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BOOKS
VIETNAM CONSTANTLY EXERTS a growing influence on Australian national politics, as it does on international relations. The national debate continues; the national division grows deeper. All efforts to stifle, scare or divert the broad opposition movement have so far failed. Threats, new repressive legislation and arrests cannot intimidate the left and radical sector of the peace movement, nor does it succeed in dividing the movement. Quite the reverse; attacks on civil liberties only widen the movement and add new forces to the opposition, as the Queensland student protest dramatically showed.

The full consequences were not foreseen when the government blithely acceded to American pressure and first committed an Australian battalion. They could not believe that the National Liberation Front would be able to stand up to American might, or that massive bombing of the North would fail to crush the national will beneath a ruined economy and a decimated people. Maxwell Taylor, McNamara, Westmoreland—all promised new victory schedules. Australian troops would be a small sacrifice, watering with their blood the tree of the American alliance with all its imagined advantages in investment, trade and a special political relationship and military protection.

Stuck with that fatal decision, the government's position has gone from bad to worse, even though it won a sweeping electoral victory in 1966 by blatant exploitation of color prejudice, fear of Asia and jingo-type "patriotism".

McMAHON'S BUDGET pleased no one, not even the Liberal Party he so blatantly aspires to lead—least of all Bolte, Askin and other Liberal premiers. And the budget was largely predetermined by the Vietnam intervention. Once launched on that slippery course, there could be less and less freedom of manoeuvre.

In six years military expenditure has grown from $406 million spent in 1961-62 to $1,118 million scheduled for 1967-68, an increase of 175 per cent. War spending now exceeds planned payments to the National Welfare Fund for social services ($1,071 million for this year). Welfare expenditure has in-
increased only 45% in six years—war consumption is increasing four times faster. Payments to the States, $1,347 million, has increased only 69 per cent in the six years despite the growing crisis in education, transport and other state and local government services.

McMahon’s budget must have been even worse—and politically more damaging—but for a certain low cunning in passing the buck to the states. Sir Henry Bolte has set a new precedent, a state income tax. It is magnificently impartial—one cent for every 10 dollars, whether the wage earner receives $2,000 or $20,000, and of course only on wages and salaries, not dividends, expense accounts or other perks.

It is only a tiny tax—so far. But the precedent is set. The tax will certainly stay—and as certainly rise. Other state budgets will certainly add new imposts to the big rises in transport and other costs already forced on most state governments by Canberra’s financial domination and the policies it pursues.

The Treasurer’s Cynicism was nowhere more evident than in his justification of the freeze on old-age pensions. Of all the failures to act on social services, this caused the greatest moral revulsion, all the more since the government has been so imprudent, inefficient and supine in face of the still-soaring price of the F111 and other American war equipment. The last has by no means been heard of this scandal, tied as it is to President Johnson and his Texan millionaire associates in General Dynamics. The increase in F111 price alone could pay for a substantial pension increase. The widespread criticism over the pension stayput was sharpened by prodigal spending on VIP aircraft, affronting the egalitarian ethos that still remains strong among Australians, even if it lacks social reality.

The budget underlines the need for a broad movement to demand sweeping reforms in education and in social services—adequate pensions, a national health service, and doubled child endowment (instead of the fraudulent and even insulting window dressing that begins at the fourth child).

This budget again stresses the need for the labor movement to advance and campaign for a new taxation system, tipping the class bias the other way. Taxation falls heaviest upon the working man, and McMahon proved this again by his “concessions”. Who pays $1,200 annually for insurance? Who gains most from increased dependents’ allowances?
Taxation is subtly devised so that the rich can evade taxes while wage earners cannot. Taxation evasion is a flourishing "industry", with accountants, consultants and lawyers earning huge fees for finding new loopholes. Indirect taxes are levied on necessities that rich and poor alike consume.

Perhaps the most glaring iniquity is the continued refusal of governments to tax capital gains. The huge field open for this form of taxation is revealed dramatically in the case of BHP and the oil finds. In a few months, wealth of BHP shareholders has almost trebled, and this extra wealth—coming from exploitation of a national resource—is completely tax-free. Compare this with the wage-earner who obtains a wage rise of $2 a week. Out of that, McMahon takes 50c!

The budget projects a whole range of economic, social, political and moral issues for explanation and action. No matter what levels of action, on whatever issue, all will be related to the Vietnam war, even if the relationship is indirect or even unseen by many who are moved to action.

The Budget speech itself had to refer to the dangers. It said:
Plainly we cannot for long continue to meet anything like the rate of increase of recent years without deep impairment of the economy . . . our mounting external defence costs are another and more serious aspect. Five years ago, our external costs of defence were well under $100 million a year. This year they could rise above $350 million . . . 11 percent, or more of our export earnings.

Yet the government is proceeding helter-skelter along the road to "deep impairment" of the economy, to still greater sacrifices of the urgent national priorities of education, social services and national development. Mounting external costs of war expenditure are the inevitable result of the general political decision to support United States imperialism, and the specific decision to join in its undeclared, unjust war against the Vietnamese people.

Cost of the Vietnam force is growing all the time. New US demands have already been served, and the policy of integrating Australia with the American war machine will continually escalate the costs of buying US equipment that is usually quite unsuitable for Australian defence.

Most US equipment the government buys—the F111 above all, but not only that—is designed specifically for aggressive action, not defence. The Pentagon has long been working on weapons and tactics against national liberation movements. The strange fruits of the massive "research" of those scientists, technologists,
and “thinkers” it draws into its service are already seen in Vietnam—napalm, lazy dog, anti-personnel bombs, chemical weapons and gas.

Australian purchases of US equipment is designed for aggression, not defence, aggression that is apparently endless since it is designed to stop the United States and its allies from “losing” Asia.

**THIS IS A WICKED WASTE**, since Asia never belonged to the United States and cannot be held by it. Western imperialism certainly conquered huge areas of Asia, but the national liberation revolutions that exploded in 1945 irrevocably ended that whole epoch. British, French, Dutch and other empires were overthrown and there is no possibility for a new American empire. Still less can the Australian ruling class aspire to impose their ideas upon its neighbours.

The Vietnamese people prove this every year, so clearly that more and more people call for an end to the war. Every new criminal escalation, justified because this will bring victory nearer, only calls forth new counter-blows and new defeats for the United States. The National Liberation Front is able to strike devastating military blows all over Vietnam, from the Mekong Delta to the 17th parallel.

Every effort of the Americans to legitimise the Saigon regime produces new contradictions and new problems. The farcical “presidential elections” could give only one-third of the “votes” to the Thieu-Ky team, and new political crises are inevitable.

The National Liberation Front has consolidated its political position. In mid-August, the Front held a national Congress from which a powerful appeal was made for national unity and salvation. In striking contrast to the Saigon regime totally dependent upon the Americans for its existence and unable to decide anything without US approval, the Front guarantees genuine national independence and a neutral South Vietnam while reunification is prepared in careful stages. It offers a place in the new Vietnam for people of all classes and beliefs who want to be free of foreign domination.

The NLF Congress appeal will find a ready response in many circles in South Vietnam hitherto only passively opposed to Saigon and the Americans. Significance of the NLF appeal lies in the timing of this important political initiative. The great strength of the NLF’s position is its combination of political and military action. Such combination is impossible to the
Americans and Saigon, drawing its power from the genuinely national character of the Front and the fierce determination of Vietnam to be free and independent.

Recognition of the NLF is the essential condition for peace in Vietnam. This in no way detracts from the fact that unconditional ending of American bombing of the North would make peace talks possible, as Pham Van Dong and U Thant have both recently reaffirmed. This indispensable step would open the way to peace negotiations, in which the NLF would have to be a principal party. And indeed this is nothing but the reality which must be recognised—that the NLF does in fact represent the majority of Vietnamese in the South.

It is this reality which cuts through all the miasma of American-Australian official propaganda about Vietnam. It alone can provide rational explanation of the way the powerful United States is unable to achieve victory in an otherwise completely unequal war, whose odds are well expressed in a recent estimate made by the Institute of Strategic Studies. This estimates that the United States is spending $22,500 million a year, forty-five times the cost of the Vietnamese patriots' effort.

It is no exaggeration to say that Vietnam's epic of national liberation, already spread over a quarter-century, is one of the greatest in human history. The Greeks who defeated the Persians at Marathon and Salamis in a decisive war 2500 years ago were neither as outnumbered nor at such a disadvantage in equipment as is the National Liberation Front compared with the Americans.

RADICAL STUDENTS who made the symbolic gesture of support for the Front are expressing much more than the alleged "ratbag" wrong-headedness. They reflect a spreading recognition that the NLF do represent the people of Vietnam, that they cannot be defeated, that the American war—and the Australian part in it—is unjust, immoral and barbarous.

The Holt Government, placed in a sore dilemma, responded as usual, with more repression. Although the 1960 Crimes Act amendments had been passed with this type of situation in mind, Holt could not use them because the war was undeclared and because he was afraid to take the step of "declaring" Vietnam under the Crimes Act, to render it a crime even to criticise the Saigon regime, let alone support the NLF. Instead, new legislation was introduced specifically to deal with the students who had been derided as an insignificant minority.
A massive campaign was mounted to whip up feeling against the students—and the peace movement as a whole—on the grounds that Australian troops had to be backed up, even if there was wide national opposition to their presence in Vietnam. The official manoeuvre was definitely to create a mood of "my country, right or wrong". This has been a resounding flop, since the government is clearly responsible for the presence of Australian troops, and their casualties.

THE GOVERNMENT is specially vulnerable on a matter of national conscience, the oppressed and exploited position of the Aboriginal people. The face-saving manoeuvre of the Referendum has now given the power to the Federal Government but this is useless without the will. And this is notoriously lacking. In the Northern Territory, where Canberra has long had the power, exploitation, maltreatment and downright robbery of the Aborigines continues.

A minor but revealing "regulation" is that the Territory dental service precludes the use of local anaesthetics for Aborigines, and sets the daily quota of 100 Aborigines for each dentist visiting a mission.

The Aboriginal struggle is reaching new levels, and can force change if it receives enough support. The historic strike of Aboriginal stockmen is still having its repercussions. Aboriginal pastoral workers are now to receive equal pay, and the Gurindji are still demanding rights to their tribal lands occupied by Vestey's.

The stage is set for action, but the Government is concerned only with appointing a commissioner and deciding what to do. The time has arrived for action to force the Government's hand.

THE HAWKS STRIKE OUT in fury at their inability to suppress these movements, desperate at the exposure of the immorality of their position and erosion of their credibility. Their answer is to become more virulent, shriller and more hawkish. The logic of their position is best expressed by the not always logical W. C. Wentworth, who has extended his anathema against traitors from Communists, fellow travellers, the ALP and the trade unions, to his own colleagues, who support trade with China.
A much more influential member of the government soon showed that not only the unbalanced Mr. Wentworth was capable of such violence. Mr. McMahon opened the Liberal campaign for Capricornia with an intemperate attack upon Labor candidate Dr. Everingham. Using religious beliefs, or lack of them, Mr. McMahon pretended a spurious concern for unity of the labor movement that, he suggested, would be undermined still further if Dr. Everingham were elected. Trumpeting that this was all the more dangerous since national unity was needed more than ever, McMahon revealed the deep concern of the government for the national division that persists and deepens.

This division finds expression in unexpected quarters, including government parties. The Basic Industries Group still remains a deep source of division between Liberal and Country Parties, and there is not much doubt that Mr. McMahon and the extremist group around him have more than one finger in this pie. The political drift away from the government already evident as its policies become more openly reactionary and its administration more inefficient, will only sharpen these difficulties.

NEW POSSIBILITIES FOR CHANGE are evident in this fluid situation. The labor movement, with its potential and actual allies, can exert a decisive influence if an all-front political offensive is launched against the government. Such an offensive would necessarily hinge upon opposition to the Vietnam war, but would extend across the whole spectrum of issues, political, economic and moral, that confront Australian society today.

This needs a new labor unity, a new vision of the possibility of joining a united labor movement with new left and radical trends. It needs a new spirit of offensive of deeper challenges to modern capitalism and the contemporary expressions of its injustices, inhumanity, and underlying inability to meet human needs today. Some idea of the possibilities, and the problems of building such a movement were revealed at important national conferences of the labor movement held in August. The Federal Labor Conference and the Congress of the Australian Council of Trade Unions each expressed new trends, the latter much more strongly.

As expected, the Federal Labor Conference was a compromise. Mr. Whitlam and those forces supporting him (in the Party and outside it) obtained much less than the sweeping changes in foreign policy and organisation they demanded. Yet they
achieved something, and pin their hopes on 1969 to get more. On the other hand, the strong working class and trade union influence on the ALP was again demonstrated, and the left was able to keep the initiative in ideas and policy, at least in most cases.

The ACTU Congress, analysed elsewhere in this issue, was a surprise to many and a deep disappointment to the Establishment. Whereas the numbers seemed to assure a further move to the right, the outcome was an important re-orientation to the left. Many immediate and particular problems and issues were the direct levers for this change, but the deeper causes lie in changes in the workforce, in clearer understanding of the challenge to unionism from state-monopoly capitalism, and in revulsion from the poverty of ideas and lack of dynamism of the old-line reformist right. The trade union movement wants a new direction, a break out from the labyrinth of arbitrationalist legalities, a revitalised, modernised and militant unionism.

It would be a mistake to over-estimate the positive trends evident at both these conferences, yet certainly the most important task for the left is to use these as the springboard in mounting the new offensive against monopoly capital and its government on the industrial, political and ideological fronts.

THIS YEAR'S first issue of U.S. NEWS AND WORLD REPORT must have caused as much embarrassment at the Pentagon as Mr. Salisbury's Hanoi Reports. Witness this passage from its analysis of the end-of-1966 position in Vietnam.

"U.S. prestige is suffering as a third-rate Asian country foils the earth's mightiest power... In the steaming jungles and rice fields of this small Asian Nation, the world's superpower, the U.S. — today finds itself stalemated by relatively minor military forces of an elusive enemy. There seems to be little for the U.S. to show in the way of firm results after six years of escalating war".

"The cost of this war to the U.S. already is immense and growing greater, with no victory—or even evidence of decisive progress—in sight"

IN AN ARTICLE published on October 2nd, 1966, concerning the C.I.A., reference was made to the magazine Encounter. As a result of a complaint from Encounter, we published an apology and paid its legal costs. In view of recent events, Encounter has now agreed to refund these costs to the Sunday Telegraph.

(The Sunday Telegraph, 16/7/1967)
A close observer of industrial affairs comments on the reasons why the Congress of the Australian Council of Trade Unions produced results which surprised many commentators.

The 1967 ACTU Congress which was the most significant of the post-war years had also the most unexpected outcome. For months experts of various kinds had confidently predicted that the shift to the right which had occurred at the 1965 Congress would be taken further and consolidated at the 1967 Congress, due particularly to the presence of the large Australian Workers' Union delegation. In fact, the entry of the AWU into the ACTU was seen as part of an overall plan to strengthen right-wing domination of the ACTU.

In light of this the outcome of the Congress was remarkable: not only that the right-wing failed to strengthen its domination—it suffered the biggest setback for a long time, far reaching in its consequences.

The defeat of J. Riordan and R. E. Wilson in their respective groups, and Mick Jordan, Secretary of the Melbourne Trades Hall Council for the vice-presidency were the most spectacular aspects of the right-wing failure, but the real dynamic of this Congress went much deeper. It could be seen in the decision of Congress to accept the Australian Labor Party policy on Vietnam, after the ACTU had consistently taken a weaker stand on the war in Vietnam than the ALP. It showed up in Bill Evans' devastating criticism of the work of the old executive and the extraordinary response this got from the delegates at the Congress. It was also reflected in the lack of initiative of the extreme right-wing forces. Their passivity at the Congress created a deceptive appearance that nothing was going on.

This Congress lacked some of the fiery debates of earlier ones. Yet it is likely that it will be remembered as the one that initiated a new stage in the history of the trade union movement. It laid the basis for deep-going changes, which will make it possible for the trade union movement to confront the problems of modern
capitalist society in the age of the technological revolution. It cracked the crust which was smothering the trade union movement.

How did it come about that the very Congress which was expected to harden right-wing domination opened the way for a progressive transformation of the ACTU? Puzzled commentators have advanced a variety of, mostly superficial, reasons. Mr. Santamaria's News Weekly claims that "the moderates had the numbers, but lacked organisation. The left-wing had the organisation." It laments that "it seems that some moderate leaders will never learn."

Yet even the very young and innocent know that the right-wing forces do not lack finance, trained cadres, the backing of the mass media and powerful outside support. The advantages are all with them. It is not that they did not try, they tried and failed. Why? There were a number of factors, all of which played some part in the outcome of the ACTU Congress:

The inability of the right-wing in the ALP to achieve at the Federal Conference the changes in policy and structure that they had campaigned for. This applies particularly to the policy on Vietnam.

The growing opposition to and uncertainty about the war in Vietnam, and the questioning of the policies of the Holt Government and their effects on living standards (e.g. the Government could not "afford" to increase pensions, the growth of taxation and the cut back on University finance).

The pressure of the upsurge of industrial struggles involving large numbers and different groups of workers, including white collar workers.

The total wage decision, particularly insofar as it demonstrates that reliance on the Arbitration Commission for improvement in living standards is based on sand.

The frustration of growing numbers of unions with the inadequacy and inefficiency of the ACTU leadership.

The attempt by the ACTU officials to take more and more under the wing of the ACTU, even to try to take over the functions of individual unions whilst at the same time being less and less able to act effectively on many important matters, has created widespread opposition. There developed a sort of anti-establishment atmosphere directed especially against ACTU secretary, Mr. Souter, who wastefully used up his own small fund of initiative to stifle the initiative of others.
The reluctance, even unwillingness, of the ACTU as expressed through its secretary, to co-operate with the Australian Council of Salaried and Professional Associations and other white collar bodies. This at a time when the need for closer co-operation is felt by most to be more urgent than in the past.

It has been suggested by some that the outcome of this Congress was due to the manoeuvring for the succession to the presidency after the retirement of Albert Monk. Certainly such manoeuvring occurred. But it was not confined to one group. The outcome was determined by deeper and more serious reasons than the skill of this or that individual.

The deeper causes on the basis of which the factors enumerated above operated, are objective changes in the Australian society of our days — changes in the economy and the class structure. Technological changes in Australia have increased in number and enhanced the importance of the more highly skilled and better educated sections of the working class. These are younger workers with a broader horizon. They merge with some sections of white collar workers. Technically and ideologically for these workers the borderline between industrial and white collar workers is becoming blurred.

They are the new working class, conscious of their increasing power in the technological society. They are certainly interested in higher wages, but they are interested in a number of other things as well. They want an efficient and up to date trade union movement. They have a vision of a trade union movement which will weld together industrial and white collar workers.

