any society are those of its dominant class; such values may in the end threaten society itself.

Bensman and Rosenberg have written a theoretical article entitled "Socialisation: Fitting Man to his Society". The title brilliantly summarises the process. Perhaps the need for an historical understanding of this process should lead to a new sociological study, and a future sociologist might write an article entitled "Humanisation: Fitting Society to Man". Its theme might well be the liberation of man from the "walls of his imprisonment".

28 Ibid., p. 80.
ONE OF THE ASSUMPTIONS pervading the study of Australian history is that the working class and their political correlate the Labor Party were the bearers of what is distinctively Australian. It is perhaps for this reason the history of the Labor Movement is a favorite field of study for Australian historians. *A New Britannia* is essentially a history of the Labor Movement — but with a difference. It is not Humphrey McQueen's primary intention to argue the significance of the strikes of the 1890’s; to date with accuracy Labor's intention to enter politics; or to dissect the more notorious strikes of the twentieth century. McQueen refers to these other peaks in the history of the Labor Movement and sometimes records a deviant interpretation. But the central impulse of the book is to locate the Labor Movement in the materialistic, acquisitive perspectives of Australian society as a whole.

McQueen accords more importance to racism as a component of Australian nationalism than any historian heretofore. It is, he says, "the most important single component of Australian nationalism". Racism had an economic origin — the fear that the labor markets would be flooded with cheap colored labor. McQueen sees racism as more than the fear of the Australian worker that he would lose his bargaining power vis a vis his employer — scarcity of labor. He refers to a notion of "pure racism" which was born on the goldfields of the 1850's. Diggers blamed bad luck on the Chinese, anti-Chinese riots occurred, the most well known being at Lambing Flat in 1861. Racism emerges as a psychological phenomenon akin to anti-Semitism. It is not completely reducible to economic fear or to the fear of the diseases and sexual aggressiveness of the Chinese and Kanakas — it has a momentum which survives the destruction of these fortuitous circumstances.

McQueen also identifies racism as an agent of the emergence of a common national identity. He instances the maritime dispute of 1878 which was precipitated by the employment of Chinese labor. Because of the interest aroused by the publication of *A New Britannia*, further comments will be published in future issues. This book, by Humphrey McQueen, was published in 1970 by Penguin (261 pp., $1.50).
seamen, where the strikers were supported by almost every section of the Australian population.

The existence of nationalist sentiment implies a certain area of consensus — an area in which rival and sectional interests and aspirations sublimate into a collective identity and interest. As mentioned earlier, the working class and the Labor Party, at least until Gallipoli in 1915, are credited with being the midwives and custodians of Australian nationalism. The values of mateship and egalitarianism nurtured in the bush and on the goldfields and later embodied in the trade unions and in the Labor Party, provide Australia with a home-grown socialism that assures justice for all — this is the popular mythology that McQueen rejects. The dominant values, he asserts, are those of the bourgeois-liberal hegemony and, in abbreviated form, these are the necessity and desirability of individual acquisition and its concomitant of competition.

His assault on mateship and egalitarianism begin at their putative birthplace — the penal colonies and the mores of the convicts fostered there. It is there that Russell Ward anchors that collection of values and virtues that form the Australian legend. Ward cites personal reminiscences, official reports, and ballads to establish his case. McQueen counter-quotes and offers different interpretations of some of Ward’s quotes. Faced only with this sort of quotation-game one would be justified in dismissing the book.

But McQueen offers more. The convicts, he maintains, desired what the more socially blessed had — wealth and property. That they stole to get them did not constitute a challenge to the existing system. They wished to rise in this system, and once landed in New South Wales for their efforts, some found they could advance their economic well-being legally and they readily availed themselves of every opportunity. They accepted tickets of leave, freedom, and land grants from their rulers and some were even recruited into the police force. Such conduct, McQueen seems to be saying, renders absurd any attempt to find incipient class consciousness in the convicts. He draws attention to the expedient morality in taking advantage of socio-economic elevation. Ward similarly invokes expediency in one of his explanations of mateship:

. . . this strong collectivist sentiment of group loyalty is, apart from his own individual cunning, the criminal’s sole means of defence against the overwhelmingly powerful organs of state and authority.\(^1\)

\(^{1}\) A New Britannia, p.46.

\(^{2}\) Ward, Russell The Australian Legend, OUP, Melb., 1965, Ch.2.

