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NOVEMBER'S GREAT EVENT was the celebration of the 50th anniversary of the socialist revolution in Russia. None ignored it. Most concede that the revolution was the most important event of all in a tempestous twentieth century. Many hold it to be the most significant in the whole history of the human race.

Enemies (of all kinds), friends (of all kinds) and those in between of equal variety said their piece, wrote articles, gave interviews, produced supplements, special features, documentaries—every imaginable form of commentary. In Australia, with the exception of a few hysterical and consequently self-defeating outbursts of hate, most assessments were thoughtful efforts—certainly from very different points of view—to come to grips with the meaning and purport of the rise of the socialist star in the modern world.

Pluses and minuses have been listed—minuses real enough, pluses monumental by any standards. But the main effort has been to put the processes set off by November 7 1917 into some sort of perspective. The very scale of the commentary—how many millions of words, feet of film?—yet recognition that not everything has been said, not by a long shot, is further testimony to the history-making nature of the occasion.

What is the perspective after 50 years—nearly a lifetime, two generations? There is more than one angle from which to get a perspective. The revolution in its historical setting—the circumstances and forces which produced it. The present position compared with the past. The impact on world development, and vice versa. And there is perspective in relation to the future. This too has received its share of attention but remains, partly in the nature of the case, less exhaustive and certainly more speculative. Yet it seems the most significant, for while the past is important and invests the mind of the living, for good and ill, socialist society has only now reached that degree of achievement and maturity which puts competition with advanced “western” societies on a roughly comparable basis.

The question presents itself: such and such has happened with and to the socialist revolution over the past 50 years—what does the next 50 hold? To many, to those without a sense of history, to friends of socialism who want to see still more improvements still quicker, to those whose political approach rests on the sands of “what about so and so”, to the young whose time scale counts
five years as a lifetime and 50 as eternity, to ask this question may seem beside the point at best, or at worst evasion.

Not so. The prospects and perspectives of socialist development from here on are the most important of all. Various assessments “the unfinished revolution”, “the story is not yet over”, “Russia’s evolving revolution” or the version of the Soviet Union itself: “the thing now is to build a communist society,” all recognise this.

To form some estimate of achievement and get some inkling of potentiality, it is useful to measure the socialist revolution against other revolutions. It took 150 years after the “glorious revolution” of Oliver Cromwell, which opened the way for capitalist development in England, for the modestly democratic Reform Bill to be introduced.

More than 150 years after the French revolution for Liberty, Equality, Fraternity, the French were fighting a desperate (though losing) battle to prevent their realisation in Vietnam and Algeria; French women did not get the vote 'till 1944.

One hundred years after a bitter civil war to end slavery and free the negroes in the United States, those with black skins are still depressed and oppressed, and targets of massive, sub-human racial prejudice and bigotry.

One hundred and fifty years after the great revolutions in Latin America most nations lag abysmally in economic and cultural development, their backwardness being powerfully reinforced under cover of a “Pax Americana”—an ugly reality which the US is fighting in Vietnam to enforce elsewhere as well (and a great advertisement for it to be sure!)

In this sphere of the colonial, under-developed world, the impact of 1917 has been and remains immense, providing still today a road forward for which capitalism provides, judged purely on the record, no viable alternative. Since that world comprises two thirds of humanity, this alone would more than justify speaking of the historic impact and vital relevance of the socialist revolution.

This is not to suggest that the socialist road for the under-developed countries is a straight one, still less one strewn with roses. Far from it. But it is to assert that any other road is still more circuitous and strewn with still larger and more numerous thorns, with less, if any, prospect of decisive success. It is equally a tribute to the existence of socialism that it affords not only some sort of model, some sort of know-how as well as extensive and suitable material assistance for rapid development of the backward, but provides a counter weight to the gun-boat diplomacy which would otherwise be running riot everywhere, not to mention its decisive part in restraining the forces making for world war.
While these aspects alone would be more than enough to justify speaking without one whit of exaggeration of the enormous and continuing impact of the Russian socialist revolution of 1917, they are not the whole—perhaps, in a way, they are only the more outward and noticeable expressions of something still more far-reaching for man's social advance.

Because if a world war is averted and the dangers of a "race war" overcome, and all countries get on the road to the relative economic abundance which advanced countries by and large have the capacity to produce (however differently used in socialist and capitalist countries) the social and spiritual problems posed in these conditions will become of universal concern. In any case they are understandably of foremost concern in countries like our own.