They are a growing social force in our society. Their most conscious elements, which they throw up as leaders, are aggressively and intelligently radical. They are left-wing in broad terms. But “left” and “right” have only limited validity in describing their attitudes. They are sick of the tired, old “do nothing” reformist leaders, of the barren anti-communism of the extreme right-wing.

As a social force they are the response to the deep changes which have taken place and which are going on in Australian society, changes which have thrown up a host of new and complex problems, which demand attention and action by the trade union movement. Yet these problems are not attended to by the current right-wing leaders. They are unable and unwilling to deal with them. It is no longer possible to hide them by pigeonholing them or to keep them off agendas by manoeuvring. More and more people can see that it is impossible to carry on in this way.
In this sense one can talk of the bankruptcy of the policy of the right-wing leaders. The much-discussed internal divisions among the right-wing forces often expressed around personalities are really due to this crisis of their policy.

What of the future? There is ample ground for co-operation between the left forces. The main task is in front of them, for only some of the groundwork has been laid for policies that the trade union movement must embark on to carry out its historic role in society. Immediately there is the urgent problem of extending the whole scope of trade union activity—the wider social problems of education, old age pensions, health and social services, automation, democratic control, etc.

There are also bound to be some differences between the left forces. Some of them centre around the nature of the urgent modernisation of the trade union movement, others are concerned with perspectives.

These inevitable differences must be resolved by discussion, in the course of common activities where all views can be put to the test of experience. In all this the left forces must not lose sight of the fact that the main enemy is monopoly capitalism, more powerful and better organised than ever. Neither can we expect that the right-wing forces will meekly accept their setback. They will try to reverse the process. They have powerful friends and ample means to do this. They will try to foster divisions and diversions.

The current developments provide the trade union movement with new opportunities for advance. Provided the left forces act in unity and with skill and determination, this Congress could well become an important stepping stone for the advance of socialist ideas among the Australian working class.

THESE are the basic rules for dialogue between Catholics and Communists:
First, both sides must be willing to avow their past sins and mistakes, admitting their mutual responsibility for past antagonisms and enmities.
Second, each side must acknowledge that they have something to learn from each other and that they are willing to talk TO each other and not just AT each other.
Third, both parties must dialogue without any ulterior motives.
Fourth, each party should remain true to its own principles and not attempt to achieve any kind of false compromise.

Max Charlesworth, Catholic Worker, July 1967 (from a talk given to the Victorian Fabian Society).
OF ALL THAT HAS BEEN WRITTEN about the racial riots in America in July, perhaps the best and most searching analyses were those published in Britain’s The Sunday Times and The Times, and in a document issued by the National Committee of the Communist Party, U.S.A.

The C.P. document, in fact, was published in June, a month before the rioting, the worst in American history, predicting that it would happen (“What may well be the longest, hottest and bloodiest summer has already begun”) and setting out, lucidly and forcefully, the reasons it would happen.

The articles in The Sunday Times and The Times appeared in late July, at the time of the rioting.

The C.P. document, An Open Letter to President Johnson, over the signatures of Henry Winston, National Chairman, and Gus Hall, General Secretary charged that responsibility for “this imminent danger to the Negro people and our country rests above all with you (Johnson)” and that:

—Conspiracy is afoot in our land to provoke and slaughter militant Negroes desperately struggling to end decades of black oppression and to claim their century-denied constitutional rights.
—With your (Johnson’s) knowledge and silent consent the crumbs of the carrot offered to a relative handful of Negroes in 1965-66 are now being snatched away.
—This assault is being directed against the Negro people because their courageous militant fight for an end to ghetto slums, segregated schools and permanent black depression and for jobs is stimulating national resistance to the unjust war in Vietnam and exposing the decay of our ‘free enterprise’ system with its immoral anti-human priorities.
—The purpose of this attack is to single out and crush the most militant force today struggling to reverse these priorities and to compel our government to use our great resources to make our cities livable for Americans instead of making Hanoi, Haiphong, Saigon unlivable for the Vietnamese.
—The present crisis has its roots in the war in Vietnam and particularly in your (Johnson’s) 1967-68 budget which provided more than $2 billion a month for that war and little more than a billion a year for the war on poverty.
The document then listed several instances of police and fascist violence against Negroes and charged that, encouraged by these assaults, racist vigilante bands were being formed by the John Birch Society, White Citizens' Council, Ku Klux Klan, followers of George Wallace and George Lincoln Rockwell (since, alas, departed) and the Minutemen.

It demanded an immediate emergency program to include:

1. An immediate $5 billion appropriation for a summer job and reconstruction program for Negro ghettos.

2. Immediate Federal intervention in Cleveland to reconstruct the Hough area (which became one of the centres of Negro revolt a month later) and to protect the Negro people of that city from threatened police and vigilante violence.

3. Federal prosecution of those responsible for police and National Guard assaults on Negro colleges and release of all Negro students jailed.

The document was republished in full in *New Times* (Moscow) Issue 32, August, 1967.

*The Sunday Times*, London, in a well-documented, dispassionate analysis of the race riots, pointed out that, while people in Britain were not used to thinking of America in terms of poverty, "there are some blunt facts (which) give some idea of the scope and subtlety of the corruption which has taken over the American cities." It listed them as:

—One in three of the Negroes in most northern cities are unemployed or as good as unemployed.
—Thirteen years after the U.S. Supreme Court outlawed it, there is more segregation in the schools than ever before.
—In a period of unparalleled boom, after six years of steady economic expansion, median incomes in the urban ghettos (where most Negroes live) have decreased during the 1960s.

The survey continues:

This is also after several years of unparalleled promises to the Negroes, hardly one of which has come true.

A tragic, automatic mechanism has been exposed in American society, through which nearly every attempt to help the poor—and the poor are, basically, the Negroes—has been transmuted into a device for making the rich richer and the poor poorer . . .

Against this background . . . the apostle of Black Power calls for guerrilla war against the whites. It is an immoderate and violent demand. But the current predicament of the Negro is immoderate. The violence is part of a context in which 36 murders in the South, of Civil Rights workers, have produced only three convictions, and no sentence of more than ten years.
The Sunday Times quotes the following by Walter Lippmann, 'America's most respected commentator':

The race problem as we know it is really the by-product of our planless, disordered, bedraggled, drifting democracy.

Until we have learned to house everybody, employ everybody at decent wages in a self-respecting status, guarantee his civil liberties, and bring education and play to him, the bulk of our talk about 'the race problem' will remain a sinister mythology.

In a dirty civilisation the relation between black men and white will be a dirty one. In a clean civilisation the two races can conduct their business together cleanly, and not until then.

The Sunday Times comments, acidly: "The sluggishness of America's response is indicated by its date. Lippmann was writing in 1919."

The survey quotes the results of the U.S. Supreme Court judgment of 1954 against segregation in schools as "going far to explain the growing Negro disdain of Government or Supreme Court promises of action."

The results: In 1963 1.8 per cent. of Negro pupils in the South went to integrated schools: by 1965, 5.8 per cent.; today, only 13 per cent.—almost 14 years since the highest court in the land ruled it as every child's right.

On the economic plight of Negroes, The Sunday Times quotes a recent U.S. Department of Labor report which revealed real unemployment among Negroes in northern cities as high as 33.1 per cent. and in the South as high as 47.4 per cent. The report "exposed for the first time just how inadequate were the incomes of Negro city-dwellers . . . worsened by the fact that food prices in the ghetto may actually be higher than in better class suburbs . . . and made worse again by the prevalence of hire purchase interest rates . . . up to 289 per cent, and higher for cars and 285 per cent, on television sets."

The Sunday Times adds: "Such economic deprivation would surely be enough to spark riots on its own. But for good measure, the Negroes have been given sharp—and increasingly frequent—doses of political frustration over the last decade since the Civil Rights Bill passed Congress."

It points out, as a result of such frustration, the high hopes raised when President Johnson swept into office with a strong civil-rights program . . . but, in his January, 1967 Message to Congress, Mr. Johnson devoted just 45 words to civil rights; but lingered sternly on ways to fight "crime in the streets"—the accepted Goldwaterism for rebellious Negroes.
The most shocking part of the survey comes towards the end:
1966 marked the real beginning of the end of hope among the Negro leaders. By summer 1967 the posters of the Black Panther party ('Move on over—or we'll move on over you') were proliferating on the ghetto walls.

Intractable, perhaps, but so was Congress. Last year 14,000 children were killed or maimed by rats in the U.S.: on July 20, Congress killed a rat-control bill with laughter about 'rat patronage' and proposals for a 'bug corps'.

Ultimately, what is terrifying about the figure of 14,000 children killed or maimed by rats, is that America is a society sophisticated enough to produce that kind of statistic but now apparently too irresponsible to do anything about it.

*The Times*, London, turned over half a page in its magazine section to Negro Dr. Nathan Hare, 33, professor of sociology at Howard University, "who recently resigned as head of Howard's chapter of the American Association of University Professors to spend more time organising Black Power groups in Negro colleges".

Dr. Hare is a very angry man and these quotes from his article will explain why:

—The (Negroes') lack of faith in the ways of gaining freedom ... is a product of the moral decadence of American society—a decadence born in part of the conflict between what white Americans preach and what they practise, particularly in matters of race and color.

—Most black residents of urban communities ... find ... instead of the freedom they sought, more disillusionment and despair. Theirs is the dual alienation of what many white youth feel about U.S. activities in Vietnam, coupled with the scars of four centuries of abuse and cunning treachery to which black people are subjected in America.

—The most recent census, in 1960, showed virtually no gains, collectively, for black people in income, occupational advancement, or residential or educational desegregation. Negro family income is barely more than half that of whites, just as it was over half a century ago.

—While Negroes moved up very slightly in the 1940s (when they were needed in war industry) they failed ... to gain ground in the 1950s. Today, a dozen years after the Supreme Court decreed desegregation, most schools (like most churches) are still virtually all-black or all-white.

—There is today slightly more residential segregation of the races than there was in 1940. Five out of every six U.S. cities with more than 5,000 white households show indexes of segregation above 80 (complete segregation would produce an index of 100, absolute desegregation an index of 0). Two-fifths of all black people are imprisoned in the ghettos of the 12 largest cities with indices over 90.

—Efforts to snare black allegiance to the Vietnam war, fighting and dying in a foreign land for a freedom they do not have in their own country strike them as no less than appalling.
Dr. Hare concludes:
There is this new awakening of the black man in America ... Can the problem be solved this side of an out and out racial war? ... Right now nobody, least of all the White Establishment, appears genuinely to think so, although nobody but a sadist or a maniac courts violence unnecessarily.
But the United States is testimony to the fact, black people increasingly believe, that maniacal beliefs and acts can become collective and socially approved.
On the other hand, many people believe that, given the high degree of social organisation and technological control, a revolution in the United States is close to impossible. Even if a revolution is not possible, a civil war is, and "you can't fight in Vietnam and at home too" is the way one black rebel put it recently.
It may not be possible to overthrow a racist white America, but clearly America can be destroyed. The choice may no longer be left to her.

MARX ON NATIONAL FREEDOM

Labor cannot emancipate itself in the white skin where in the black it is branded.


No nation can be free if it oppresses other nations.


A people which enslaves other people forges its own chains.

Resolution of International Workingmen's Association, 1869.

* * *

THE MIDDLE EAST is the capitalist world's richest oil region, with prospected deposits of 32,000 million tons compared with 5,000 million in the United States.

American capital controls more than 50% of the oil output, British capital 34%, French about 6% and Japanese about 4%. The selling price ranges from $US11 to $15 a ton, while production cost is between $1 and $2.
On the occasion of the 50th anniversary of the USSR, a number of prominent Australians tell the significance to them of the October 1917 Socialist Revolution.

James Aldridge

EVERY YOUNG MAN of my generation in Australia had his life shaped for him by the October Revolution of 1917 whether he knew it or not and whether he likes it or not. It wasn’t the only event that decided our lives as we grew up in the bush or in the city or in the small country towns that always seem lost on our lazy rivers, but it became the most important one.

Young people today imagine that the older generation was always inclined to see things too much in black and white, but what they forget is that we actually lived in a black and white world, and had no other choice. If fascism had appeared in a world without socialism, nobody would have escaped it. That was the black and that was the white. What the socialist world did in those first twenty years of its existence was to establish a remarkable alternative which the world had always hoped to have but had never before achieved.

We have lived with the alternative now for fifty years, and we know that it works. Moreover it works better and better, despite the failures and the cruelties and the tensions that seem to pull it this way and that. Once we did claim that it was perfect. Now we know how foolish that was. Perfection is not yet the point. What fifty years of socialism is giving the world now is the only hope it’s got. It is still the alternative. It is still the achievement of god knows how many years of struggle.

It is still the pride of an awful lot of people in the world who have never even seen it, and will probably never see it. I hate to think what life would be like if it weren’t there. What more could a man say than that?
M. L. Oliphant

IN SCIENTIFIC and technological achievement the U.S.S.R. presents strange contrasts. Those natural sciences which are important for industrial growth and military strength — mathematics, physics and chemistry — have been fostered from the beginning, and show immense achievement. Knowledge gained in Russia and elsewhere has been applied rapidly and effectively in technology. In the age of computers, automation, specialized materials such as are necessary in jet engines and rockets, sophisticated electronics, and applications of nuclear energy, the U.S.S.R. has few equals. Soviet geology is excellent, and with its aid enormous resources of minerals, oil and natural gas have been discovered and exploited, especially in Siberia.

It is strange, therefore, that in some other ways the achievement has been so much less. Although some excellent modern buildings have been erected and many historic palaces and monuments restored with loving care and fine craftsmanship, the general design of houses, flats, factories and laboratories, is poor, and the workmanship shoddy. Many which I have visited show crumbling concrete and plaster, ill-fitting and badly finished woodwork, inadequate lighting and very elementary plumbing. Lifts, in even the best and most modern hotels, are of poor design and uncertain performance. While Soviet aircraft are among the best in the world, the organization at airports is chaotic and inefficient. Books are excellent, and very cheap, but the process of buying them is frustrating and time consuming. Obtaining meals in a restaurant is agonizingly slow, while buying medicine is reminiscent of entering an early Victorian pharmacy.

The most glaring anomaly, however, is the failure of this great nation to develop its agriculture. About 40 per cent of Soviet citizens still lead a peasant life on the land, as against 5-10 per cent. in other highly industrialised economies. The biological sciences, upon which advance in agriculture depends, have been neglected, and the best brains have all gone to the physical sciences. Perhaps this is due to the exigencies of defence and rapid industrialization, but the strange influence of Lysenko, now fortunately at an end, deterred good scientists from entering the biological field. However, it appears that this situation is now changing, and agriculture and animal husbandry in the Soviet Union may soon reach the same high standard of productivity and efficiency as has been achieved in nuclear energy, or the production of machine tools.
I FIND IT very interesting to compare the present conditions in the USSR with those of 50 years ago. Little did the people of the world anticipate the world wide changes in every field that developed as a result of the Russian Revolution in 1917.

As my personal struggle for the past sixty years has been to get equal status, rights and opportunities for women I will use the space at my disposal to report the phenomenal changes in this field in the USSR after the Revolution.

My earliest recollections are prohibitions as to what I should not do "because little girls did not do" that.

One of the experiences which gave me the greatest satisfaction in my life was when I went to the Soviet Union in 1938—there I saw women driving trains and buses—the engine driver and stoker of my train were both women. Women were working in the building industry—on the land—in fact everywhere. They seemed to have a free choice of jobs, and what is more, as long as 50 years ago they got the same rate of pay as the men and the same opportunities for advancement.

The USSR, by developing and utilising all its brains, has not only pioneered the way for women but has enabled women to make great contributions by the part they have taken in the development of research in the engineering and building industry, in farming and in every phase of science.

While doing this over the last fifty years the USSR has not neglected the Arts. Her ballet dancers, opera singers and musicians take their place side by side with the most celebrated artists of any other country.

An important aspect of the developments in the USSR is that they are nation wide. It is not only in Moscow and Leningrad that the gifted children can develop their talents—but in all the schools throughout the USSR all children are taught the arts and sciences as well as the routine subjects, and those that show the greatest promise in dancing, painting or any of the arts or sciences are sent to special schools, universities or conservatoria so that their talents may be fully developed. When the young people have completed their studies and qualified in their special training, they have no difficulty in finding employment. In fact jobs and opportunities are waiting for them.

These developments and the wide opportunities for the training of women in the USSR have resulted in a great expansion of the
opportunities open to women—especially in the medical profession.

Pioneers are necessary for progress in all fields. The USSR pioneered the development of the capacities of women. Now many countries are opening new opportunities to their women.

S. L. Macindoe

OF THE 18 European countries visited in 1965 the two weeks spent in the Soviet Union left the deepest impression. One could not but wonder at the advances made by an exhausted feudal Russia during a mere 50 years—progress made in spite of five years of civil war and foreign invasion, followed two decades later by devastation involving the death of an estimated 20 million Russians as they drove back the Nazi war machine.

Despite a comparatively low standard of housing, some consumer goods missing or not to our liking and slow hotel service, here clearly was a once backward society pioneering a new way of life with speed and vitality.

In Moscow and Leningrad the splendors of the past housed in museums and art galleries impressed more than their modern counter-parts—Moscow University, the Palace of Congresses, the Moscow Botanic Gardens, buildings for young pioneers and many research stations. The 60 permanent pavilions in the Exhibition of Soviet Economic achievements helped us to realise the emphasis placed on labor, science and agriculture, since the exhibition must represent the bringing together of those things the Government and Soviet people think are most important.

The Soviet Union places great emphasis on biological and agricultural research. It has a network of 1,000 research stations. The eight we visited seemed to be well equipped and staffed. Soviet plant breeding programs in most instances parallel those in other advanced countries and in some fields they are well ahead.

In contrast to the problem of small farm size in other European countries, virtually all agricultural land in the Soviet Union is organised into large collective and State farms. A collective farm was visited at Krasnodar. It is difficult to gauge the efficiency and output of labor on a property of 27,000 acres worked by 7,000 persons. It appeared the collective has many of the functions of an Australian country town as well as being a group of co-operatively farmed enterprises. Certainly extensive areas are well farmed with big machine and large scale animal raising projects run on a business basis. Collective farming appears to have many advantages as a way of life.
Fred R. Ayres

DESPITE the importance of trade and cultural relations between Australia and the Soviet Union over the past 50 years, very little direct exchange in agriculture has taken place. The scope and growing influence of Soviet agriculture in the world today is not generally recognised by the average Australian.