\(^{3}\) Ibid., p.27.
Ward is right in emphasising the advantages accruing to the individual by collective activity in such an environment. But this type of mateship is not the quasi-religious phenomenon of the popular mythology. The fact that emancipists were so easily absorbed into the society shows that they were not irreconcilably opposed to the organs of state and authority. One instance of the absence of class identification that McQueen cites is the alliance of emancipist farmers and town dwellers with the squatters in the early 1840's to oppose Gipps' land regulations. If collectivist sentiment is interpreted simply as serving the convict's best interests, and if it is conceded that there were instances when one man found his interests in conflict with those of his mate, the socialist overtones of mateship evaporate. It is not necessary for McQueen to take the extreme position that the convicts' behavior towards each other was characterised by betrayal and treachery. It is simply necessary to show mateship was compatible with advancement in capitalist society.

The notion of mateship embodying a domesticated socialist outlook is further menaced by McQueen's account of bushrangers and gold seekers. He questions the esteem in which the bushrangers were held by the rural population, noting the number of cold-blooded murders they committed; the fear they inspired in the settlers and the bushrangers' fear of being murdered by the settlers. Once again he is challenging Russel Ward's account*. But McQueen's small section on bushrangers cannot be taken as a thorough refutation of Ward if only because he does not provide enough evidence to suggest more than that there were significant exceptions to the bushranger stereotype. The most interesting contribution of McQueen's is his account of why bushrangers entered the national mythology:

It was not accidental that Australians chose a racehorse and a bushranger as their heroes since both expressed the same get-rich-quick Tatts syndrome.5

Life on the goldfields, McQueen argues, was more significant as an example of individual effort and acquisitiveness than as a continuing development of the values of mateship and egalitarian solidarity. He argues cogently that gold strengthened capitalism in Australia by providing hope for all to rise by hard work and material gain. McQueen does not succeed in establishing that mateship and egalitarianism are merely nostalgic constructs upon the past. Nor does he really show that these values were not stronger in Australia and that to this extent they were not born of circumstances unique to Australia. He does show that what

* Ibid., Ch.6.
5 McQueen, op. cit., p.140.
mateship and egalitarianism did exist did not embody the germ of values countering those of capitalism.

As alluvial mining became less rewarding and thousands of diggers looked for a new means of livelihood the need to liberate the land from the squattocracy arose. In 1930 Keith Hancock wrote:

Australian nationalism took definite form in the class struggle between the landless majority and the land-monopolizing squatters.  

Contrary to this McQueen’s account emphasises the desire of bush workers and selectors to rise in the existing society. The frontier syndrome and the bush virtues fade into insignificance juxtaposed to the drive for individual security.

The legends of the nomad tribe, of mateship and egalitarian solidarity are tied to attitude to the land. After all it was the land which was different from anything in the Old World. McQueen notes the quasi-religious significance of land in Australia, and traces the importance of the land to Irish peasants and English Utopians of the nineteenth century. Certainly much of the importance accorded to land in Australia must be traced to these sources and the idea of the redemptive value of life on the land publicized by politicians and clergy. Much of this is a desire to escape industrialism and much is a desire to strengthen the economy of the country. But the idea of the land as sacred cannot entirely be reduced to such impulses. Unfortunately McQueen does not explore the relation of the myth surrounding the land to the mateship and egalitarian myths. He does point out that even though the land was enshrined in a sacred idiom the bulk of Australia’s population were urban dwellers even in the 1880’s. Both myths, it seems, entail an idealization of reality which has been interiorized in the public consciousness until its truth value is not relevant. What is of interest here is what public needs were fulfilled by this process. McQueen does not broach this question. He confines himself to exposing the capitalist values obscured by the myths. How reality was alchemized into myth is equally crucial to the understanding of the dynamics of Australian society.