It is natural that common problems of human relations and attitudes should arise on the basis of similar types of production (in many ways, a factory anywhere is a factory; issues raised by the advance to automation are similar). The big question in the contest between socialism and capitalism in advanced countries is how these similar problems will be tackled. Which form of social organisation is the better based to meet these great challenges in the interests of man? One formulation of the way in which marxists view this is as follow:

"The moment science and its practical applications become decisive factors of growth the release of man's creative powers acquires a new social and production connotation.

"A higher level of technology will enable man for the first time in history to pay the attention to himself that he rightly deserves. In time the most effective way of expanding the productive forces of society will be the development of the human personality for its own sake." (From a document produced by a research team of the Czechoslovak Communist Party and the Academy of Sciences. Published in abridged form in ALR No. 3 1967).

Of course this has yet to be actually achieved; there must be big changes in the economy and in social relations, and no big social change is easy. There are obstacles in the Soviet Union and other socialist countries, as well as in the capitalist countries. But are they of the same kind?

Conservatism, bureaucracy, inadequate development of democratic processes may be picked out everywhere. But in addition to these, there is in capitalist society a further and most powerful obstacle—that the main wealth and sources of wealth are mono-
polished by a tiny minority. These owners get absolutely and relatively richer, even if the non-owners may not get absolutely poorer. (It is easier, so the saying goes, to make the second million than the first thousand). And who doubts that wealth is the main measure of influence and status in our society?

And there are no available democratic forms or processes within capitalism by which this can be altered. A bureaucratic union official, party functionary, manager of a public enterprise can be removed, but a bureaucratic owner (how many are not bureaucratic?) cannot. This is inbuilt in the system, and beyond the reach of the people as long as that system lasts.

In a socialist country there are no such inbuilt and irremovable obstacles, which is not to deny that there are obstacles. There were obstacles to removing Stalinism yet it was removed, many economic and other improvements made, and democracy greatly expanded. Further progress will be no more difficult. If the advanced social forces could find the strength for the one, they will surely have it for the other.

In contrast, in the last 50 years, what expansion of democratic rights has taken place in Australia or other "Western Democracies"? The lack of expansion of such rights is hardly because democracy has reached the limits of development! And in fact the currents have been all the other way — usually stemmed only by mass opposition. Yet the threats are continually renewed, at a time when far-reaching changes in economic and social life demand a great new advance.

The Dialogue

AN IMPORTANT EXPRESSION of the seeking for answers to the problems of today and reaching towards a new understanding of man, is found in the growing cooperation and communication between religious people and communists, roughly summed up under the term “dialogue”. In this issue we introduce to our readers a number of writers on this subject which, far from being a passing fashion, will be with us for a very long time.

On an increasing scale, and on a growing number of issues, communists and a section of religious people are finding themselves moved by similar concerns. World peace or the alternative of nuclear armageddon. Problems of the colonial and underdeveloped world. Race and national relations. Poverty in the affluent society. Unemployment and economic instability and who is to bear the burdens. Respect for the dignity and democratic rights of human beings in today's conditions of big institutions and enterprises, and of sweeping social change stemming from the scientific and technological revolution. The commercialism and
self-seeking of our society in which those concerned with the spiritual and moral qualities of man, and imbued with the need for new steps in man’s infinite progression, whether conscientiously religious people, communists or others, often feel themselves “embattled” — these are some of the deep sources from which the cooperation and communication spring.

At the same time, both the viability of socialism as an alternate form of society, and the crisis in religious ideology stemming from the advance of science and the cultural level of the population, has also worked in the direction of impelling many to re-seek what is most basic in religious belief. Communists likewise have been driven by big events which they had not envisaged, to re-study and re-assess what is most basic in their own outlook.

While all sections of society are affected by the problems posed above, giving the social foundation for the emergence of a movement seeking in one way or another far-reaching social change — a movement described, not so completely and not so accurately in the phrase “coalition of the left” — there is a particular feature distinguishing religious people and communists and marxists. This is (without in any way claiming exclusiveness) that both, in Australian society at least, are by and large unable to divorce their concern with individual social, political and moral questions from their general philosophy regarding man, his history, fate, and place in the universe.

All the above influences combined mean that the two are driven together of necessity and not because of manoeuvrings, “front” work, undercover reds who have wormed their way into the bosom of the church, or (still more fanciful) secret believers who have white-anted the ranks of the Communist Party. The questions will not go away by incantations about the trickiness of communists, or their relative weakness (“derisory”, said one eminent journal, hopefully) in Australia.