Because of lack of contacts, many Australians have been led to believe that the Soviet Union remains the undeveloped backward country of the 1917 era. The fruits of her experimentation, development and achievements in agriculture, which includes her pastoral industry, grain production, viticulture and tea, cotton and rice growing, have been almost completely ignored in Australia, except perhaps by a select few scientific workers. This has been to our disadvantage. Mainly this has been due to insular social and political prejudice, and a very real fear by the majority of producers, and even the population of Australia, that expressed interest in Soviet life, science, or agriculture, and particular contact or friendship with the few scientists, educationalists, artists and agriculturalists visiting Australia, would immediately lay them open to social and security pressure or interference. Over the 50 years our Australian newspapers generally have been antagonistic and prejudiced in dissemination of news and description of research in the U.S.S.R.

In the Soviet Union there has been tremendous specialised research into processed phosphates, natural salts and plant stimulants, and treatment of underground salt and mineralised water. The development of huge acreages of semi-desert land for pasture, and the diversion of rivers, and the construction of large canals in the sand deserts of south-eastern Kazakhstan should be of interest to us here. The great benefit Australia can derive from the knowledge obtained by scientists and others who are developing the vast semi-arid areas of Central Asia is not what it should be.

The continual and steady increase in national and personal prosperity in the Soviet Union in recent years, and prospects for its acceleration in the near future, offer tremendous and vital prospects for increased disposal of our surplus wool at profitable prices. (We export 94% of our total wool production). That is, provided that Australia institutes a more realistic and equitable balance of trade and exchange, and agrees to take some of the
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AUSTRALIAN SALES TO THE U.S.S.R.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1963-64</th>
<th>1964-65</th>
<th>1965-66</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wheat</td>
<td>£72,166,000</td>
<td>£43,907,000</td>
<td>£29,245,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wool</td>
<td>£33,992,000</td>
<td>£31,681,000</td>
<td>£18,588,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>£7,974,000</td>
<td>£853,000</td>
<td>£59,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>£114,132,000</td>
<td>£76,441,000</td>
<td>£47,892,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Balance of trade in Australia's favor is completely unrealistic. In 1963/64 it was 61 to 1; in 1964/65 it was 35 to 1; and in 1965/66 it was 30 to 1. This is despite the fact that we enjoy a Most Favored Trade Agreement signed in 1965.

Frank Nolan

OLD RUSSIA was a most backward country with the most down­trodden working class in Europe and millions of poverty-stricken peasants. Agriculture was extremely primitive.

She emerged from the first world war maimed and bankrupt. It would require but little imagination to realise the difficulties, turmoil, and chaos that faced the new Government on winning power. On top of this the new regime was called upon to resist attacks by Japanese, French, and British Imperialists plus assistance from America.

After the wars of intervention and the civil war the Government was faced with the task of restoring the country's industry and agriculture. This was completed in a comparatively short space of time and then followed a program of industrial development, the magnitude and boldness of which amazed the world and has since transformed the country into a powerful industrial State second only to the U.S.A.

One marvels at the tremendous progress made in all fields of economic and social endeavor and recalls the fact that in the days of the first 5 year plan most of the technicians were imported...
from America and paid high salaries. Russian technicians were few and far between.

The new Soviet Government from the first day of its existence has been striving for peace. By its very nature it needs peace to give its undivided energies to provide for the steadily rising standard of living and for improvements in the realms of Education, the Arts and Sciences.

The coming of world war two halted such peaceful developments and compelled the Soviet Government to use time and energy and the resources necessary to build such a life for a war which could only bring death and devastation.

That it was able to build up a military machine capable of withstanding the attacks of the Nazis is now history.

The revolution rescued the Russian people from the catastrophe to which the country was brought by the rulers of old Russia.

It extricated them from the imperialist war and saved the country from degeneration and destruction both political and economic.

It saved her from the imperialist aggressors. It emancipated her from economic slavery to foreign capital, it saved her from world economic crises which brought suffering and poverty to the people in the other countries in the late twenties and early thirties, and also from fascist reaction that raged around the capitalist world.

The revolution brought a new and better life to the Russian people. For humanity, it has laid the basis for a new social and economic system, a new advanced culture in which the new socialist man is being formed and it has brought into being that which the best minds of all races have envisaged—socialism.

Tom Wright

IN 1917, I was in the second year of my apprenticeship in Sydney working with Paddy Drew, a leading member of the Australian Socialist Party, who was giving attention to my political education. He spoke eloquently on the Russian Revolution, and from the first days was an ardent supporter of the bolsheviks.

This was a period of rising militant activity in the Australian working class movement. There was general support for the Russian people, activity against the war of intervention, and
support for the relief movement during the famine. The left-wing forces in Australia were profoundly influenced, leading to the formation of the Communist Party in 1920.

During 1927, I visited the Soviet Union as a representative of the Labor Council of NSW. This was the year that the Soviet economy was restored to the 1913 level, and preparations were being made for the first five year plan, to begin in 1928. Trotsky was opposing the five year plan as impossible of realisation. He denied the possibility of building socialism in one country, which caused a discussion throughout the Communist Party.

As well as the capitalist enemy without, the Russian workers had to contend with dangerous views from within. The Russian workers overcame all opposition and resolutely proceeded with the building of socialism.

My second visit to the Soviet Union was in 1952. After only a few years of peaceful socialist development, the Soviet people had been able to withstand the most powerful armed invasion in history, and, at the cost of enormous sacrifice and material loss, had defeated the fascist aggressors. The great creative forces of the Soviet people had made up for the tremendous war losses and had raised the economy to still greater heights.

Many new socialist states had come into existence and the old colonial empires were disappearing, and the imperialist states were a declining minority in the world.

In a further visit to the Soviet Union in 1963, I was able to witness again the great economic, social, and cultural progress. A dissenting voice from China had been raised within the socialist world, vilifying the Soviet government and Party and denying the possibility of peaceful co-existence between States with different social systems. The Soviet workers proceed firmly on their forward march at the head of world socialism, refuting their opponents, with practical achievements, and confirmed by history.

Katharine Susannah Prichard

TRIUMPH OF THE OCTOBER REVOLUTION in Russia changed the course of history. It is trite, perhaps, to say so, but it is nevertheless true. The October revolution introduced socialism on the basis of the ownership and administration of a country's resources by the people.

The U.S.S.R. has proved the case for socialism in practice. In a brief 50 years it has advanced from a backward, semi-feudal
country to one of the two most powerful sovereign states of our time. This has made a tremendous impact on peoples everywhere; inspired with hope and courage those struggling against poverty, exploitation and superstitions, for a better life.

The USSR has championed the cause of peace since the triumph of the great October Revolution. It has opposed the aggressive actions of other powers, as in the crisis over ownership of the Suez Canal; and intervened to negotiate a peaceful settlement of differences, as between India and Pakistan. It has opposed the gangster war of the United States of America in Vietnam, and supported North Vietnam and the National Liberation Front in South Vietnam in their resistance to this barbarous and unjust war. It has sponsored the movement for international co-operation and disarmament.

Recognition by the Soviet Government of equal rights and opportunities for women citizens has made a great difference everywhere to the status of women.

During 1966, we know, thirty-four per cent. of all deputies in the Supreme Soviets of Union and Autonomous Republics were women, and 390 women were deputies to the Supreme Soviet of the USSR. There are many women occupying high government posts, for instance, Yadgar Nasriddinova is Deputy Chairman of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR. Yekatarina Furtseva is Minister for Culture for the USSR. Several other women have ministerial rank. What courage and faith in her country’s scientists and government Valentina Tereshkova must have had when she became the first woman cosmonaut and explorer of space!

One phase of socialist culture which particularly impresses me is the extent of the Soviet Union’s publishing interests. These cover works of science and technology, the literature of Soviet and foreign modern writers, translations from innumerable languages, the classics of these languages, and the histories, fables and stories of races which didn’t even have a grammar or calligraphy until it was provided them by Soviet culture.

These scattered reflections don’t do justice to my profound realisation of what the October Revolution has meant to humanity. It charted a new way for the progress and peace of all peoples. Throughout the 50 years of its existence, the USSR has championed the cause of peace. May the star of the USSR always glow for the peace, friendship and good living of all peoples.
DISCUSSION:

EXPLOITATION ON THE INCREASE

BERNIE TAFT well opens an important subject in his article “Exploitation in Affluent Society” (ALR, April-May, 1967). As he demonstrates, marxists have never viewed exploitation in terms of a simple point of production formula, even though the point of production is its main seat. Exploitation under capitalism has always been a complex all-enveloping shroud that remains essentially the same but assumes different shapes as some surface features of capitalism itself change.

The rate of exploitation is increased by directly raising the intensity of labor, or, as is more usual nowadays, by raising labor productivity through technical change, and by minimising wage increases, increasing the working week, and raising the cost of living. A higher rate of exploitation of labor and a relative decline in living standards are primary but often underrated facts of present-day Australia. And as the application of advanced technology to production gathers momentum the rate of exploitation will undoubtedly snowball with it, as it has in the United States where the marxist economist Victor Perlo estimates a rise in the rate of exploitation in manufacturing of 25 per cent between 1958 and 1964.

In Australia the relative decline of living standards is best shown by the length of the working week, and the hours of labor contributed to production by the average husband-wife unit in return for the socially established and acceptable average standard of living for their family.

But first let us take a look at the hours worked by the adult male. Through systematic overtime and other devices the real working week in industry is increasing, and today is little behind the levels of the early 1940s.

In 1944, at the height of war production and under a 44-hour week, the average working week for adult males in industry was 43.61 hours. In 1964, in this so-called age of affluence, the average working week for adult males in industry was 42.84 hours, or about 45 minutes less per week than twenty years earlier. But at the heart of heavy industry, in foundry, engineering and vehicle production, the average working week for males in 1964 was 43.91 hours or eighteen minutes a week more than the all-industry average of 1944!

By taking the average home unit or husband-wife contribution to national production in relation to their material returns, the picture is worse still. Before the second war, when far less than 10 per cent of married women worked, a family when employed enjoyed the average standard of living in return for a husband-wife average of about 50 hours of work a week. But today, as most 'one-worker' families will testify, the average job with overtime tossed in will not return the average living standard. Today the weekly average contributed to national production per husband-wife team is more of the order of 60-65 hours for relatively the same return as before the war—that is, the socially established and acceptable standard of living. This is exploitation and relative decline of living standards of a very high order. Affluence (which is des-
cribcd by the Concise Oxford Dictionary as 'freely flowing, copious, abounding') is paid for dearly by Australian workers in long hours of toil. This is an economic fact of prime political importance and one the labor movement does far too little about.

In terms of practical politics I believe two things are needed:

First, well-planned research of the different facets of exploitation in Australia with more emphasis on the 'harder to see' aspects that are presently smothered by the fact there has been an absolute improvement of living standards. This should be followed of course by clear but profound dissemination of the findings with suitable emphasis on the moral and humanist factors.

Second, and most important, perhaps the whole labor movement should seek a new, offensive attitude on wages and wages campaigns. Of all the issues in Australian society crying out for radical reform none cries louder than wage levels and the cumbersome, one-sided wage fixing procedures.

In my view the labor movement presently stands flatfooted and in a malaise on wages campaigns and wage fixing methods. This will probably be aggravated by the not unexpected success recently of the employers' total wage claim over which the capitalists are now so jubilant. The unions appear to stagger continuously through long and costly court procedures before wage tribunals that do not seem to have clear terms of reference, but whose bias is perfectly clear.

The labor movement could usefully set its sights on an offensive campaign aimed at the political goal of reconstitution of wage fixing procedures. The precise nature of such procedures can't be spelled out in advance but it seems likely that on the judicial side—and we probably shan't escape the mercies of such for some time to come—the main need is for clear, legislatively established terms of reference for wage fixing tribunals to work upon.

From the labor movement's point of view, such terms of reference should not rest on a single formula or index but on several indices including productive capacity, price movements, profits, the needs of the family, and the moral factors of exploitation in a supposedly enlightened society.

A campaign for political and legislative reform of wage fixing terms, and such a campaign would no doubt embrace varying levels of industrial and political action, would have enormous unifying possibilities among rank and file workers who, I believe, are becoming increasingly disenchanted with the gross injustices of our 'affluent' society. Such a campaign would also help put the labor movement as a whole on a much-needed front-foot offensive on the most important economic issue of all.

CHARLIE GIFFORD

SOCIALISM AND DEMOCRACY

EDGAR ROSS, writing in ALR (August-September 1967) quoted from the booklet Revolution in Russia and Australia by R. S. Ross.

Ross was a remarkable man who saw the danger of uncritical support for the Soviet Union or, worse, the attempt to turn legitimate Soviet experiences into a theory applicable everywhere at every time.

Ross argued for the labor movement to base itself on Australian traditions.

"As a fact, the more I read on Russia and its situation and problems—the more I read by Lenin himself (and he grows bigger and ever bigger
to me)—the more I can see the possibility of Australasia finding its separate way, as greatly as Russia, to the New Order, and the supremacy of Labor.

He placed great value on Australian democratic practice and democratic institutions. He raised the possibility of transforming parliament into a genuinely representative body. His call for action on the political front was for nationalisation and his call for action at the industrial level was somewhat more than ‘One Big Union’. He raised the demand for workers’ control of any nationalised industry. Above all he was aware of the British heritage in Australia and called upon Marx’s views on Britain to suggest the possibility of a ‘peaceful and legal revolution’.

It is of significance that Ross headed one chapter of his booklet *The Road to Power*—in Australia. He argues against those Australian revolutionaries of the time who centred their view on the relative levels of democracy in both Australia and Soviet Russia. He criticised those who sought support for the dictatorship of the proletariat in the form then being practised in the USSR—that is with the disenfranchisement of certain classes and strata. Ross must have felt that this idea had important support since he argued heatedly against it. In considering a strategy for social change he sought not to reject Australian institutions and experience but to make the point that, “oppression and exploitation can be as simply and as surely ended by developing and strengthening our own industrial and parliamentary weapons as by seeking to overturn them in favour of weapons we are not fundamentally in tune with nor know how to apply as usefully as we do our own”.

In this respect he took to task those who claimed that democracy in Australia was a “sham and delusion”, although he regarded it as “incomplete”. He warned that hard won democratic rights must not be let go.

“If the suffrage be a moral right,” he said, “it must be immoral to dis disfranchise. We cannot copy the Bolsheviks in this matter. To suggest it is to invite our own disfranchisement. To coquet with the idea is to seek disaster. Our Australian system of the ballot and adult suffrage stands high as achievement and practice. If we say we have a bourgeois democracy, that may be correct as designating our social order, but it is not to say that the universal vote is bourgeois, for the universal vote is mass action of a very advanced character. We can, indeed, amend the details of its operation to provide for the recall and the referendum, but to insist that proletarian dictatorship demands its repudiation is to ask for confusion and conspiracy.”

His cry was for more not less democracy.

Ross put into his program as number one priority for a socialist movement, free speech, “the right and urge to say anything . . . in a word, no censorships whatsoever—none, and again none and still again none.”

He regarded free speech as fundamental to achieve socialist political action. While he saw nationalisation as a main aim he called for action in the name of socialism to lessen hours of work, increase wages, abolish militarism and the laws of inheritance. Summing up his view, he said, “Socialism is not merely a system, but a process.”

Industrially, he saw the need for “One Big Union”, but this was but one of his six points. Together with free speech and socialist political action, his fourth point was internationalism, amply demonstrated by his support for the Russian revolution, which he saw as one of the great
events in the history of mankind. His fifth and sixth points indicate something of the depth of the man. They were opposition to sectarianism and his stress on the role of ideas or as he called it “character culture”, the moral values of socialism.

Ross therefore wanted to emulate everything in the Russian revolution which would assist the movement for social change in Australia, but he had no hesitation in rejecting those parts of the Russian experience he considered irrelevant or harmful.

In this sense he was truly a pace-setter, worthy of study today.

—Mavis Robertson.

RESEARCH FUND

THE first research appointment has just been made by a Fund launched in Australia early in 1967—the Socialist Research Fund. The Fund was formed because its sponsors considered that in Australia the development of serious inquiry and research into problems of concern to all socialists was hampered for lack of direct encouragement and support. Its initial statement says:

“If a new level of consciousness and direction is to be found on the left, fundamental re-thinking is needed. The increase in the flow of isolated pieces of research, in Australia and abroad, suggests that such re-thinking can now be more soundly based and fruitful than in the past. But what is lacking is the opportunity for serious theoretical work in the field of socialist ideas.”

The extent to which such work can be assisted, and the variety of ways, will depend on what support socialists give the Fund.

As a first step, the Trustees decided to raise sufficient funds to support, on a minimum stipend, one research worker for a two-year period. An appointee was to be invited who would “inquire broadly within the socialist perspective and the marxist method,” and would be entirely independent as to the questions studied or the use to be made of any material produced. Support in the early stages was sufficient to show the Trustees that an immediate appointment in these terms could be made. Mr. J. D. Blake of Sydney has now accepted the first appointment, as from July, 1967.

GEOFF SHARP.

HELEN G. PALMER.

Trustees: Socialist Research Fund, Box 2227T, G.P.O., Melbourne.
The Secretary of the Communist Party in South Australia analyses some of the causes of the growing tensions between Liberal and Country Parties.

THE LIBERAL-COUNTRY PARTY coalition which forms the Australian Federal Government is torn with internal conflict and the leaders have great difficulty in maintaining even the appearance of unity. The collapse of the coalition would spell the end of a long period of domination in Federal Parliament, by these reactionary parties.

The Basic Industries Group recently returned to its attack upon the Country Party's policies and its leader, Mr. McEwen, who in turn branded the Group as "faceless and nameless but very rich indeed and very reckless in misrepresentation" in its efforts to destroy the Country Party. There are quite a few others, members of the Liberal Party and its agencies, who also have the same objective.

Many of the issues dividing the coalition have been evident for a considerable time. They include economic, political and personal differences expressed in such things as protective and tariff policies, markets, electoral boundaries, decentralisation, foreign investment and the fight for leadership. They affect State politics, where the conflict is sometimes bitter in the extreme and these in turn influence the Federal position.

Important reasons for the sharper divisions include the increased competitiveness of markets for rural production, the decline in the relative importance of the rural industries in the Australian economy compared to the spectacular growth of secondary industry, the enhanced place of manufactures, minerals and metals in exports and the growth of monopoly.

With the growth of monopoly the rural industries are beset with rising costs and generally falling prices and this is also
the picture on a world scale with a growing gap between the advanced industrial countries and the underdeveloped, raw material exporting countries. This is referred to as "an increasingly competitive world in which the long term dice are, as far as price is concerned, generally loaded against commodity producing and exporting nations."1

Big business, nevertheless, and including overseas capital, has increasingly acquired interests in the rural field to the detriment of the smaller producers. The industrialists, financial and commercial interests represented by the Liberal Party, are more aggressive in their attempts to extend their control, increase their wealth and combat the leftward trends of the labor-democratic movement and the anti-monopoly stance of the smaller farmers.