In dealing with socialism, the trade union movement and the Labor Party, McQueen continues to stress the absence of any systematic and coherent challenge to capitalism. Writing in the 1890’s, Albert Metin described the politics of Australia as “le socialisme sans doctrines”. McQueen, like Brian Fitzpatrick, finds the trade unions and the Labor Party no more socialist than they were doctrinaire. He sees the spirit of trade unionism in nineteenth century Australia embodied in the motto adopted by the

---

6 Hancock, K. *Australia*, Syd. 1948, p.52.
Australian Union Benefit Society in 1834 — “United to relieve, not combined to injure”. In stating that this attitude survives throughout the nineteenth century he blurs the distinction usually drawn between the earlier craft unions composed of skilled workers combined for mutual benefit and adopting methods of discussion with employers and the new unions of the 1880’s composed of unskilled workers organized to some extent on an intercolonial basis and prepared to strike to gain better wages and conditions. Throughout the book McQueen’s method is often defiant statement rather than argument and here all the proof he offers is that all W. G. Spence did in organizing the Amalgamated Miners’ Union was to bring together the existing societies, with no significant change to their essentially friendly society character. Robin Gollan has described the differences in organization and method between the craft unions and the new industrial unions, and McQueen does not come within striking distance of this account. McQueen is consistently loath to recognize any sort of radicalism in the Australian past. If radicalism and conservatism are held to be virtually synonomous because the radicalism is compatible with ongoing of the existing society, the past is being once more distorted.

The Great Strikes of the 1890’s emerge from his account as at most the tools of short range industrial purposes. The fact that they were broken by volunteer labor is enough in itself to suggest that there was little hardening of class identification. Both Robin Gollan and Brian Fitzpatrick have noted that bitterness and militancy were strongest in Queensland. McQueen disagrees:

The militancy of the Queensland shearers fed upon the rancour and enmity of smallholders towards large landowners.

This does not take sufficient account of the shearers in the central west, but it seems an accurate account of the Darling Downs. D. B. Waterson’s recent study reveals that:

The signing of the Pittsworth Agreement left the Downs shearers satisfied and reluctant to follow their colleagues of the central west along paths which many thought would lead to the destruction of all private property. Most of them had too much to lose — or so they thought.

As McQueen rejects the idea that the Australian labor movement ever enjoyed a period of ideological innocence there is no need for him to document the betrayal of the socialist ideal by

7 McQueen, p.206.
8 Gollan, R. Radical and Working Class Politics in Eastern Australia.
10 McQueen, p.216.
labor in politics. The political labor parties continued to exhibit their acceptance of capitalism by joining coalition governments; their consciousness of a multi-interest electorate and their willingness to break strikes.

The Australian working class, according to McQueen, was dominated by the materialist values of a bourgeois-liberal hegemony. In A New Britannia he delineates only the response of the dominated which, on the whole, seem to have been a willingness to acquiesce. Apart from adopting the Gramscian notion of hegemony, McQueen does not have any solid ideological framework to show why the Australian working class willingly acquiesced. This book suggests nothing to extend the explanation of Brian Fitzpatrick.

The working Australians tried, as all men try, to better their position in society, to get for themselves a greater share of the common loaf.¹²

Neither does McQueen define the composition or the dynamics of the bourgeois-liberal hegemony.

Another question McQueen leaves unasked and unanswered is whether the Labor Party sharpened the liberal conscience into conceding social welfare programmes of pensions, factory regulations and the workers’ compensation. While the Labor Party did not embody a socialist vision it did advance the belief that all men deserved a better deal in this society. In Brian Fitzpatrick’s phrase this made Australia a place where “men could call their souls their own”. McQueen would probably reply that this is a horrifying measure of the success of capitalism — it can seduce men into finding freedom in domination and repression.

The value of McQueen’s book is that it has started clearing the ground for a re-definition of Australia’s self-image. Mateship and egalitarianism may well survive this re-definition but in an attenuated form, and not as Australia’s version of socialism. Such a re-definition is most necessary to the Australian Left who have consistently held that a return to the values of the late nineteenth century would usher in a new order.

Like Manning Clark, McQueen locates the story of Australia in a universal context. Clark’s polarization are men’s ideals confounded by their weaknesses; McQueen’s are capitalism and socialism, vaguely defined. Further, both stress the options that did not arise — there was no attempt to define men’s needs other than on a materialist level. But where Clark’s work is imbued with a Kierkegaardian bleakness, McQueen’s excites the hope that change is possible and indeed must be possible.

¹² Fitzpatrick, B. The Australian People, MUP 1946, p.43.

ERNEST MANDEL’S new work EUROPE VERSUS AMERICA? CONTRADICTIONS OF IMPERIALISM is bound to attract a lot of attention over its basic proposition—that the imperialist system continues with the same potential for inter-imperialist wars as it had from 1900 to 1940.

The theme of Mandel’s book, like the title, deals with a popular topic in Europe, but of too little appeal elsewhere. The underlying theme of Mandel is that imperialism is functioning today largely as Lenin charted its early growth and functioning—a mainly European-based system, but with an important extension to Japan and according the US with a more central and leading role than in earlier periods.