There is no sign of any relatively developed new philosophy of man, of life, being thrown up by the capitalist social order. The extent to which religion once met or seemed to meet this need has been greatly lessened both by the crisis of religious thought in face of the advance of knowledge, and the new turn of elements within the churches away from endorsement of that order. So far the only more or less developed non-religious ideology produced by capitalism has been fascism. The “social-Darwinism” (survival of the fittest in the rat race) prevalent in the United States can be made scarcely more attractive, even if theoretically elaborated further than it is at present.

The fact that much of the dialogue involves highly generalised and abstract principles on the moral and philosophical plane may
make it appear rather rarefied or high falutin' to the average person (particularly in the English-speaking countries which have an "anti-philosophical" or perhaps more accurately, an empiricist tradition). The resulting lack of communication even within the ranks of the participants themselves is of course a problem, but one to be faced both with patience and continued effort at self-education.

Some will want to confine dialogue or cooperation to specific issues. But they should reflect first, that this has spontaneously developed and will continue to do so (and is, in fact, a long standing tradition — in the unions for example), and that only deeper probing can give it greater strength and depth. Second, that the specific and the more general are not divorced from each other, but are different aspects or expressions of the same thing approached from different starting points.

In all denominations those considering entering into the dialogue (as yet quite few) have to face powerful opposition within their orders. And another obstacle may well be that since the Roman Catholics have been traditionally (again, in Australia at least) more "ideological" and philosophically inclined than most Protestant denominations, the "dialogue" may develop unevenly, thereby running into the shoals of sectarianism, and even generating a modicum of what might, with apologies, be termed "Protestant backlash".

A further obstacle is the lack of understanding of each side's real positions. This is partly because of the past habit of mutual anathema, which has made it still easier (it is always easy!) to tackle the straw, rather than the real man or argument. Understanding of actual (and especially of new) positions is likely to develop a healthy mutual respect. As a rough generalisation it might be said that in Australia the leaders on the religious side of the dialogue have a better understanding of the communists' real position (witness the articles which follow) than vice versa, while at a rank and file or lay level the position is probably the opposite. Clearly, there is much study to be done.

One thing stressed by all concerned with the dialogue is that they neither seek nor want some cheap "togetherness", or ideological hybrid as an end-product. Some ultimates appear irreconcilable. But the participants are moved by the same problems, they share the same concern for man, they participate in the same quest. And since they are deeply moved, since the concern is genuine and the quest real, the answers cannot be considered to be already possessed readymade by anyone. Cross-pollination of ideas in this field too, may result in the long run in a new advance.
MARXIST-CHRISTIAN DIALOGUE

Roger Garaudy delivered the paper which appears here in an abridged form, at St. Michael's College Toronto. It was first published in the Roman Catholic quarterly, Continuum, St. Xavier College, Chicago. This paper represents the main ideas of Garaudy as they appear in his book From Anathema to Dialogue, recently published in English.

It was under this title that a Pax Convention was held in Melbourne September 24, 1967, where Roman Catholics discussed questions pertaining to dialogue.

We present here summaries of various papers given at this Convention.

The papers by Fr. Kenny and Fr. Marstin were prepared for the Convention but were not actually delivered. They were, however, made available there, together with the other papers.

IN OUR TIME, the dialogue is an objective necessity. This absolute necessity of dialogue and cooperation between Christians and Communists proceeds from two incontrovertible facts:

1 In this second half of the Twentieth Century, the presently existing stocks of atomic and thermonuclear bombs have made it technically possible to destroy every trace of life on earth. We have now reached the sublime and tragic moment in human history, in which the human epic begun a million years ago could well come to an end. If mankind is to survive, it will not do so merely through the force of the inertia of biological evolution, but rather through a human decision which requires, as Teilhard de Chardin has so admirably said: “the common effort of all those who believe that the universe is still progressing, and that we are in charge of this progress.”

2 The second incontrovertible fact is that on this earth, this vessel floating in space with three billion men aboard, which dissension in the crew could scuttle at any moment, there are two great conceptions of the world: hundreds of millions of human beings find in a religious belief the meaning of their life and of their death, the meaning of human history itself, and for hundreds of millions of others it is Communism which shapes the hopes of the world and gives meaning to our history. This, then, is an incontrovert-
ible datum of our time; the future of mankind cannot be built in opposition to those with a religious faith, nor even without them; the future of mankind cannot be built in opposition to the Communists, nor even without them.

Father Gonzales Ruiz distinguishes two levels for such a dialogue: the level of the concept of man, and the level of politics. Such a distinction seems quite legitimate to me and the connection of the two problems appears equally legitimate. For it is not possible, in such a debate, to set aside the respective concepts of man in order to discuss exclusively political policies. Marxism, like Christianity, will not divorce the treatment of social and political problems from philosophic principles.