The Country Party is dependent upon the rural population which tends to decline. The greater the problems of rural industry the more protective the Country Party becomes and the more it runs foul of those forces in the rural field such as the big graziers who oppose state controls and who believe they can "go it alone" without protection; those rural commercial interests who have more in common with the Liberal Party and those economists who oppose protection of inefficient industries.

The Country Party which became a political force in the early 20s in the various states gained from the weighting of votes in favor of the rural electorates.

In Queensland, the Country Party is the stronger partner in the coalition. It won the additional seat of Kennedy at the last Federal elections. In NSW, Victoria, West Australia and Tasmania the Country Party exerts considerable influence in State politics either in coalition with the Liberals, in government or in opposition, or by bargaining independently. In South Australia where farming and manufacturing interests have, in many cases, been long identical, a single Liberal Country League was established in 1932.

Federally, the Country Party collaborated with the United Australia Party before World War II through such politicians as Earle Page, A. G. Cameron and A. W. Fadden. Following the wartime Labor governments of J. Curtin and J. B. Chifley, the Liberal Party formed in 1944, joined with the Country Party to become, in 1949, the Menzies-Fadden coalition, later the Menzies-McEwen Government and at present the Holt-McEwen combination.

Country Party political philosophy, while believing that the primary industries are basic to Australia's welfare, also claims to speak for the nation as a whole.
The Country Party is a Party which is pledged to make the strongest possible effort in the interests of all sections of the community. It is a Party, however, which has a specialised knowledge of the problems of the men and women on the land and those in the country cities and towns of Australia.2

Generally it has resisted pressures to amalgamate with the Liberal Party, maintaining that adequate protection for the rural industries is best achieved by a separate party in the form of the Country Party and that its aims are indirectly assisted by the competition of other parties seeking support from rural voters.

It is jealous of its favored electoral advantage and not willing to agree to changes in boundaries that would weaken its position in the countryside where population grows at a much slower rate than in the cities or even declines.

Mr. McEwen, as Minister of Trade and Industry, has been accused of feather-bedding both rural industry and manufacturing. It is said that rising production costs for the rural industries are caused by uneconomic protection of secondary industry. A big advertisement during the Federal elections accused the Country Party of "courting the big influence of city industry, supporting misdirected subsidies, restrictions, quotas, and tariff charges that are forcing up production costs for the man on the land."

Mr. McEwen replied to his detractors: "We have no intention of retreating from these policies. We are protecting Australian manufacturing because in that way we are protecting the growth of Australia."

The Country Party has shown that it is not simply a complementary part of the coalition, responsible for the rural population, but is in fact a rival to the Liberal Party for votes.

Central to the problem of Liberal Party-Country Party relations are the differences on economic policies. The costs of rural production have been steadily rising while the return to the farmers has at best remained stationary or tended to fall.

During a recent visit to Queensland the Treasurer, Mr. McMahon, pointed out that

Whereas in 1958-59 farm income had reached $941 million on the basis of a gross value of rural production of $2,523m., in 1965-66 it reached only $902m. on the basis of a level of rural production $678m. greater. Costs between those two periods had risen by $689m.

Australia's biggest industry, wool, is experiencing severe competition from synthetic fibres, falling prices and rising costs. With the expiration of patent rights, a price war has begun between the big synthetic fibre producers, further depressing the market.
It was reported in August: "The Yorkshire wool textile industry is going through the biggest slump it has experienced for 15 years and, in particular, few can recall when trade was as slow in top making and spinning."

The proportion of wool to total Australian export earnings fell from 29% in 1965-66 to 24% in 1966-67 and prices fell 2.70 cents per lb. in the same period. The ratio of prices received by farmers for wool compared with prices paid for producing it has fallen from a base figure of 100 for the average of five years ending in 1950, to 78 in 1963-64; 63 in 1964-65; 62 in 1965-66 and 61 in 1966-67.

The problems of the wool industry are one of the important reasons for increased tensions in the coalition. While Mr. McEwen supported the referendums of 1951 and 1965 for a wool reserve price scheme, leading Liberals co-operated with the big graziers to defeat the plan. The big graziers, whose main income is from wool sold on the international market, believe in free trade and the present wool auction system. They depend on adequate capital to keep ahead of the cost-price squeeze by improving flocks and properties to increase productivity.

Wheat farmers, who are an important base for the Country Party, have grown from 45,000 to 55,000 in the last 10 years. Many of them also grow wool and from their experience of the benefits of wheat stabilisation, they favor a more orderly marketing system for wool.

It is the big graziers, many with other business interests, like Mr. C. W. Russell and Mr. R. Chapman spokesmen for the Basic Industries Group, some wool brokers and rightwing influences who, it appears, are associated with the somewhat sinister and secretive BIG.

Mr. Russell stated that the purpose of BIG was to change the policies of the Country Party, that the coalition was unnecessary and that it would be better for the Liberal Party to develop its own rural section. He said BIG could actively campaign against the Country Party at the next elections. In the 1966 Federal elections BIG campaigned against C.P. candidates in six electorates.

Other rural industries such as dairying, sugar, tobacco and dried fruits, are subsidised by the Federal Government. If Britain is successful in joining the European Economic Community, the loss of markets to Australia may require subsidies for other commodities, such as canned fruit.
Some economists on purely economic grounds argue that subsidies are wasteful.

When an Australian rural industry strikes trouble, political pressures generally result in subsidies and loans to hold inefficient producers in the industry, thus preventing a redistribution of resources. In 1960 an enquiry into the dairying industry proposed that 3,000 dairymen in less fertile areas should be eliminated from the industry. A later series of recommendations from the Australian Dairy Industry Council advocated that the subsidy should be kept at $27 million, that loans should be granted to allow the amalgamation of inefficient farms and that retraining of those wishing to leave the industry should be investigated.

Earlier Mr. McEwen's warnings about the adverse effect from the loss of trade received only lukewarm support in the coalition; since then he has been criticised for not gaining more in the negotiations.

As far back as 1960, while Mr. Holt was Federal Treasurer there were differences on this matter. Mr. McEwen disagreed with Mr. Holt on import licensing and the credit restrictions. The 1961 recession and electoral reverses for the coalition, seriously undermined Holt's prestige and McEwen was tipped as a possible successor to Sir Robert Menzies. It was in this situation that L. H. Bury, Minister for Air and, significantly, Minister Assisting the Treasurer, publicly stated that the economic consequences of Britain joining the Common Market had been exaggerated and that Mr. McEwen's warnings were having a depressing effect upon the business community. As a result of his row with Mr. McEwen, Mr. Bury was forced by Sir Robert Menzies to resign—against the advice of Mr. McEwen. "It didn't prevent the Liberal Party for years from pursuing a campaign of calumny against me for compelling Menzies to sack Bury," said Mr. McEwen. In criticism of the Country Party, Maxwell Newton in Nation wrote:

In domestic affairs it is notorious that the Government does not have one economic policy. There are two economic policies, as anyone can glean from reading the Treasury Annual Economic Survey, followed by Mr. McEwen's speech to the United Farmers and Woolgrowers' Association Conference on July 17. The Treasury economic policy is based on efficiency. Mr. McEwen's policy is based on hand-outs for the perpetuation of inefficiency. In his report to the UFWA, the biggest woolgrower body in any of the States and one in favor of protection, Mr. McEwen rightly condemned the United States, from which "we buy twice as much as she buys from us," for retaining the tariff on Australian wool. Also at this meeting Mr. McEwen criticised Britain for its lack of cooperation during the Kennedy Round negotiations and for its failure to give assurances for future Australian
Mr. McEwen has been accused of interfering with and reducing the independence of the Tariff Board in favor of his own theories on tariffs. But the debate on this matter is part of the difference on economic policy. The anti-Country Party correspondent, Maxwell Newton, wrote:

The real issue is the policy of extravagantly high protection being espoused by the Department of Trade and Industry and by Mr. McEwen for his own political reasons. Those asking for more independence for the Tariff Board are really asking for more moderate tariffs.

They don't want a Tariff Board which is receiving its riding instructions from a Minister and a Department who are jointly engaged in making friends and influencing people for and on behalf of the Australian Country Party, a party which is seeking an eventual role as The Australian Party, befriending those who need hand-outs in city and country alike, the Party of "all-round protection", of inefficiency, of kick-backs and subsidies, of high home prices and dumping of exports, the party that appeals to much that is cheap and base in our national character.8

Against such arguments the Country Party in Western Australia during the last Federal election stated:

The so-called Basic Industries Group is vigorously opposing Country Party policies for wheat and dairying stabilisation, fertiliser subsidies and all Country Party policies which help to compensate primary producers, who have to sell their products on world markets.

It blamed spokesmen for BIG for defeating the 1965 wool marketing scheme.9

In addition it accused the Liberals of wanting to rip up the Uniform Fuel Prices Act, the numerous Acts giving taxation concessions to country people and the tariff acts preventing cheap imports from overseas.

The NSW chairman of the Country Party, Mr. R. J. Hunt said: "The Australian Country Party always has and always must insist that tariff protection is not the basic cause of undue stress on the export industries." He blamed the increase in farm costs of 15 per cent in the last three years for the difficulties.10

No doubt the coalition's strife has a great deal to do with the clash of personalities. It has been freely stated that the ambitious Federal Treasurer, Mr. McMahon, wants the position of Deputy Prime Minister, at present occupied by Mr. McEwen, as a step towards the Prime Minister's position.

Mr. McEwen's advancing years mean that he must soon relinquish the Deputy Prime Ministership, a position which up to the present in the coalition Government has been reserved for the Leader of the Country Party. Possible successors to his position
as Leader of the Country Party are already being discussed. But it is a fact that some of those who are loudest in their censure of the Country Party and its leader are strongest in their praise for Mr. McMahon for his activities. At the same time two rivals for the future leadership of the Country Party, both young — are Mr. D. Anthony, Minister for the Interior and Mr. I. Sinclair, Minister for Social Services.

Maximilian Walsh wrote:

Already Mr. McMahon's propagandists are busy pouring cold water on either Mr. Sinclair or Mr. Antony being Deputy Prime Minister, and, in the absence of Mr. Holt, acting as Prime Minister should Mr. McEwen retire in their favor.11

After the Federal elections Mr. J. Hallett, Canning, WA and Mr. D. Maisey from Moore in the same State, were tipped as possible Country Party Ministers and replacements for Mr. McEwen.

Mr. McEwen has been charged with entering into an agreement with Mr. Chamberlain of the WA ALP for an exchange of preferences prior to the last elections. Whether this is true or not, his CP policies are often closer to those of the labor movement than they are to those of the Liberals

Mr. McEwen has long been critical of unrestricted foreign investment—"selling a bit of our birthright every year"—a policy which the Liberals have encouraged. He has particularly condemned overseas investment which buys up existing industry and contributes nothing to development.

He has criticised the overseas shipowners for their regular increases in freight charges and has supported development of Northern Australia despite Liberal attempts to blame him for the abandonment of the second stage of the Ord River scheme.

If the labor movement studies the needs of the working farmers a greater area of agreement can undoubtedly be found that will hasten the day when the labor movement and the country people can join in a coalition to their mutual advantage.

4 Quarterly Review of Agricultural Economics, April 1967.
7 Maxwell Newton, Nation, July 29 1967.
8 Maxwell Newton, Nation, June 3 1967.
10 The Australian, June 22 1967.
THE ART OF HONORE DAUMIER

An Australian artist reviews Daumier: Man of His Time by Oliver W. Larkin, Professor Emeritus of Art, Smith College, U.S.A. The book was published this year by Weidenfeld and Nicolson. Price $8.90.

THIS IS A delightful work on the art of the great French realist, Honore Daumier (1808-1879). The clue to its originality lies in its title. It is the concept of Daumier as the complete man and artist of his time which lends distinction to the book.

Professor Larkin sees Daumier's genius as expressing the ideology of the French middle and lower classes in their revolutions and counter-revolutions from 1830 to the Paris Commune of 1871. He draws attention to the artist's prophetic significance for our time, the twentieth century.

The handsome cloth-bound volume, 7" x 9", contains 245 well designed and printed pages which include twenty devoted to notes, references and bibliography. There are 100 excellent photogravure black and white reproductions and eight color plates. Together they cover a wide range of Daumier's art, though the emphasis is clearly on his graphic work, his lithographs rather than his paintings and sculpture.

The chapters analysing his development and significance as a painter are none the less penetrating. Interest in the color plates is heightened by the inclusion of less familiar works such as the "Fugitives" from the Minneapolis Institute of Arts and the Boston Museum's lovely "Horsemens". Of his two famous and beautiful studies of a working woman and child "The Washerwoman" the version reproduced is that owned by the Albright-Knox Gallery, not the one in the Louvre.

Two magnificent photographic portraits by the artist's friend Nadar expose the artist's splendid head with its great open brow, plebeian features and expression of calm, good-humored intelligence. This is the man of whom the draughtsman Forain said: "He was the most generous of us all."

In the scholarly text Oliver Larkin treats in historical detail the evolution of Daumier's manysided art and the outstanding
movements, events and ideas of his time to which his art was related. He deals blows at some familiar myths, throwing fresh light on the question of Daumier's "bondage" to the lithographic stone, his poverty and his blindness. Like many artists, Daumier had no money or business sense at all. He was often in difficulties and at the end there was no money left. The State paid for his funeral.

Famous as he was because of his newspaper cartoons and illustrations only one exhibition of his paintings was held in his lifetime and that barely a year before his death at Valmondais.

But over and above the fees received for his drawings and lithographs Daumier sold paintings from his studio to very perceptive as well as wealthy collectors. The facts are that most of the paintings shown at this exhibition organised by friends and colleagues had to be borrowed for the occasion from collectors. The exhibition strengthened his reputation enormously, particularly as a painter in oils and watercolors, but it was also a financial loss. He received a small pension towards the end of his life. The State which he had lampooned for nearly half a century felt obliged, under pressure from the artist's more influential admirers, to offer him the Ribbon of the Legion of Honor. He refused it with modest dignity.
His standing was such that he could come across forgeries of his work in dealer's windows.

His blindness, such an especially terrible blow to an artist, was not absolute but intermittent and of varying severity. In fact, as late as 1872-73 he was able to execute some of his most brilliant lithographs, such as the "European Equilibrium".

Daumier was born at Marseilles, the son of a glazier who wrote poetry and who introduced his gifted and imaginative son to good literature. Where, asks Professor Larkin, in the welter of conflicting opinions of nineteenth century France was Daumier to take his stand?

The German poet Heine wrote that he had seen in Paris artisans reading Robespierre, Marat, Cabet and Babeuf, “writings that smell of blood.” He had seen half-naked foundry workers beating time with their hammers to the tune of songs which “seem to have been composed in Hell”. There were political newspapers inflaming the fires. Philipon, described by someone as “journalism made flesh”, was the supreme tactician behind journals like Caricature and Charivari. He hired Daumier first to draw for Caricature and then for Charivari. Caricature experienced four years and ten months of crippling fines, confiscations and prison terms before expiring. Daumier received a six months sentence during his first year with the paper. Philipon’s tireless manoeuvrings enabled Charivari to survive such persecutions for several decades.

*The Uprising, oil.* Phillips Collection, Washington, D.C.
Pierrot Singing To The Guitar. C. Reinhardt, Winterthur.
Daumier was 23 when his drawing “Gargantua”, depicted a fat monarch excreting favors, honors and gold to his sycophants gained him his jail sentence. The sentence did nothing to deter him from resuming violent attacks on the regime whose detested monarchist principle was epitomised by the pear-headed Louis-Phillipe, imposed on the 1830 July Revolution by Adolphe Thiers acting for a triumphant and reactionary bourgeoisie.

Thiers, a shrewd little lawyer from Aix, was a rabid opponent of universal suffrage and an arch opportunist. As a caricaturist Daumier pursued Thiers mercilessly year after year, as he did the fat monarch.

In 1834 he published a large drawing showing Louis-Phillipe waving his gamp furiously at a sturdy, defiant young typesetter who stands with clenched fists crying out in defence of Freedom of the Press: “Don’t meddle with it.”

This typesetter is one of the few examples of the organised worker to appear in Daumier’s work. He is drawn with sympathy and without condescension, to use Professor Larkin’s terms, and as one who deserves the tribute which Victor Hugo was to offer in later years—“true, formidable and sincere.”

Whenever Daumier drew or painted working class men or women he invariably invested them with their full dignity and humanity. Unlike many of the solid citizenry of his day he had no fear of the working class and depicted the people with warmth and understanding. The peasant does not often appear among his images, but when he invented Ratapoil, the political bully and magsman, he made one drawing of the scoundrel blowing his shady promises into the ear of a wary peasant who turns aside with a wonderfully observed scepticism, his earthy commonsense warning him against the glib tongued humbug.

In 1834 crowds gathered before the publisher’s window where Daumier’s lithograph “Rue Transnonain” was displayed. The workers’ patience with a regime which blandly ignored them was becoming exhausted. Strikes had broken out in Lyons and then in Paris. Minister of the Interior Thiers rode alongside Marshal Brugaud into the crossfire of the barricaded streets. An officer was wounded by a sniper. Troops in retaliation broke into private houses in Rue Transnonain and butchered the inhabitants without discrimination. Beaudelaire said of Daumier’s great drawing: “Only silence and death remain.” This print was to serve as a warning and a reminder. Oliver Larkin recalls that Flaubert, wanting to explain, in his novel The Sentimental Education,
how a character had become a republican, described how the young Dusadier, standing before a grocer’s shop in Rue Transnonain, observed soldiers with bloody bayonets and with human hair stuck to their gunstocks. The drawing persists with a grim relevance today with its wanton murder of negroes.

So, as Larkin says, for nearly forty years Daumier’s drawings were to prove his

Obstinate belief in a Republic, in social, economic and political equality, the right of all Frenchmen to determine who should best represent them, and full freedom of written and spoken opinion.

Through characters like Ratapoil, Robert Macaire, Prudhomme, and an array of cynical lawyers, judges, bloodletters, quacks and assorted fakers, he created undying generalisations which typify the essence of political and social cant, hypocrisy, moral corruption and coldblooded self-enrichment.

According to Larkin, Daumier favored the democracy of the historian Michelet who when “the clerical pack were in full cry against him” cried from the class room: “We have overthrown one dynasty to drive you out and if need be we shall destroy half a dozen.”

Professor Larkin insists that between the 4,000-odd political and social lithographs and drawings on wood and Daumier’s paintings there exists an intimate, if complex relationship. As a painter he studied closely Rembrandt, Rubens and Fragonard but the graphic elements in his painting owed much to forms developed for lithography.