Mandel poses growth features of American capitalism and consequential repercussions to American imperialism in a way that implies almost an inescapable new war or series of wars or a new redivision of the world through inter-imperialist rivalries developing between the “Common Market 6” leading Europe and America, on the one hand, and between Japan and America on the other. These could, although he doesn’t state this definitively, lead to a Third World War generated by the inner-imperialist rivalries and conflicts, that can only be resolved by inter-imperialist wars, like World Wars I and II. In these conclusions he differs little, in essence, from those of Eugene Varga in Studies in the Political Economy of Capitalism. But US economists like Harry Magdoff, whose paper, read to the first Socialist Scholars’ Conference in New York in 1966, was expanded into the important book The Age of Imperialism, and some of the US and British contributors to the New Left Review reach different conclusions.

Some of the other schools of Marxism don’t subscribe to the Mandel view that a “Common Market 6” or a “Super Japan” will challenge and perhaps enter a new war to supplant the US as the dominant force within the present imperialist system. Consequently, they don’t see much logic in the argument of, for example, the Warsaw Pact countries invading Czechoslovakia over an allegedly imminent West German military invasion in 1968. Magdoff states the contrary, but widely accepted view:

“The struggle to divide the world has been succeeded by the primary struggle against a shrinking imperialist system.”

Moreover, Magdoff doesn’t pose the “shrinking imperialist system” only in a recording of the facts of actual US imperialism’s expansion and growth through control of other capitalist countries’ and Third World countries’ finance, trade, military, communications and political institutions, or by the take-over of so many positions held by European capitalism; his method is much more complex.

To read Mandel’s book with some of the background information drawn from the other conflicting analyses in trade, finance, wage levels in the US, Japan and Europe, trade rivalries and Imperialism v. Third World conflicts and containment seems an essential experience for anyone wishing to know where we are heading in this imperialist world of the 1970s.
Mandel's book is provocative, but unfinished "case" somewhat over-orientated on European capitalism and without enough regard to the multinational corporations and the "Second Empire" of the US now firmly established in its overseas multi-national corporations.

The relationship of the USSR and the Eastern Socialist bloc, on the one hand to China, and to the Third World, appear to enter too little into Mandel's exposition, just as the ownership of so many of the Third World countries' raw materials, so critical to US imperialism security and extension, appear to be under-rated factors.

When dealing with the union movements in the Europe v. America framework of conflict, Mandel is inclined to rely on incidents too unrepresentative to make a pattern and ignores the internationalism of students and their role in developing international anti-imperialist attitudes. He points to the factors forcing some internationalism on unions and their first responses to the new needs by the US auto workers and French glass workers:

"... there is nothing to prevent giant corporations, with ramifications everywhere, from switching orders from one country to another, if it suits them, blackmailing wage-earners or trade unions whose wages are 'too high' or even closing down some businesses so as to depress wages, and systematically boycotting countries where wages are too high". (p. 114.)

Mandel cites cases of firms skirting round those problems and of unions trying to organise to meet such challenges and these incidents are becoming more common. He warns:

"In the gigantic socio-economic metamorphosis which late capitalism is now experiencing sections of the working class could suffer as bitter a fate as they did in the first industrial revolution (although) it has a far better chance of defending itself and of winning self-determination and ultimate emancipation than it had at the beginning of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries." (p. 115.)

He doesn't really get to the bottom of the CGT-CGIL isolation from the ICFTU affiliates, but quite correctly suggests that a series of international strikes that simultaneously dealt with the plants of multi-national corporations in the EEC countries would pay off handsomely:

"The true way is by practical and concrete experiences, by ACTIONS carried out on a European scale. As we wrote ten years ago, one strike of European dimensions would do more to give the workers of the EEC a 'European Consciousness' than a hundred European Congresses. Experience, alas, has subsequently confirmed this in a negative way".

Mandel should, it seems to me, have treated the great counter influence to industrial solidarity of the work-forces of Europe within the migrations of labor through the Common Market countries (up to 35 per cent of the work-forces of some countries) with its consequential destruction of homogeneity, solidarity and industrial and political involvement of the total work-force in the industrial and political life of the "temporary" homeland for so many.

In posing a lot of the questions, Mandel doesn't do much more than make a first search for an answer. This may be good for a scholar if not the many readers. His book should be read with Magdoff's The Age of Imperialism.  