*Testimony Behind Closed Doors*, water color. Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek, Copenhagen, Denmark.
At times his paintings commenced with ideas from his newspaper drawings. The watercolor "Three Gossiping Women" with its simple, massive forms derives directly from the lithograph "Yes, Madame Fribochon".

The author refutes the views of the English theorists Michael Sadleir, Roger Fry and Clive Bell that Daumier was a frustrated painter whose gifts were crippled by poverty, obsession with social and moral issues and enslavement to the litho stone and newspaper deadlines.

Although Daumier was often dragged from his easel to make a *Charivari* lithograph it is obvious that drawings made as late in life as the brilliant "European Equilibrium" and others were expressions of passionate conviction.

His lithographs had developed his graphic powers and made him the creator of forms which most completely expressed the outlook and ideas of the radical lower middle class of his time.

Beaudelaire compared him to masters like Ingres and Delacroix. Delacroix himself wrote to Daumier that there was no man he admired and respected more. Professor Larkin quotes the German Daumerist Stahl who wrote in the 1920's: "What stunted minds the purists must have to ignore the fact that Daumier labored all his life for a free and happy society."

Reflecting on the painter's many pictures of Don Quixote and Sancho Panza and in particular on these later works which sacrificed all descriptive detail until the figure stood for the unending conflict between the "generous dream and the harsh reality, the lean and the fat in man's existence", the author again spurns the view of aesthetes that Daumier turned to painting as a relief "from being significant." On the contrary he says, and I agree, the paintings were his search for "deeper significance."
The astonishing freedom of the expressive brushstrokes in paintings like "Pierrot Singing To The Guitar" and many studies of sculptors and painters in their studios, as well as the superbly free play of line in pen sketches like that of his friend Corot, is quite prophetic of twentieth century expressionist modes.

The breadth of paintings like "The Uprising", the feeling for mass and monumental forms in "Head of a Man", a study for the picture of revolution in the Budapest Museum, and in the later Don Quixote paintings, have influenced strongly the extensive and varied modern Social Realist trend.

In many of these works the light which flashes dramatically through them is not merely light at all but is an important dynamic element assisting the plastic organisation of form. Daumier's use of light was thus radically different from that of the impressionists for whom light was in fact the subject of the picture.

The American novelist Henry James, in a short but thoughtful booklet called "Daumier—Caricaturist", surprisingly overlooked in Larkin's otherwise comprehensive bibliography, wrote that Daumier's drawings belonged to "the highest art" because of their "peculiar seriousness". Daumier's figures were so foolish, he wrote, yet "they give us a strong sense of the nature of man; they are so serious they are almost tragic."

Oliver Larkin's final paragraph is worth quoting in full:
In our present world, where Sancho more often represents our mood than does his venturesome companion, where individuals often feel helpless in the mass, where men begin to doubt their own capacity to think and to act their way through the injustices, the impasses, the threat of total disaster, we can ill afford to take any but the broadest and most comprehensive view of Daumier, whose luminous common sense can still in the context of our time lay bare our small meannesses, our misplaced ambitions, our stupidly false values, our moral ambiguities.

Nor by the same token can we dispense with his constant reminder, in hundreds of drawings and paintings, of his unshakable belief in the strength, dignity and wisdom of the human creature.
A Greek migrant, now a member of the National Committee of the Communist Party of Australia, stresses the need for new labor movement policies towards migrants.

THE LARGE SCALE of post war immigration is unprecedented in Australia's history in its volume, continuity and—what is significantly new—in the large numbers of non-British migrants. It is having a tremendous impact on the nation, and on the labor movement in particular, yet it has been subjected to less analysis by the left forces than any other major aspect of Australian life.

Immigration is now accepted with fewer reservations in the labor movement. Workers have seen that living standards did not break down and soccer did not take over Australian Rules.

The migrants being poured into the fast-growing monopoly enterprises of GMH and BHP have found themselves in bitter class conflicts, and have drawn closer to the trade unions. Hence class unity has been slowly overtaking national prejudices. But this reflects rather the overcoming of fears than a proper understanding of the historical significance of immigration.

Working class policies and attitudes have been very much influenced by the fact that the ruling class sees immigration as a means to strengthen its own position, using it, when able, to weaken the bargaining power of the trade unions. The deep-seated White Australia concept has also played a part in clouding migration in general with suspicion and in some cases with enmity. The only policy the labor movement appears to have on immigration is to limit it at times of recession. It is in effect, at best a non-immigration policy, and at its worst an anti-immigration one. The labor movement should have a positive policy on immigration.

Australia is becoming industrialised more rapidly than ever before. Industrialisation requires workers and more workers to build bigger and better factories, to design and operate new
machines, to transport and sell the manufactured goods. Britain and Germany, in the initial stages of their industrial revolution, created workers out of their country's peasants. Because Australia was launched in the era of capitalism, every step forward was accompanied by the import of workers, some with working class backgrounds, others of peasant or lower middle class origin.

As a result of the rapid industrialisation most migrants join the ranks of the working class. This objectively strengthens the forces for social change. But the strength of the working class movement cannot be judged by numbers alone. It depends on solving many problems, and when workers of more than one nationality are concerned the problems are more complex.

**MAIN FEATURES OF POST WAR IMMIGRATION**

The main characteristics of post-war immigration are its volume and diversity. From October 1945 to September 1966, 2,500,000 people have migrated to Australia, of whom 2,150,000 have settled permanently. In addition, according to official figures, nearly 900,000 children were born to migrant parents in that period. Almost one-quarter of Australia's present population of 11,500,000 is the direct result of post-war immigration.

The conditions that produced this phenomenally large migrant flow—economic expansion in Australia, uncertainties and upheavals in Europe—do not remain constant. Australia's involvement in the Vietnam war coupled with certain economic and political improvements in some West European countries is already reducing arrivals, and increasing departures. The Immigration Department warned last year that it is becoming harder to obtain sufficient migrants from the existing sources with the existing incentives.

To partly meet this situation the Government has provided in this year's budget payment of fares for the first time to certain non-British migrants and old age pensions to non-naturalised persons. New sources are being officially canvassed and of late Asian migrants are being considered for Australia's mining ventures. However, the overall economic situation in Britain and Europe and Australia's rate of development should continue to make possible a large flow of migrants, with Britain, Italy and Greece providing 2/3 of the total.

Before the Second World War almost 90% of all migrants to Australia were British. But, of the 2,150,000 permanent settlers since 1945 approximately 50% have come from non-British European countries. This Immigration Department table (November
1966) gives the permanent and long-term arrivals in Australia between 1945-1966.

| Country     | British       | Yugoslavian  | Italian     | Hungarian  | Greek       | Latvian     | Dutch       | Russian    | German     | Czechoslovakian | Polish     | Spanish     |
|-------------|---------------|--------------|-------------|------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|------------|------------|----------------|------------|-------------|-------------|
|             | 1,334,407     | 60,136       | 300,031     | 28,633     | 152,074     | 20,050      | 141,616     | 16,861     | 107,176    | 12,336        | 83,210     | 12,850      |

1,172,329 migrants have come from 40 non-English speaking countries. The British total includes 45,000 Maltese and 20,000 Cypriots. Furthermore, the percentage of migrants returning home is far greater among British than non-British. It is lowest among Southern Europeans. The nationality figures do not apparently take into account that children born to non-British migrants, particularly Southern Europeans, consider themselves in most cases more non-British than British. The Italian Chamber of Commerce estimated last year there are 500,000 Italians in Australia. The Greek figure is probably well over 200,000.

Altogether 90% of post war migrants have come from capitalist West Europe. Of the remainder, some 220,000 have come from the socialist countries, mainly as displaced persons or refugees after the last war. Some of these left their native land because of their violent opposition to socialism or their fear of having to answer for collaboration with the Nazis. It is among this small section that one finds the fascist elements such as the Ustashi.

Politically, migrants reflect very much the society they come from. Many have had important experience in struggles against capitalist exploitation and war. The Communist and/or Social Democratic Parties in England, Italy, Greece, Holland and Germany are mass parties. Migrants are influenced by what goes on in the countries of their origin. In many European countries there is a left trend, with growing unity of the left forces. Progressive migrants could contribute usefully to the current discussion on the concept of the left alliance on the basis of their overseas experience and the excellent mass position some of them have among their compatriots in Australia.

Political and industrial struggles involving migrants will produce better results if some thought is given to the overseas and community affairs close to their minds and hearts. Greek migrants, for instance, are wrapped up now in the political battles in Greece.
IMPACT ON THE LABOR MOVEMENT

Industrial workers have comprised 50% of all permanent settlers in Australia since 1945. The 1961 census showed the percentage of industrial workers in the whole Australian population as approximately 30%. The difference between those two percentages demonstrates the impact of mass migration on the working class.

In the Ford plant (Broadmeadows) 36% of all workers are Greeks, 28% Italians and 22% either British or locally-born. Non-British migrants make up substantial and often majority percentages in these industries: Vehicle, steel, building, transport, clothing, rubber, glass, liquor, food. The occupational changes brought about by technological advances will expand still further the percentage of foreign-born workers in industry.

The industrial working class is being replenished in large numbers by first generation migrants as the sons and daughters of the Australian-born workers and the migrants themselves are increasingly required to fill in the new positions. Most Southern Europeans, unlike British and Northern Europeans, are becoming industrial workers for the first time. For them the development of trade union consciousness and organisation is fundamental. Recent struggles which involved thousands of migrants (GMH strike, Mt. Isa dispute, claims of railway workers in Victoria) have shown:

1. Militancy and enthusiasm for struggle, motivated by longstanding economic and moral injustices, and influenced by the militant labor traditions of their birthplace.

2. Impatience and anarchistic tendencies, resulting mainly from non-working class background and difficulty in understanding the tactical line of the unions, their craft composition and the shackles of penal powers.

NATIONAL MINORITY GROUPS

Another important fact is that Southern Europeans are emerging as national minority groups in industries and localities. There are several reasons for this:

1. A big gap in social, economic, political, cultural and psychological background.

2. The inferior social and economic position they are made to occupy. They usually get the lowest-paid jobs and the oldest inner suburban houses. Although they are better off than in the old country they also compare their lot with other sections here.
3 The strong migration current which acts as an ethnic blood transfusion.
4 The need to face the new world together.
5 Fear in the labor movement that migrants will be used to lower living standards.
6 The policy of assimilation influenced by the White Australia concept which in essence, denies the national identity of migrants and the existence of specific problems and demands unconditional acceptance of the Australian way of life.

These factors undergo changes. But the trend towards national minority consciousness and organisation will grow in the immediate future because of the volume of immigration and its concentration in particular areas.

An Italian or Greek gets along much more easily today with less English and knowledge of Australian than 15 years ago. At work he is surrounded by compatriots. Process production eliminates the need for language communication. At home, the housewife needs no English to shop in the supermarket or in the Greek or Italian corner store. Neighbors often come from the same village. Dozens of foreign language newspapers are published in Australia. Daily ones from home arrive by jet within 24 hours of publication. Churches and evening schools keep alive religious and national traditions. There are hundreds of national, social, cultural and sporting organisations. Inner suburban theatres are reviving, showing now only Italian or Greek language films. All this makes for national minority existence and attracts closer to it even the second generation migrant.

What is taking place is not assimilation but integration, which is a slow complicated process demanding recognition of the migrant's particular needs and qualities as relevant to the development of this country. This process is taking place contrary to expectations and theories. It catches the labor movement unprepared.

ETHNIC GROUP DEVELOPMENT

Ethnic group development does not in itself prevent unity. What happens depends on the migrant's social position and on the political thinking in the community as a whole and among migrants in particular. To work for unity we must above all recognise ethnic group development and end the attitude that migrants ought to become more like us.

Twenty years of mass immigration have brought valuable knowledge and experience. Progressive policies receive mass sup-
port, for instance, among Greek migrants, not only because there is a base to start from, but primarily because Greek communists and other progressives here are an integral part of their community. They lead, or help to lead many fine struggles for migrant rights and for support of the democratic forces in Greece.

The best feature of the GMH strike was the ability of many migrants to lead the workers in the manner and language that was understood. The best contribution to progressive policies among migrants is made by the migrants themselves. There are many today in industry and the community in general who are making such contributions or who are potentially capable of doing so. They should receive more assistance and be listened to with greater attention and readiness to learn.

The main job of progressive migrants should be in the direction of fighting for the best interests of migrants. They should be so organised as to have the most natural and effective contact with their compatriots.

QUESTIONS OF POLICY

Although immigration is a most valuable national asset, the committee advising the Government on migrant intake is entirely made up of leaders of industry. The millionaires aim to manipulate immigration in their own narrow interests. The price paid for ready-made migrant labor usually does not even cover their fare to Australia. And as soon as the migrants get off the ships and planes the Government washes its hands of responsibility, inviting the industrialists and land speculators to descend on them like vultures.

The labor movement has no real say on immigration planning and administration. The ACTU's voice is only advisory and it is inadequate. A peoples' immigration policy should take into account the needs of the entire people and the specific problems of migrants settling here—stable employment, proper and cheap accommodation, better social services, fully subsidised fares, no discrimination, respect for the right to retain national traditions.

The labor movement should combat the concept that migrants have an obligation to Australia. This concept assists the ruling class to impose super-exploitation, to deny migrants social and political rights and to cause friction between workers. The internationalism of the Australian labor movement is tested by its policies and attitudes not only towards the people of other countries but towards the workers in Australia who have come from overseas.
Non-British migrants are denied some social service benefits for five years, yet they pay taxes on their first pay. They cannot claim deductions for supporting families overseas. They cannot collect old age pensions if they decide to see their last days in their birthplace. They are placed last on the lists for housing commission accommodation. The education crisis affects their children worse because of the lack of facilities to give them special tuition in the English language. They cannot gain citizenship if they exercise the same right as locally-born people to join the party of their choice, unless this be the Liberals or the DLP. Formation, last March, of the Special Police Branch for migrants, is another and serious step in legalising political intimidation.

SOME PROPOSALS

The thing needed for wider participation of migrant workers in labor movement affairs is to improve the lines of communication between them and leading labor bodies. Policy and tactical questions go over the heads of most migrants. Far too few of them are in leading positions even where they have excellent mass standing and capabilities. The work of many unions can be vastly improved if the migrant membership, sometimes up to 70% of the total, becomes more active. To this end the consistent use of foreign languages, mainly Greek and Italian in the written and oral form is most urgent. The forces to do this job can be found and developed from within the organisation.

There must be a policy of promotion of migrants to leading positions, from job level to full-time officials. The primary consideration of promotion should be the person's mass position and ability to do a good job among migrants. If this worker has a language difficulty, the organisation should subsidise his attendance at a school. There is also a demand for migrant personnel in union offices. (The employers have long recognised the value of migrant interpreters in factories, shops, banks).

There is a great need for detailed and patient explanation of awards, the structure of Australian unionism, the function of Arbitration, entitlement to industrial and social benefits, their shortcomings and inadequacies.

Formation of migrant advisory bodies in unions and other organisations would also help.

Our concern is for working class unity, for maximum participation of workers in developing policies and tactics to serve their struggles. The process of integration will then be quicker, and there will be more unity and struggles.
THE MASSIVE, greyng, mild-mannered Joe McGuiness of today, who so dislikes to talk about himself, doesn’t admit to any deliberate militancy in youth. He implies that he merely dealt, as they came, with the problems common to most workers who battled up through the depression years. But an Aborigine asserting his independence in a northern, white-dominated community of that time must have been endowed with exceptional qualities.

Even at the age of 18 he set off with two older Aboriginal mates for Darwin’s Government House to interview a visiting Minister for the Interior. The case they put was for drinking rights for their people. That was in the Darwin of the “thirties”, and like many deputations it wasn’t immediately successful,* but it evidently put young McGuiness on the road to another deputation thirty years later.

This time, 1963, a mature McGuiness was the leader of a delegation of Aborigines from five States, and a Torres Strait Islander, to wait on Prime Minister Sir Robert Menzies at Canberra. And this deputation presented a developed, definite program of Aboriginal and Islander needs which could, to some extent right a century and a half of injustice and oppression.

1967, by now seven years President of the Federal Council for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders Advancement, he journeys thousands of miles through eastern States explaining the urgency of a Yes vote on the Aboriginal section of the referendum to job meetings, church congregations, trade union bodies and officials, politicians, clergymen, civic organisations. The public response to him, to his campaigning colleagues and all who took up the fight is now history.

*Shortly after this deputation the Exemption system was introduced under which certain Aborigines were allowed some citizen rights including liquor drinking.
Joseph Daniel McGuiness was born in Darwin in 1914, youngest of a family of five. His father was a prospector and railway worker. His mother, Lucy (tribal name Ullngdubboo), was a member of the Khoongarakhung tribe from the Humptydoo district. Lucy McGuiness was held in the highest regard by northern Aboriginal people and remained one of Darwin’s most respected citizens till her death at the age of 86.

During some lean years of childhood after his father died, Joe spent a short time in Darwin’s infamous Khalin Compound. “I don’t know how we survived,” he told me, “there were never any regular or organised meals.”

“How did you get out of the place, Joe?”

“I just walked out.”

No regimentation, none of the humiliations of mission or settlement life for young Joe. At 13, on leaving primary school, he was off with a travelling salesman. “Five shillings a week, two bob in the hand, three for the Trust Fund*. My job was to grease the car, fix the punctures—plenty of them on those rough tracks—open gates and be general Billy Boy.”

Through Queensland’s outback, its towns and outposts, inland to Alice Springs, down the Birdsville track, finally to Adelaide, the Aboriginal boy became acquainted with more of the country than most of us can do in a life time. Two years later he was driving a truck with a Katherine mailman over wide areas of the Northern Territory. “Five pounds a week, and that was money,” he relates, “but the job only lasted the Dry and then you had to sit down for the four months’ Wet”. (Station work never attracted him. His horse always had wheels). There is scarcely a district in the Territory or Queensland you can mention now to Joe that he doesn’t know something about.

Numbers of unemployed workers on the track from both south and north during the Depression managed by various means to reach Darwin. At a camp established by some hundred of these men the youthful Joe often had a good feed, made friends, listened to the talk. He observed how they ran the camp and pooled their weekly £1 dole to buy food wholesale. “They got three good meals a day and some tobacco,” Joe told me. “You couldn’t live alone on a quid a week. Then when the dole was cut to 17/6 they pulled on a strike.” This was his first lesson in working class organisation and struggle, one which no doubt prompted

*A government method of extracting part of Aborigines’ wages, claimed to be saved for them or used for their general benefit. Neither claim has proved to be valid.
him and his friends to venture on that early deputation to speak up for their people.

"I remember the first job we got when things picked up a bit," he told me. "Shovelling coal off a railway truck. Our condition wasn't the best and we had to keep pace with a mob of 'Bulls' who'd had it good all through the Depression. We stuck the job out for the ten days, all sorts of hours and extended shifts. We got about £15 each and thought we were millionaires."

The "Caloden Bay Murders" off the coast of Arnhem Land is an incident still vivid in his memory.

Rough justice, but the Japanese were trespassing and the local tribes were proud people. Church missions later went to Arnhem Land to tame the savages. Nowadays big mineral companies exploit the Aborigines along with the area's manganese and bauxite, but the land is no longer the tribes' and the royalties promised them are insignificant.

After the Japanese bombings of Darwin where he was then employed by the Public Works Department, Joe was called up in 1943 to drive Army ambulances and trucks, stationed in camps from Bacchus Marsh to Northern Tablelands and finally Borneo. An Army course in motor mechanics rounded off his long practical experience to turn him into a first-rate mechanic.

Demobilisation, and he worked at odd jobs around Thursday Island till 1947 when he became a member of the Waterside Workers' Federation. He came to Cairns in 1953 and has remained a wharfie ever since, sometimes holding executive positions in the local branch.

The war had made a big impact on Aborigines and Islanders. Many, called to various naval and military duties and construction moved into a wider world, came into more fraternal contact with the ordinary soldier, sipped a little at the cup of freedom. Wasn't this a war for freedom? Wasn't it time something was done about this freedom for themselves?

This temper was reflected in Cairns, a centre to which Aborigines still come from stations, missions and settlements for medical care, holidays, to visit relatives or seek work. Over the years hundreds have remained in the town, retaining connections with their own people left behind.

There had been independent Aboriginal and Islander activities in Cairns after the war, but these were mainly social till 1960 when a case of discrimination against a colored taxi driver was
taken up by the Cairns Trades and Labor Council. The campaign for the driver's reinstatement canalised the growing resentment of the colored population against discrimination in employment, humiliations in public places; against galling restrictions and pittance wages. From that campaign emerged the Cairns Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders Advancement League. The most conscious and courageous participated, foremost among them Aboriginal women, two of whom, with Joe, were the League's first officers.

Deep understanding of his people's conditions and problems, as well as experience in trade union struggle and methods brought Joe inevitably to prominence. A delegate to the Federal Council for Aboriginal Advancement conference held in Brisbane in 1961, he was elected President of that body in place of the retiring President, Mr. Donald Dunstan, and was drawn actively into the national advancement movement. He has been re-elected President at every successive Federal Conference.

The name of Joe McGuiness is known widely throughout northern Queensland. Much of his earlier work involved setting up League branches, weekend travelling around the Tablelands, listening to Aborigines' problems, advising and giving them glimpses of a better future, at least for their children, if they themselves would make some concerted effort. Innumerable cases of harsh or brutal treatment, deprivation of meagre rights, under-payment of meagre wages — the multitude burdens placed upon those under the Protection Acts — were brought to him to be taken up with the authorities. Whether his endeavors succeeded or not, word soon spread to remote places that here was one of their own openly fighting Aborigines' battles.

The help given by the Cairns League, under Joe's guidance, to the people of Mapoon and Lockhart River missions to retain their lands and oppose deportation to other settlements stiffened resistance. His proposals of delegates from remote places and assistance to get them to Federal conferences has disclosed a new horizon to some who have never been far beyond their own settlement or island. Mapoon peoples' fight for freedom as they termed it, will be long remembered. Joe's personal letters, news bulletins and verbal messages telling of so much support from the outside world put them in good heart.

At a recent quite large meeting of Aborigines listening to Joe's story of how far the movement had come over the years, a settlement man got up to thank him on behalf of all of them for the job he was doing. "You understand," he said, "better than any white man ever can."
Integrity is natural to Joe. Never much of a talker, hesitant in conversation, never known to bustle, he is an unwearying listener. With friends he indulges a lively sense of humour, a gift for neat irony, sometimes in a bit of tomfoolery. Yet slow moving and mild as he appears, he is an indignant man, a man perpetually angry at the crude ignorance of officialdom and calculated inhumanity behind pious assertions from so many quarters. Sophistication in method and diplomacy have come with widening experience. He no longer conducts acrimonious correspondence with departmental officials concluding, as one memorable letter did—"Yours in displeasure".

Joe lives with his wife Amy, and bright young daughter Sandra, in a small house in West Cairns. Amy, a meticulous housewife, coming from a famous Thursday Island family, has a store of Island songs and dances and is a talented performer much in demand at festivities, a popular member, too, of the town's Folk Singers. She holds executive position on the Cairns League and has attended Federal conference as a delegate. Innumerable people come to that small house with their pleas and problems, or ideas, or just to enjoy its simple hospitality.

Government policy has always been to play Islanders against Aborigines (mainlanders). Joe's long sojourn among the Islanders, his knowledge of their culture and customs and his efforts on their behalf have made them more prone to listen to his insistence that the basic problems of both peoples are identical and that solution lies in unity along the same road.

Compassion, towards all of his class who are ridden by their conditions, is combined in Joe with confidence that his own people, retaining their own identity, can and will make their distinctive contribution to society. Their emancipation, he maintains, will only come hand-in-hand with the democratic advance of all Australians.

Joe McGuiness will hold a niche in our history as the first Aboriginal leader from the organised Australian working class.

Latterly he has had to spend some time in southern cities. His participation along with Federal Council colleagues, in conferences and seminars, organising and publicity activities have brought him more into national prominence, but few could wish for a more heartfelt welcome on return to the home town.

The simple tribute paid by an Aborigine who had come the long distance from Townsville to Cairns to join a referendum victory celebration, summarises best his standing here in north Queensland. "Joe", he said, "is a mighty man!"
W. E. Gollan  

**STATE AID**  
**RE-THINKING THE ISSUES**

*A noted educationist discusses State Aid as one of the issues involved in the context of the wider problem of educational reform.*

THE NEED for educational reform in Australia is not in dispute. Facing the era of technology and automation with their associated social and economic problems, the Australian governments have already partially modified their former attitudes to education. The problems are legion, as is only to be expected when a deep-seated change is under way in technology, with corresponding social changes, which in the next few decades will have increasingly profound effects on society.

The first task is to raise the general level of education, and ensure that greater percentages than in the past proceed to higher education (advanced technical, university and other forms of tertiary education) — an inescapable consequence of passing into an age when science and technology play such a dominant role in production. However, this is merely the beginning. Other urgent questions demand a solution: the quality of education, preparation for life, for democratic participation in the life of society based on peace among the nations, the re-training of workers and technicians made redundant by technological advance, and countless others.

To what extent have Australian governments faced these issues?

The Murray and Martin Reports on tertiary education and their partial implementation have certainly radically revised the scale of governmental financial provision for education. From $4.2 million in 1945-46, direct expenditure on education by the Commonwealth rose to $127.8 million in 1955-56, the greater part on tertiary education.

The result has been a considerable expansion in this field, but even so the figures below demonstrate Australia's relatively retarded position:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First degrees completed in relation to total population—1963</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First degrees completed in relation to population of the appropriate age—1963</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>USA (age 21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Furthermore, the staff-student ratio in Australian universities is heavily inferior to that in Britain, the United States or the USSR. At the universities, as at all levels of education, students and staff suffer from an unimaginative and inadequate provision. In Australia approximately 3.8% of the gross national product is expended on education as against 5 to 6% in Great Britain and the USA. Even the minimum proposals for university education were cut by $56,000,000 in the 1966-67 budget.

**PRIMARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION**

The attitude of successive Federal Liberal governments to the basic educational structure in Australia, the state of affairs existing in the primary and secondary schools, has been to refuse even to examine the facts. Repeated demands by teachers, parents, and, in fact, most sections of the community, for an inquiry into primary and secondary education have been stubbornly rejected.

In place of this obvious and necessary action the Menzies and Holt Governments have chosen a diversionary move to provide marginal benefits for the non-government sector in education, the most recent being the increased provision of facilities for science teaching, and the allocation of 10% of places in the new Teachers’ Colleges financed by the Federal Government to trainees for non-government schools. As to the facilities for the teaching of science, the schools at present receiving aid fall into the following categories: Government schools 204; Non-government schools 508.

The 1966 election proposals of the Holt Government will double the amount to non-government schools, raising the ratio from 5:2 to 5:1 in favor of non-government schools.

The spokesmen for the Roman Catholic hierarchy during the Federal elections made it clear that they understood very well that the Holt Government’s financial proposals would give only marginal assistance to the Catholic schools, struggling as they are in an intense crisis of understaffing and overcrowding. As Bishop Cullinane stated, “I feel that (Mr. Holt’s policy statement) shows a complete lack of understanding of the problem facing Catholic parents, I fail to see how Mr. Holt can consider realistic his declared policy on assisting non-government schools.” And as Father Dennis Healy stated (Australian, April 1, 1967) “The promises of both Mr. Holt and Mr. Calwell were calculated to win votes rather than solve a problem that seriously affected the national interest.”

However, the Holt Government, confident of the support of the DLP on its general reactionary policy and knowing full well that the right-wing forces in the hierarchy would under no circum-
stances support the Labor Party with its anti-Vietnam war and anti-conscription policies, did not feel any compulsion to expand its State aid program except in minor details. The paltry allocations to the Federal Department of Education and Science in the 1967-68 budget make no material difference to the situation.

The general direction of "State aid" in fact, as it is being applied by the Holt Government, far from improving the lot of the poorer schools, is providing increased handouts to the schools of privilege, and leaving the general crisis in the non-government schools untouched.

It is in the Catholic parish schools that the crisis has taken on its most extreme form. "John Manning" writing in the Sydney Bulletin of February 4, 1967, from a "contemporary" Catholic position asserts that the arch-diocese of Sydney faces a shortage of $4,000,000 in estimated expenditure for the 1964-67 period, that the Canberra diocese has a $4,000,000 building debt and that the Queanbeyan parish, typical of a number, has a building fund debt of $150,000. Some schools have already closed and others must inevitably do so, as the Catholic school population pressure mounts. Between 1947 and 1961, according to the same writer, the Catholic population of Australia increased by 65% but Catholic school enrolment by 102%.

One result of the Roman Catholic population increase and the crisis in Catholic education has been a sharp increase in Roman Catholics among State school pupils—in NSW from 10.3% in 1955 to 13.7% in 1966, an increase of 36,000 children. (Department of Education statistics quoted in the Sydney Morning Herald 26.4.67).

A NEW APPROACH TO "STATE AID" IN THE CATHOLIC COMMUNITY

Growing numbers of the Catholic laity and a section of the clergy are currently engaged in a serious reappraisal of the relevance of the state aid issue in Australian public life, and in a basic questioning of the whole concept of separate Catholic education.

For some Catholics this attitude has its roots in a pragmatic approach. It is becoming more widely understood that the parish schools are unable to cope with the demands of contemporary education and are providing an inferior training for their pupils. Allied to this is the growing realisation that massive state aid as proposed by the hierarchy is a chimera, that whilst marginal benefits flow from the role of education as a political football, the kind of aid needed to give the child attending the parish schools equality of opportunity with those in the State schools is not a realisable political objective.
The only policy that would give equality of opportunity to Catholic children and remove the special burden borne by Catholic parents would be to subsidise Catholic schools on a pupil basis on a parity with the amount spent per pupil in the State schools. Clearly such a proposal is utopian and the solution in the interest of both Catholic parents and children as well as the community generally must be sought in other directions.

Catholics like all members of the community are becoming more and more aware of the serious defects and inadequacies of even much of state education in Australia; not to speak of the very backward state of affairs in the parish schools. Furthermore, it is clear that Catholic thinking is going far beyond the alleged benefits that would flow from massive state aid to Catholic schools, to wider questions of the kind of education needed for all men in contemporary society. This is an integral part of the “aggiornamento” (the move to face contemporary problems of man in society) whose first important public expression was the papal encyclical (Pacem in Terris) of Pope John XXIII.

The sharp criticism by an Australian bishop of the views of a visiting American theologian and the equally sharp reaction of a section of the Catholic laity in defence of freedom of thought and expression was a dramatic revelation to many of the depth of the discussion now proceeding in Roman Catholic circles. The demands within the church for greater freedom, the emphasis on the responsibility of the individual, the questioning of dogmatism and of doctrinaire authoritarianism, the attempt to relate Catholic teaching to the advances in modern scientific knowledge, the concepts of humanism, that man and not merely Catholic man should be the object of the church’s interest; even that Catholics and communists could find a common basis in joint activities against war and for human welfare — all these and many other problems are matters of urgent investigation and discussion in Catholic circles.

It is against this background that the debate on State aid is beginning to take on an entirely new emphasis in the thinking of an influential and growing section of Catholic opinion. Included in this is the insistence by growing numbers of Roman Catholic parents on genuine freedom of choice of schools for their children; a refusal to be bound by the dogma of the bishops of “every Catholic child in a Catholic school.” “John Manning” gives clear expression to this growing set of opinions, still comparatively new in Australia, but expressing a world-wide ecumenical trend within the Catholic Church, which the reactionary forces still promoting state aid as the major question will ignore at their peril. Says John Manning:

In the aggiornamento, pre conciliar parochialism bows out to ... a commitment to the needs of man ... peace pleas ... priests in freedom marches
and the laity chiding a bishop for his nastiness to a nun. Small wonder then that State aid as a top priority . . . produces a pantomimic tediousness for a growing number of Catholics . . . (State aid pros and cons) are of minor importance for Catholics . . . Parochial schools are only small fish in the renewal that the (Vatican) council urges Catholics to embrace in order to flee the marginal in their lives and enter the mainstream that adult man frequents in his quest for life.

A further problem, which has so far been evaded but must inevitably compel attention, is that of the degree of State supervision and control as public funds are advanced to private institutions. Clearly the question of the standards of education, qualifications of teachers and allied matters, will call for an increasing degree of State intervention and control, as the extent of aid increases.

These ideas are given a more comprehensive and precise expression by Father Dennis Healy (Australian 1/4/67) who clearly represents a fundamental questioning of the whole concept of state aid as it has hitherto been conceived by the Conference of Bishops. Commencing from the position of the responsibility of Catholics to mankind as a whole, Father Dennis Healy concludes that this (new) emphasis "tends to render invalid one of the main reasons for a separate Catholic education system."

As an alternative to the dual system he proposes that the Roman Catholic church should confine its "educational activity to what it can afford without placing special burdens on Catholic parents; that some brothers and nuns should become teachers in state schools; and that a national commission of enquiry into Catholic schools should be established with the function of investigating the present situation of Catholic schools in Australia and making recommendations to the Federal Ministry of Education and to the Conference of Catholic Bishops on whether the present dual system is in the best interest of the church and the nation."

When two Catholic priests raise such questions in papers so widely apart as the Bulletin and the Australian, it is clear that an important segment of Catholic opinion is pointing the way towards a reassessment of the whole traditional position of the church; and to unity of action that can end the present unprincipled attitude to State aid by the Liberal Party, which has manoeuvred the ALP into abandoning its principled position for an opportunist one, damaging both to the ALP itself and to educational progress. The possibility may not be remote of unity of action by all Australians irrespective of religious belief to secure for all Australian children and youth the education necessary for life in modern society.
In this issue we publish a summary of the papers delivered at the Sydney symposium to mark the centenary of the first appearance of Karl Marx's Capital. A summary of the papers read at the Melbourne symposium will appear in the next issue. Some controversial views were expressed and these will be the subject of discussion in later issues.

TO MARK the one-hundredth anniversary of the publication of the first volume of Marx's Capital, Australian Left Review recently organised a seminar in Sydney on various facets of Marx’s life and work. As befitted such an occasion, the tone of the papers given was largely historical: Marx as a politician, a philosopher, a man and an economist. An effort not so much to interpret Marx for the present as to show how he reacted to his own times and how his eventual position as probably the most influential thinker of the nineteenth century came about.

Mr. Phillip Richardson, of the University of Queensland, delivered the first paper on “Marx as Politician.” He pointed out that Marx’s political views were never static, but like the rest of his thought, in a continual state of development and flux. His busy life, ill-health, and his eventual retreat to England gave him little time to develop a systematic political standpoint. One result of this is that to familiarize ourselves with Marx’s political views we must search widely, not only through books and pamphlets, but through letters and articles as well.

Mr Richardson stressed that probably the basic factor in Marx’s continually evolving political thought was his general indifference to organised political parties and to their role in the class struggle. Although his views seem to have changed towards the end of his life, his characteristic assumption was that socialism would be established in Europe regardless of political parties; perhaps even in spite of them.

But if he was wrong in this, and came to realize he was wrong, Marx’s main contribution to the political world was his transformation of the socialist movement from a heterogeneous confusion of well-wishers, do-gooders, anarchists and adventurers into a move-
ment spear-headed by the conviction that the application of scientific principles, deduced and demonstrated by Marx, was the key to grasping and moulding the significance of the class struggle. And it was through the First International, of which Marx was a member, that such principles were first widely promulgated.

It was this essentially pragmatic beginning which the speaker stressed: Marx had to jettison much of the socialist thinking of his time as useless because dogmatic or impractical. He sought to develop instead ideas that were demonstrative, flexible and of some value in the political world of the moment. This is even reflected in his view of political parties as something “thrown up”, rather than consciously formed and manipulated. It may have been the eventual fate of the First International which caused Marx to change his mind on this issue, for the basic thing wrong with the International was precisely what was wrong with Marx’s notion of the loose-knit political party. It was composed of such disparate elements that its full effectiveness as an implementor of Marx’s ideas could not be felt. Had it been welded into a cohesive unit, it would have been of much greater value than it was. History might be moving along an inevitable path, but that is no reason not to kick it along a bit. This was the basic difference between Marx’s conception of the party and that, say, of Lenin.

Mr Richardson also pointed out that, living as he did his later years in England, Marx’s political interests still remained centred in Europe, and hence the close analysis that on-the-spot observation can make possible was not carried out. The British Museum had a lot more to do with the development of Marxism than did the House of Parliament or even the Trades Union Congress.

One indirect result of this is that it is impossible to say that Marx’s view of politics, or of the state, was a mechanistic one. It was always too much in a state of flux to become rigid or formalized. And certainly his views on class, and class-structure have been greatly over-simplified, to the detriment of the Marxist movement as a whole. Marx was only too well aware that a continually evolving economic system, even if one in which the general tendencies of the future were discernible, meant a continually evolving class structure. He may, as Mr Richardson suggested, have underestimated the role of nationalism in the development of the class struggle, but he certainly did not underestimate the complexity of the class struggle itself.