Colanti
Select Bibliography

This select bibliography is an attempt to draw together articles of interest to labor historians, in particular those concerned with Australian communism, which have appeared in the following publications: Communist Review (abbreviated to CR) during the period 1934-1966, that is from the first to the last issue; Australian Left Review (abbreviated to ALR) from the first issue, in 1966, to the last for 1970; Tribune, 1950-1970. In the case of the latter, the two-decade limitation is the result of an arbitrary decision on my part.

I have tried to extract from these publications material of the following kinds: biography (also political biography), memoirs, and articles which seek to contribute to the study of labor history.

Following the bibliography is a brief section comprising a list of people associated with the Australian labor movement, about whom biographical information, often in the form of obituaries (though not necessarily), is to be found in Tribune — to which the references apply. This data should be of considerable use for further checking.


BACON, E.A. “How Communists (in peace and war) have battled Chauvinism”, Tribune, 18 November 1970, p. 8. Contains data on the role of the Communist Party in the Australian Army during World War II. It was prompted by a polemical article by Denis Freney (Tribune, 28 October 1970, p. 7). See also the brief rejoinder by Doug Olive (Tribune, 2 December 1970, p.4).

B.W.


COATES, Roger.

“Australia’s own ‘First International’”. A two-part article, Tribune, 2 September 1964, p. 6; 16 September 1964, p. 6.


DAVIDSON, Alastair.

“Writing the History of a C.P.”, ALR, No. 27 (October-November 1970), pp.74-82. Historiographical views of the author of the history of the CPA.

DIXON, Richard.


EARSMAN, W.P.


Earsman’s report to the Central Executive of the Australian Communist Party on the activities of the Third Congress of the Communist International, Moscow 1921.

JEFFREY, Norman.

Jeffrey was a foundation member of the CPA. In Tribune, 6 November 1957 (p.4), he discusses the impact upon himself and others of the news of the 1917 Russian revolution. See also his note on the Australian career of Artem Sergeyeff, Tribune, 27 March 1963, p.7.

LANE, Ernie.


LARDNER, Tom.


LOCKWOOD, R.


“Capitalist Affiliations of ALP in NSW”, CR, No. 266 (February 1964), pp.48-51. These two articles present a brief historical analysis of the ALP and its relationship with capitalism.

McNEILL, Jim.


79

RAWLING, J.N. During 1939, Rawling edited and introduced a selection of items from the organ of the Democratic Association of Victoria (a section of the First International), Australian International Monthly. See CR, Vol. VI, Nos. 8 and 9, pp. 473-479, 557-562 respectively. In issue No. 10 that year, he included an extract from the Sydney journal Stockwhip relating to the effect of the Paris Commune on Australia (pp. 621-626).


SALMON, Malcolm. “Gerald Griffin still ‘measures up’”, Tribune, 4 December 1968, p. 5. Recent reminiscences of Griffin, mainly on Kisch affair. See also Salmon’s profile of Griffin in ALR, No. 1 (February-March 1969), pp. 50-57.


Jim Coull, 3 May 1967, p.15.
Len Donald, 13 January 1965, p.2.
Paddy Drew, 28 October 1953, p. 5.
Jack Kilburn, 3 May 1967, p.15.
J. B. Miles, 28 October 1953, p.5. 28 May 1969, p.8.
Jack Pratt, 8 June 1960, p. 6.
Frank Weigel, 3 May 1967, p. 15

ROWAN CAHILL

AUSTRALIAN LEFT REVIEW—MARCH, 1971
Corrections

*ALR* No. 28 contained an unusually high number of literal errors and transpositions, for which we apologise to readers and contributors. Most mistakes are obvious but two transposed footnotes on page 7, each concerning two different publications, could be misinterpreted if left in an uncorrected state.

The footnotes to the article "Victims of Double Oppression" by Mavis Robertson should read:

14 The journal *Our Women* published by the Union of Australian Women devotes pages to cookery, fashion etc. in much the same way as any bourgeois women's journal while on some important social issues it accepts the framework of present society. The title and the content of an article called "Family Planning" in the Sept-Dec 1970 issue is a case in point. These reinforce the concept that such clinics are only for married women who want to regularise the size of their families.

15 The Journal of the New South Wales Trade Union Education and Research Centre in its first issue invited "trade unionists and their wives" to a seminar. This Centre has however, developed several activities for women unionists.