IN DEALING with “Marx as Philosopher” Mr. J. D. Blake had a similar emphasis. He pointed out that whilst Marx has been widely recognised as an economist, historian and sociologist, it has
been customary to ignore his contribution to philosophy, or else to over-simplify a position of great complexity. Marx's formal studies began with a course in philosophy and it was his mature philosophical position which gives such a marked degree of unity to all his work, even in the most diverse fields.

But it would be a mistake to regard Marx's philosophy as one to be dogmatically adhered to by all claiming to be Marxists. As Marx himself learned, it is only by rejecting hypotheses and theories which don't correspond to reality that progress can be made. If reality is straight-jacketed into theory, it will be to the detriment of both.

Mr Blake went on to argue that, with the recent publication in English of Marx's *Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts of 1844*, it is now possible to see the continual development of Marx's philosophy. Not that this is a universally held belief. The French Marxist Louis Althusser, for example, has argued that the *Manuscripts* are too much influenced by Hegel, and he therefore has minimized their importance ("an idealist anthropology") in favor of Marx's more mature works.

But the real strength of Althusser's current work on Marx lies in the way in which he has drawn attention to the lack of faith in mechanical economic determinism in Marx's philosophical work. All too often Marxists (and others) have been content to sit back smugly in the belief that economic forces "out there", beyond their control or comprehension, are at work in shaping their destinies. It was one of Marx's great contributions to the development of materialist philosophy that he pointed out that Man is not a passive reflecting medium of an external objective reality which alone is active. Men never act on reality without some preconception—even if only on an elementary or primitive level. When men ask questions of reality they are already altering it and making it human. As part of nature, thinking about and acting upon nature, and himself in the process. We do not grasp nature except in this humanly sensuous, active manner.

All men, far from being merely acted upon by some mystical economic or historical process are an integral part of that process and can alter or shape its development. The philosophy can describe the men, but the men also mould the philosophy.

Once this point has been grasped, Mr Blake argued, it takes on a central position in Marx's philosophy. It demonstrates, for example, the truly humanist element in Marx's thought. It radically alters the all-too-common notion of Marx as the coldly-calculating economic historian, plotting in facts and figures the destinies of his fellow-men. It shows, instead, what had always been apparent to those who, like Lenin, had grasped the essence of Marxism: that human beings can never be regarded as pawns in a game of chess played by the rules of economic determinism. For it is a
realization of the essentially human control of history, a belief in man's ability to shape his own life, which lies at the core of Marx's philosophy.

THE THIRD PAPER given at the seminar was by Professor C. Manning Clark on "Marx the Man". Professor Clark's bias, like that of Mr. Blake, was towards Marx the humanist, towards the man who led the children of the world towards the promised land, not only in the tradition of Abraham, Moses and Christ, but of Dostoevski, Newman and Lenin as well.

Marx came from a prominent Jewish family, but his father's rejection of the religion of his fore-fathers when Marx the boy was only six, and the subsequent acceptance of the family into the Lutheran Church, may have had a profound influence on his thought. The need to reject the past and to strive for acceptance in an entirely new world can't be lightly glossed over in discussing the nature of Marx's personality.

This markedly religious background, and the influence of religious thinkers, were the elements of Marx's makeup most stressed by Professor Clark. It was after reading Feuerbach's The Essence of Christianity, for example, that Marx formulated his first great discovery. He said this:

"that because of religious belief man had become alienated from his true mission in life; because of religious belief men had pursued shadows." As his mentor Feuerbach put it: "Religion was a dream, the dream of the human mind, not the reality." Through religion, as Marx put it, man had dualised himself, he had become a stranger to himself.

By 1844 he had drawn a very simple conclusion: "the criticism of religion," he said, "ends with the precept that the supreme being for man is man." That was in 1844.

Like his compatriots Goethe and Schiller he placed his faith in humanity, and worshipped at the shrine of mankind.

Professor Clark went on to suggest that there were perhaps four main keys to understanding Marx. There was his reading — especially Aeschylus, Shakespeare and Goethe. Aeschylus because, like the Greek, Marx believed that men could and should steal fire from heaven. If Marx had compassion for the fate of Sisyphus it was through Prometheus that he looked to the future. And in Shakespeare and Goethe he also saw and emphasised this human potentiality.

He also had a great gift for seeing right into the heart of a problem. We only have to look at his few brief references to
Australia to see that this was so—he certainly understood what was going on here.

Looking at the world in general he also realized that the central struggle of life is not between God and the Devil for the souls of men, but between men themselves for the control of society: the class struggle. It was in objectifying this struggle, and in clarifying its issues, that his life's work lay. It was this word “struggle”, Professor Clark said, that Marx saw as the core of reality. He was once asked “What is?” and he replied “Struggle”.

In some of his amplifications and predictions about future developments Marx was certainly wrong—as Mr Richardson had pointed out in relation to nationalism, or the role of the highly organized political party. But in essence Marx the man was right: it was his vision of society and of man's potentiality that showed the new way forward.

IN THE FINAL PAPER, “Marx the Economist”, Mr. Bernie Taft pointed out that Capital has been called “the most influential unread book in existence”. Nonetheless, Marx as an economist has been the subject of increasing interest. But Mr. Taft suggested several reasons why Marx has been misinterpreted and misunderstood.

Capital after all is an incomplete work—some problems Marx wanted to deal with later he never got around to. Others are barely touched upon. In many ways too it was Marx's thoroughness which prevented Capital being completed—his attention to detail was painstakingly accurate.

All too often Marx's opponents have delighted in pointing out his omissions, whilst his supporters have displayed an equal tendency to regard whatever he wrote as holy writ. Both attitudes have resulted only in misunderstanding and confusion.

But why is there a revival of interest in Marx's economic work today? One obvious reason is the continued progress of the USSR, and the rapid economic growth in the socialist world. Another factor is that groups of non-Marxist economists are turning more attention to the practical problems posed by state monopoly capitalist development, especially the question of economic growth. This has meant a more objective examination of economic processes than was common previously—in other words, a more Marxist approach.

What first led Marx to economics was his desire “to lay bare the laws of motion of modern society” (Capital). He had realized that the general shape of any given historical period was determined
by the prevailing mode of production — which, in turn, implied the whole class structure of society:

"His objective was to give society a consciousness of itself, to explain the reasons for its conflicts and social struggles and to find the way to their solution.

With this vision in his mind Marx made an extraordinarily thorough examination of the economic facts of the past and the present.

The most notable fact to him was the existence in all forms of class society of a huge mass of unearned income. In capitalist society this took the form of nett profit on capital, rent on land and interest.

The theoretical problem that faced Marx, as he saw it, was to account for the existence and the persistence of these forms of unearned income in a society in which there was quite a high degree of mobility and competition."

Mr Taft argued that the crucial question of Marxian economics is "Do his main conclusions apply today, is his method of study still significant?" Of course some of his theories have dated or been shown to be wrong, but Marx's system is capable of much further development and provides important guide-lines for what is happening at the present time. But it would be a mistake to insist that the letter of Marx is more important than the spirit. For this is to treat Marx's economic thinking in a non-Marxist way.

It was in developing his labor theory of value that Marx made his most sweeping contribution to economics. In capitalist economics the emphasis has traditionally been placed on a theory of exchange and the utilization of profit for further investment. The centre of Marx's theory is that the law of value is the key to understanding the economic basis of society.

In dealing with the question of exploitation Marx's conclusions remain equally valid. Though the living standard in Western capitalist countries has risen, so too has the degree of exploitation — Marx's concept of increasing polarization has been vindicated.

The task facing Marxists today, Mr Taft concluded, is to develop in the spirit of Marx economic theories explaining in detail the nature of modern economic life, especially economic growth. The development of state monopoly capitalism and the technological revolution have created other problems which are still not fully understood. It is not a question of Marx the Economist not having done his job; it is really a question of his followers not doing theirs.
Books

SUBTLE FLAME, by Katharine Susannah Prichard, Australasian Book Society, 300 pp, $3.95.

A NEW novel from Katharine Susannah Prichard is always an event in the literary world. Few writers have so consistently influenced writing in this country; few have ventured into so much virgin territory or covered such a wide range of subject matter. It is fifty-two years since her first novel The Pioneers won an Empire-wide competition. But it was not until 1926, with her book Working Bullocks, that notice was served, in no uncertain manner, that a new writer of unusual strength and insight had appeared on the Australian literary scene.

If there is a connecting link, a thread running through Katharine Prichard's work, it is surely her humanity, compassion and reverence for life. This is the dominating theme that illuminates her latest novel, Subtle Flame.

The story is set against a background of almost contemporary Melbourne life. This is the Melbourne towards the closing stages of the Korean War and the period immediately preceding the Peace Conference of 1959. It is a Melbourne vibrant with life and color. On the one hand, gusty, gay, provocative; on the other, conservative, corrupt, backward, decaying. It is the city of the great monopolies, the prostitution of the press, the drug rackets. Under the developing threat of nuclear terror the author sets her characters to work.

To some extent the city itself has taken on a living personality, and Katharine Prichard, with skill and precision, reveals facet after facet. This is the familiar, the loved city of the south, but with a difference. We are seeing it through fresh eyes, with someone who is as much at home in the office of a newspaper magnate as in the room of the humblest pensioner.

Much of Katharine Prichard's work is concerned with revealing the inner meaning of life; the struggle between man and himself, and man and his society. Thus, in this story, David Evans, the successful journalist, editor-manager of an important Melbourne newspaper group, sets out on his wandering in search of a new identity. This is the story of a man with a burdened conscience who leaves wife, family, comfortable middle-class home, secure position; a man who can no longer live with himself.

The death of his son Robert in the Korean War is the personal tragedy that influences his decision. He is guiltily aware of his failure to present the true facts of the Korean conflict in the newspapers under his control. His agony of spirit is revealed early in the book in the age old cry, "My son. My son. Would that I had died for thee."

In his flight David determines to embark on a program of free-lance writing, a program designed to bring the truth, at least, to the public. But as others have found before him, a journey of self-discovery can be an agonising journey. Not only because of the psychological overtones, but because the journey will point up sharp material differences, as well. Changing mental attitudes will throw up conflicts where none might have been expected. These will, to some extent, influence the behavior of even old and trusted friends. What newspaper editor, for instance, will welcome articles smacking of pleas for peace and understanding, or radical, left-wing thinking? Despite David's great skill as a journalist, his articles are rejected.
He drifts and becomes something of a derelict. During this period he becomes familiar with the lives of boxers, waterside workers, migrants, prostitutes, housewives and others. He learns how it feels to be poor, hungry, cold; to be badly dressed and repudiated. The death of his wife Clare is another bewildering loss at this stage of his life. His positive gain is the friendship of a young girl, Sharn Leigh, a peace worker. They join forces and Sharn introduces him to others. This situation corresponds with the end of part one of the novel. It seems to me that the author is warning of the futility of the “lone wolf” approach, of the need to join forces, and the necessity of unity if we are to survive.

In part two there is a shift of accent. This could well be titled “The story of David’s temptation, backsliding and redemption.” A voyage of discovery is not always plain sailing. Too often the voyager will hesitate, draw back, fearing the challenge of the unknown. Part two finds David, ill with fever, wandering in the rain outside his old newspaper office. A young woman Jan, who was a junior when David was in charge of the papers, recognises him and takes him to her flat. She is now occupying an important position in the newspaper world. David is made a virtual prisoner, though Jan nurses him back to health and he undertakes certain journalistic tasks for her. They form a not very satisfying sexual relationship. For the time David drifts with the tide. But family problems intrude and David frees himself from Jan’s influence. He meets Sharn again and returns to his room in the poorer part of the city, determined to continue his search for truth, and help in the struggle for peace.

He had previously befriended a young boy, Tony, who was involved with an unsavory crowd at a restaurant. The importance of this episode does not become clear until part three.

Work for the peace conference is now well in hand. Part three is dominated by preparations for the conference, David’s association with the boy Tony, and his growing love for Sharn. David is arrested on a trumped up charge and serves a time in prison. He is discharged and his friends who have always believed in him welcome him back. He has become more and more part of the working class movement. His marriage to Sharn is not unexpected.

This is a penetrating novel and a deep analysis of life in a big city. The background material alone, the movement for peace, the pen pictures of world-famous people, the understanding of life in different social strata, the uneasy world situation, mark it as a work high above the average.

Though Katharine Prichard is uncompromising in portraying her vision of life as she sees it, her characters are always real, always living, always credible. It is not exposing truths about a society that produces bad literature, but rather the failure of the writer to present her material with true understanding and artistry. Katharine was one of our first writers to absorb this and it has been a feature of her work ever since. This understanding has shaped her novels and short stories, so that we read not only stories, creations, but part of our history, too.

David Evans’ journey is a journey that many have already taken. It is a journey that will face many in the future. The situations might not be quite the same situations, the people not quite the same people, but the track will be recognisable.

In her eighty-fourth year Katharine Prichard has again demonstrated her belief in people. She has produced not only a significant novel, but a passionate plea for world peace, and an important social document.

Mena Calthorpe.

"IF YOU PRICK us do we not bleed? if you tickle us do we not laugh? if you poison us do we not die? and if you wrong us, shall we not seek revenge?"

*The Merchant of Venice.*

This is a selection of prose and poetry drawn from all the countries of Africa. For the most part, they are written in English, although some are translated from the French and Portuguese. There are so many native languages in Africa, that it is uneconomic for books to be printed in them, so the African writer uses the language of the race that conquered them in which to develop his literature.

The language may not be indigenous African; but the works contained in this collection most certainly are. Yet they underline the fact that there is no typical African, no ideal of a noble savage breaking his bonds. These works are of ordinary men and women, experiencing commonplace emotions. The setting and culture may be different from ours, but these stories and poems invite us in to join the experiences of the African.

Many people may be surprised to find that Africans have feelings, or write love poems. As yet they do not turn out stereotyped situations beloved of our women’s papers, which pass for love stories. But who can doubt the feelings of Mbella Sonne Dipoko, from the Cameroun, who writes:

"Let us go and learn by the candle of fire-flies
The difficult lesson on radio signalling

Which others older than us have felt
On the blackboard of the long night,
So that tomorrow when we are apart
We may transmit on the frequency of love
Those intimate messages we can never post."

Some of the writings lean heavily on native mythology, such as *Bendek’s Gift*, by Sarif Easmon (Sierra Leone). He tells how the tribe sentences to death a warrior who fled from battle when he was wounded. Another tale, *Wages of the Good*, by Birago Diop (Senegal), has the character of an Aesop’s Fable.

While we are still looking at the stories that rely on folk-lore, Grace Ogot (Kenya), has written the tale of a cannibal, *Tekyo*, and how his family dealt with the crime. To our Western minds, cannibalism is a matter for horror; so it is revealing to see with what sympathy the subject is treated, as well as with a matter-of-fact attitude.

At least two of the stories are particularly interesting as they deal with attitudes to white men. Camara Laye (Guinea), writes of a slightly simple man called Clarence, who is sold by cunning coloreds to a chief to service his wives, as he is growing too old. This is a good-humored satire on the white/black attitude. Far more bitter and ironic is Lewis Nkosi (South Africa), in his story of *The Prisoner*, which involves a change in role between the white man, George, who was originally Mulele’s warder, and Mulele, who ended up as George’s warder when George broke the apartheid laws, and took a colored woman for his mistress.

Every author has a different tale to tell, and a different situation to unfold. One tells of the chaos in a village when their hereditary leader
turns Christian and wants to become a priest. He refuses to take up his hereditary position, as it means marrying a number of wives.

Also, from Cameroun, comes the excerpt from *The Old Negro and the Medal*, which describes how the hero, Meka, is forced to stand within a whitewashed circle for hours, awaiting to be awarded a medal for his services to the white regime; and how the experience caused him to be disillusioned with the white supremacy myth.

I could go on describing these stories and poems for ever, as each is worthy of mention, and it is hard to select and discard. The whole collection serves to give the intelligent reader a map of themes and styles of African writing in metropolis languages. They add a further dimension to the literature of the world, by being peculiarly African experiences superimposed on world concerns.

Hazel Jones.


Frantz Fanon's *The Wretched of the Earth* is a splendid book, a work of burning honesty and compelling analytical power. It is a book in which, as Jean-Paul Sartre says in the preface, "the Third World finds *itself* and speaks to *itself* through Fanon's voice."

The nobility of its vision is perhaps best summed up in this paragraph from the conclusion: "It is a question of the Third World starting a new history of Man, a history which will have regard to the sometimes prodigious theses which Europe has put forward, but which will also not forget Europe's crimes, of which the most horrible was committed in the heart of man, and consisted of the pathological tearing apart of his functions and the crumbling of his unity. And in the framework of the collectivity there were the differentiations, the stratification and the blood-thirsty tensions fed by classes; and finally, on the immense scale of humanity, there were racial hatreds, slavery, exploitation and, above all, the bloodless genocide which consisted in the setting aside of fifteen hundred millions of men."

It is about these "fifteen hundred millions of men" the "wretched of the earth", the peoples of the colonies and other lands who have been or are dominated by the European, that Fanon writes.

Fanon, a Martinique-born psychiatrist who practised in Algeria and took part in the liberation struggle there, is essentially concerned with the process of the emergence and upbuilding of the national consciousness of colonial and former colonial peoples.

In the course of his examination of this process, he has produced what amounts to a full-scale account of the psychology of the colonial condition, as it affects both rulers and ruled.

Only in Ho Chi Minh's *French Colonialism on Trial*, written in the 1920's, has this reviewer come across anything like the appallingly concrete evocation of colonial life that is offered by the case histories presented in Fanon's chapter, "Colonial War and Mental Disorders".

But it is more than evocation and description. Fanon, who died in 1961, before Algeria achieved freedom, was also a revolutionary activist and thinker. He is concerned in this work (especially in the chapters on "Spon-
taneity" and on "National Consciousness") to establish political models for the life of the newly free countries.

His observations on the means by which the way to socialism can be found in the conditions of the third world are no doubt today serving as a guide to a whole generation of participants in the struggle for genuine liberation from colonialism.

His treatment on the question of revolutionary violence—for the colonised man, a "way of re-creating himself"—is as majestic a piece of writing as is likely to be found anywhere in contemporary political literature.

Although Fanon pays scant attention to the socialist countries as such, he is keenly aware of the importance of their existence in the international arena to the forward political movement of the Third World.

He is also firmly wedded to socialism as the wave of the future for the countries of the Third World. Fanon writes: "Capitalist exploitation and cartels and monopolies are the enemies of under-developed countries. On the other hand, the choice of a socialist regime, a regime which is completely orientated towards the people as a whole and based on the principle that man is the most precious of all possessions will allow us to go forward more quickly and more harmoniously, and thus make impossible that caricature of society where all economic and political power is held in the hands of a few who regard the nation as a whole with scorn and contempt."

Fanon's book is justly described by its publishers as "a classic of anti-colonialism".

Segal's central thesis, advanced with an encyclopedic command of historical fact, is that world history is tending towards a universal clash between the poor, colored peoples of the world on the one hand and the rich, white peoples on the other.

He writes: "The two colors or races are physically clashing in a dozen parts of the world already, whether through riots in the slums of American cities or the engagement of guns in South Vietnam and Angola. It is the contention of this book that the occasions for clash must multiply, and the war grow ever more intense, unless the circumstances which provoke the antagonisms of race are themselves removed."

He adds: "I do not attempt to deny that whites may, for greed or fear or a difference of belief, fight each other, as they have done so often before; I am well aware that non-whites, similarly excited, have recently been fighting with each other, from the Himalayas to the Sudan. But it is my belief that the whites and the non-whites are, for the most powerful of reasons, each drawing closer together, and that the struggle between them is the major preoccupation of mankind."


Taking one feature of the vast complexity of world political phenomena, however valid in itself, and elevating it into a virtual absolute, might well make for interesting reading. And Segal's book is nothing if not readable. Whether this practice makes for good politics, however, is another matter.

So dogged is he in pursuit of his
central argument that Segal passes virtually unnoticed such a central socio-political contradiction as that between socialism and imperialism. This lack contributes to the visionary, apocalyptic character of the work, however persuasively the case is argued in many places.

The author is so anxious to thrust the Soviet Union into his "White World of London and Moscow" that he does real violence to the actual Soviet record by the prominence he gives to the incidents reported some years ago (and unrepeated) of alleged racial discrimination against African students at Soviet universities.

In the international field, too, he is forced by his hypothesis of future Chinese leadership of the entire "world of color" to heavily overplay the suggestion that the Soviet Union is mistrusted by the colored peoples because the Russians are white.

Rich Japan also presents Segal with some difficulty. But this is overcome by claiming that Japan, though colored, is regarded as a mere "satrap" of the "white" world.

Confronting Mr. Segal’s thesis with two real, current, international crises, one is inclined to the view that the mechanisms of world conflict are in fact far more complex and varied than the concepts of The Race War allow for.

Where, for example, are the clear lines of color dividing the two sides involved in the Vietnam war, in which the Soviet Union is the main supplier of the embattled Vietnamese, who face, among other invaders of "color", some 50,000 troops from South Korea?

And where are these same color lines as far as the contending forces in the Middle East crisis are concerned?

Mr. Segal’s book, it seems to me, is a classic illustration of the proposition that a truth, when carried beyond the point of its application, ends up as an error.

All this is not to deny the value of the book as a compendium of racist crimes and as a searchlight on the pre-colonial history of many countries. The section on pre-colonial Africa is particularly good.

Mr. Segal, a South African now working in London as editor of Penguin Books’ African Library, has to some extent at least cast the whole world in the mould of his native land’s present apartheid system.

But, it seems, the world does not fit altogether easily into this mould.

MALCOLM SALMON


PRINTERS AND POLITICS is only the second full history of an Australian trade union to be published in the last fifty years. Unionists and everyone connected with the labor movement should reflect on the backwardness which this shows. The truth is that despite pride in the strength of the Australian trade unions we lack much of the basic knowledge to explain their past, understand their present or guide their future.

Hence Dr. Hagan’s book is a particularly valuable study and one with its special interest, because at the heart of printing has been a unique craft of men whose indispensable skills made them an aristocracy of labor and at the same time educated, articulate working class intellectuals. Despite the title it is much more about printers than politics. It is a many-sided
history of their unions in a diverse industry which was both traditional and changing. The questions they faced are the same as those which confront unions today: only the circumstances have changed.

We follow the unions in prosperity and depression, strength and weakness, confidence and despair. They epitomise the ideas and forces which have moulded Australia. We see clearly the heritage which the Australian working class brought from Europe, the early struggles against the masters' law and convict labor. We feel the heady excitement of the gold rushes, then watch the determined building of solid unions that would last in the years of prosperity to 1890. Already the question of "whether to limit themselves to preserving the privileges of their craft, or to take on the less skilled" had arisen. Experience showed there was no choice—the protection of craft privileges required the organisation of the unskilled.

The printers' unions survived unemployment and strike defeats in the depression of the 1890s. Out of that travail came the Labor Party and compulsory arbitration. In the slow revival to the First World War the unions gained new experience in strikes and arbitration courts, Commonwealth and State awards, in dealings with Labor and non-labor governments, in industrial and political action. They were torn by the conscription struggles and strikes of the First World War, touched by the I.W.W. militancy. They suffered again in the depression of the 1930s, lifted their eyes to perceive the threat of fascism and war, took part in the national effort of the Second World War and the post-war struggles for the forty hour week and a better life. They reflected the attitudes of the Cold War period and in 1966, spurred by technological changes, combined in the Printing and Kindred Industries Union to provide a significant example of the current amalgamation trend.

So the printers illustrate a great deal of Australia's past. It is one of the merits of Dr. Hagan's book that he gives a clear picture of the periods in Australian history, their economic, political and social characteristics, and of the position of the printers in each of them.

Because this is a pioneering work the author has to do everything himself. He has to explain the technological changes which constantly affected the printers—the illustrations of this are excellent. He has to discover the structure and economics of the industry at each stage, and to write a commemorative volume which celebrates the jubilee of a federal union. The unions must be traced in each Colony or State, when they were often quite separate. Only the author's smooth style and skill in compression enables him to encompass all this.

It is a careful, objective and scholarly book which is still close to an academic thesis in its exactness of detail and its caution in judgement, although it is told with quiet humor and unfailing humanity. Often the reader would like to see some themes carried further as the large questions which arise for the trade unions and the labor movement are presented. Dr. Hagan does not hide his commitment to his printers and labor but he is writing history from which each reader must draw his own conclusions. He neither romanticises the workers nor vilifies the employers but seeks to understand and explain their actions and the objective circumstances which governed them.

A book like this is a major job which will take at least three years' full-time work by a professional historian or a trade union official. There is no way of doing it quickly or easily, yet we wander in the dark without such studies. Very little labor history
has been written in Australia compared to, say, Britain, and much of that has been strictly political. Undoubtedly this reflects the gap between the labor movement and intellectuals in this country, which can only be overcome by co-operation on both sides.

The Printing Industry Employees' Union, as it then was, is to be congratulated on making its records available and sponsoring the research. It was fortunate to find in Dr. Hagan an author who combines the skills of an historian with experience in the labor movement. Its history is celebrated in a volume of lasting value which makes a wider contribution. We need more trade union histories of this quality.

E. C. Fry.


MOST PEOPLE can recall that in the recent past the two largest ideological structures of the world, Catholicism and Communism, were monolithic, rigidly ruled systems. Criticism from within was only tolerated within narrow confines, if at all. The 20th Congress of the CPSU and the Vatican 11 Council were focal points in a process of change. Whatever these two historically important meetings achieved, or failed in, they gave the impetus that has lifted criticism and proposals for renewal into the open. Progress is both necessary and painfully demanding. C. G. Jung expressed himself as follows: "Jesus is the perfect example of a man who preached something different from the religion of his forefathers. But the imitatio Christi does not appear to include the mental and spiritual sacrifice which he had to undergo at the beginning of his career and without which he would never have become a saviour." (p. xxi, The Tibetan Book of the Great Liberation, OUP 1954). There is no doubt that Father Kenny has included mental and spiritual sacrifice in his imitation of Christ. This book bears the marks of much study, meditation, and theological research.

Compared to many western countries, Australia is extremely conservative in most of its ways. In the Catholic Church in Australia, this is accentuated somewhat by the general influence of Irish Catholicism, which, despite its undoubted fecundity, is extremely conservative. In keeping with this environment, Fr. Kenny's book could be described as conservatively progressive, as opposed, say, to Fr. Kavanaugh's A Modern Priest Looks at his Outdated Church, currently running second only to J. K. Galbraith's The New Industrial State in the American non-fiction best seller lists.

Fr. Kavanaugh's book is radically progressive, and has not the theological depth of Fr. Kenny's, which, in this reviewer's opinion, deserves widespread study by Christians and non-Christians alike. A Christian who ignores this sort of book is not loyal to the prophetic and reforming traditions of Christianity, and a socialist who refuses to consider it is not loyal to his belief in the primacy of mass movements and social development. Catholicism is a mass movement, as a whole, and the progressives within it, though a minority, are also, on a world scale, a mass movement.

The book is divided into three major sections, dealing respectively with the Vatican 11 Council, the Church and Freedom, and the Church and Marriage. The text is succinctly broken up into manageable sections, and is presented in what might be called the modern manner, which
saves time, and aids comprehension. Many sections could be used to initiate discussions and debates. The book is theological enough to be interesting and colloquial enough to be comprehensible. This, in itself, is an achievement. The placing of the footnotes at the end of each section is a mistake, because one has to continually turn pages when reading. At the bottom of each page would have been better. Likewise, a glossary of terms would be a help to many. Not everyone knows terms such as 'kerygma', or 'eirenicism', much less the 'Gnosticism' (should be Gnosticism) on page 181.

The first section concerns itself with Vatican 11, and with contemporary Catholic theology. Vatican 11 highlighted a problem not peculiar to the Catholic Church, namely the role of national influence within an international field. Rome and Moscow are both centres of world-wide movements. In the hierarchy of each it undoubtedly helps if you speak Italian or Russian, to touch the problem only at its periphery. Likewise, the business capitals of the world, London and New York, require English. Whether the conservatives in these centres are called bureaucrats, organisation men or apparatchiks, they share certain traits, and the world over, are in frequent conflict with members of their movement seeking 'renewal'. There is a class or power struggle within all mass movements. Whether differences in ideology cause or are caused by these struggles, at any rate, they go hand in hand. These struggles can be either beneficial or destructive.

The western philosophical style, for some time, has been 'anti-metaphysical', and Fr. Kenny makes an eloquent and well thought out plea for freeing Catholic theology from metaphysics. However, it should be borne in mind that there are many kinds of metaphysics, and Fr. Kenny is only really objecting to one particular kind (the scholastic type, based on neo-Platonism modified by Aristotelian elements). Progressive Protestants have, for instance, made considerable use of the existentialist metaphysics of Martin Heidegger in opposing their orthodox traditions. But, more generally, it should be remembered that all western thought, since Greece, is in a certain sense metaphysical. Metaphysics is the 'style' of western thought, and this only becomes fully obvious when one compares it with traditional Indian and Chinese thought. These, respectively, have 'mystical' and 'ethical' styles. As an example of what difficulties this causes on the practical level, we have Vincent Cronin's excellent book The Wise Man from the West (Fontana Paperback), being the story of Matteo Ricci, the first Jesuit missionary in China. In the life of this early Jesuit, many of the points raised by Fr. Kenny are already in evidence.

The essay on Freedom raises questions that are of ever increasing concern to Catholic lay people, and the younger clergy. Behind this problem lurks a deeper one, that affects many ideological groups. Traditionally, ideological groups viewed the world dualistically. There was 'us', who were right, and there was 'them', who were wrong. The division was clear-cut, loyalty was a simple matter, and thought was moulded by this oversimplified pattern. The world was interpreted by a precise, dual standard. Progress and sophistication have made this position intolerable to many thinking people. These turn to a form of 'pluralism', in which, situationally at least, the world is made up of a number of groups, none of whom are always right, or always wrong, and who are all an essential part of over-
all reality, deserving respect. A Christian, of this persuasion, will see them all as part of Divine Providence, demanding love, while a Marxist will see them as part of the dialectics of matter and its social manifestations, to be taken seriously. To these people, an Inquisition, a Holy Office, a Cheka, or dogmatic rule by Commissars, is not the correct contemporary application of their ideology, be that Catholicism or Marxism. However, if one thing emerges from history, and from Fr. Kenny's pages, it is that freedom is not just a romantic ideal, to be attained by barricades and manifestos, or nailing theses on a church door. Freedom in modern times means, among other things, a careful re-thinking of history and ideology. Its attainment will be a process of re-search, re-organisation, and promotion of dialogue.

The third section, on Marriage, is the most Catholic of all, because many of its problems exist only for Catholics. But, for them, these problems are very severe, and deserve outsiders' sympathy rather than ridicule. There are two points in this section which are weak. One relates to the nature of marriage as a sacrament, within the Catholic sacramental system. Marriage is the only sacrament in which the recipients are also the ministers. A priest only witnesses a marriage for the Church. As the clergy are celibate, this sacrament is an entirely lay dominated one. Laymen, and laymen alone, administer and receive the sacrament of marriage, and yet have practically no say in its definition or interpretation. Fr. Kenny does not bring this important fact to the fore. The other weakness is that the major problem within marriage for many people is not mentioned. It is the female orgasm. Many women, caught between a socially acquired abhorrence of traditional contraceptives, and a personal fear of pregnancy, develop difficulties in achieving orgasm. The ramifications of this situation are very great, as anyone in the 'marriage-counselling' field will testify. Intercourse without orgasm is an extremely disturbing experience for most women, and leads to innumerable problems. It is at this point that the anovulants (pill) serve their greatest function. They remove the fear of pregnancy without evoking the guilt associated for many women with traditional contraceptives. This is a situation that merits a book similar to Fr. Kenny's on its own.

The bibliography, good in what it lists, does not list enough. Pages of bibliography are never wasted. Among the books the reviewer feels could have been included are: Paul Tillich, *Systematic Theology*, 3 volumes, Nesbit (especially Volume 3 on the Church); *Christian Existentialism—a BerdyayeV Anthology*, Allan and Unwin 1965; *Church and State* by Luigi Sturzo, Geoffrey Bles 1936.

For Catholics this book will be both stimulating and informative, while for non-Catholics it gives an excellent review of the important struggles taking place within the Catholic Church of our time. Culturally it is a credit to Australia, and this reviewer hopes that it will receive the attention it deserves.

P. L. Eldar.


ANY factual account of the life of the ordinary people of China today is useful for an understanding of the essential material and spiritual motivation of the world's biggest nation, Australia's near neighbor.

Such accounts have become more important than ever in recent times, when US and Australian propaganda efforts to create an image of a hysterical people bent on aggressive expansion may appear to receive some
justification from the extravagant statements of leaders of the so-called cultural revolution.

In an interesting introduction of over 40 pages, Jan Myrdal describes the reasons why he sought and obtained permission to spend about a year in China, beginning in the Spring of 1962 with journeys in inner Mongolia and ending in Western Yunnan, with one whole autumn month—from mid-August to mid-September—spent in the village of Liu Ling, near Yenan in northern Shansi.

Among these reasons were his own intellectual, humanist and social attitudes arising from Sweden's strong free peasant traditions and based on a premise that human beings are, in the last analysis, rational, that they respond in a rational manner to an existing social and material reality.

During the four months in China that preceded his stay in Liu Ling, he had struggled to obtain a clear picture of the tremendous change resultant on the Chinese revolution, which he rightly calls "one of the great social and political upheavals of modern times."

As he says, the Chinese development is of such a character that it demands of each of us to understand why and how. But, though the literature on China is enormous, including many excellent and scholarly tomes, he lacked the one book he wanted to read; a factual, concrete account of one specific village, thus making the question of the village in general understandable.

So he obtained permission to live for a month in Liu Ling where, with the aid of two excellent interpreters, he patiently interviewed the villagers and made extensive, factual notes of their mode of life, organisations and ideas.

The resultant book, divided into 13 parts, with careful explanation of terms used and a good index, is the best and most detailed description of a Chinese village I have seen—better, for example, than Edgar Snow's The Other Side of the River, published in 1962 and also containing a description of Liu Ling.

It is not a study of the Chinese village in general and does not pretend to be. As the writer reminds us, China is a vast country and conditions can be extremely different in different parts of the country at the same time.

For instance, the peasants in this book do not mention the famine and agriculture catastrophe which followed the disastrous Great Leap Forward.

This, says the author, does not mean that famine did not exist—the food situation in China was precarious when he arrived there. But for several reasons, both climatic and political, the results were not so catastrophic in northern Shensi.

Nor will the reader find in the accounts of the village's progress by its 23 Communist Party and 24 Youth League members any of the violent criticism of the Soviet Union and modern revisionism which have become the hallmark of leaders of the cultural revolution. Their emphasis is on the tremendous, patient work done by the Chinese Party and Youth League in carrying the anti-Japanese resistance and social revolution through to victory, and on the construction work being done to consolidate and extend the people's gains from these great historical events.

The book is honest and objective—or, at least, as the author confesses, as honest as possible, bearing in mind that he is biased towards the ordinary people and that one of the aspects of Chinese civilisation he likes most is the respect it gives to work, both physical and intellectual.

E. A. Bacon.
AUSTRALIAN MARXIST RESEARCH FOUNDATION

The *Australian Left Review* recently initiated a proposal for the establishment of an Australian Marxist Research Foundation. The warm support and readiness to participate in such a project expressed by a number of trade unionists, academics, professional people and others shows clearly that it fulfills a long-felt need in Australia.

Some of the projected activities of the Foundation are described below.

A specialised research library will be established, open to all interested persons. The services of a competent assistant will ensure efficient conduct of the library and help for research groups and individuals with the provision of lists of material relevant to their subject, and in other ways.

The Communist Party of Australia has expressed readiness to make available its valuable collection of books and periodicals at 168 Day Street, Sydney, as the nucleus of such a library.

A number of research scholarships will be endowed. Scholarships of, say, one year, will carry a grant of $1,500-$2,000.

Candidates for the scholarships will be publicly called for in accordance with clearly established requirements, final selection being made from among the applicants by the Foundation, or some selection committee it might appoint.

Endowment of these scholarships will be sought from organisations and individuals in Australia, from marxist institutions in other countries, and as possible, from contributions to the general funds of the Foundation.

The Foundation will participate in the organisation of lecture tours by prominent Marxists from other countries and from within Australia. In conjunction with such tours it will develop various forms of educational work—seminars, symposia, schools, discussion and research groups and the publication, as possible, of suitable materials and the results of research.

Further public announcements will be made shortly.

Opinions, expressions of support and financial contributions would be welcome. Please address these in the first instance to *Australian Left Review*, Box A247, Sydney South Post Office 2000.
Available shortly . . .

Papers presented at symposia held in Sydney and Melbourne, July-August 1967, The symposia commemorated the hundredth anniversary of the publication of Capital by Karl Marx.

MARX

The Man
Philosopher
Historian
Economist
Politician

Sydney Symposium
C. Manning Clark
J. D. Blake
Bernie Taft

Melbourne Symposium
Dr. Alan Roberts
Dr. Ian Turner
Bruce McFarlane
Eric Aarons

The seven papers appear in one volume priced $1.00 post free within Australia.

Copies may be ordered from the Australian Left Review, Box A247, Sydney South Post Office, 2000.