A dialogue conceived in such terms is distinctly demanding both with respect to oneself, and with respect to the other. For the encounter, if it is to be more than sporadic or for merely tactical purposes, must engage the very centre of our being. Such a dialogue requires that each partner return to what is fundamental: Both the Christian and the Marxist must abstract what is essential from what is merely historical accident or temporary circumstance; he must abstract that which cannot under any circumstances be subject to compromise. In the course of these last few years, such a reassessment has occurred on both sides, each side sensing the need to return to what is fundamental.

Three of the most important events of our era: the overwhelming development of the natural and technical sciences; the socialist revolutions, which have furnished us with historical evidence that capitalism does not represent the only possible form of social relations in our time, nor even the best form; and the irresistible movements of national liberation amongst nations hitherto colonised, which have created new centres of historical initiative and have revealed sources of human value outside the western tradition. These three major events of our period have considerably enlarged the scope of the human horizon, and, in so doing, have led Christians to a clearer realisation of what aspects of their faith are merely the incidental results of the historic conditions of the birth and development of Christianity, and what aspects of their faith are essential.

The scientific concept of the nature of the world has, in every period, influenced the manner in which men have conceived of God and of their own function in the world. It is for this reason that every period of great progress in the natural sciences has changed man's general view of the world, and, in so doing, has brought forth major religious crises. Starting from this historical insight, Father Teilhard raises the question of a current formulation of the Christian faith which will take into consideration the
changes which have occurred in the world. The conversion of the Church to the hopes of the world requires most certainly a bold initiative:

She must submerge in order to be able to re-emerge and lift up. To participate in order to render sublime. This is the very law of the Incarnation. One day, some thousand years ago, the popes bid farewell to the Roman world, and decided to turn towards the barbarians.

Is not a similar and even more profound gesture appropriate today?

I believe that the world will not be converted to the celestial hopes of Christianity, until Christianity is converted to the hopes of the world to make them divine.

Father Teilhard is never opposed to a faith in something beyond the struggle here on earth.

Taken by itself, faith in the world does not suffice to move the earth forward. On the other hand, however, is it quite certain that, taken by itself, Christian faith is still sufficient to move the world upwards on high?

He even adds:

The synthesis of the Christian God on high with the Marxist God ahead; this is the only God whom we shall in future be able to worship in spirit and in truth.

Never before, perhaps, has the problem of the totality of man been stated as boldly. To achieve thus a concept of Christianity as a "religion of action", to re-evaluate the world, is not merely an answer to the problem of the relationships of religion and science, but also an answer to the problem of the relationships of Christianity and society.

A concept of Christianity immersed in the world and not divorced from it nor averting itself from it as if the world were unclean, this is not an innovation of our age at all. Side by side with the tradition of the Imitation of Christ, there exists in the Catholic Church a tradition of Christian humanism. Each time that mankind has accomplished decisive progress in the mastery of nature, of society, and of its future, the accent has shifted to this Christian humanism. During the Renaissance, Cardinal Bel-larmine wrote of "the ascent towards God by the ladder of the creatures." The extraordinary renaissance of our Twentieth Century has once more brought to life this state of mind, now, however, not merely for a small elite of humanists, but rather for the broad masses of mankind.

The whole history of the Church is informed by this internal dialectic, by this opposition within it of the Constantinian tradition, in which the accent is on the fact of sin, and which serves as a justification for a providential and legitimate state of authority
leading otherwise incapable men to liberty, and the apocalyptic tradition, which re-appears whenever the masses of the populace become aware of their strength, which places the accent on the fact that God incarnate as Man has triumphed over sin, and which undertakes to inscribe this apocalypse into history. The Constantinian tradition sanctifies the dominion of class over class, confirming slavery, servitude and dependence on wages; it aligns the Church in solidarity with this dominion. The apocalyptic tradition, on the other hand inspired the rebellion of John Huss as well as the more recent colonial heresies. The most profound significance of the movement towards an "aggiornamento"* is perhaps that, under the pressure of the changed conditions of human existence in the Twentieth Century, the apocalyptic pole in the Church gains ground at the expense of the Constantinian pole.

Christianity stimulates historic creativity by its indication of the merely provisional character of every historic present, and participates with all its power in the full realisation of man, because it is through this full realisation that man can encounter God. Such an attitude permits us now to place the dialogue on a new and higher level. It is on this level that Father Gonzales Ruiz, writing in the organ of the Catholic Youth Movement of Spain, raises the question:

Socialism has brought more justice into the world than the old social structures. The human meaning of work, the suppression of the social classes, the building of socialism . . . a serious and faithful confrontation of ideas becomes necessary on all these points.

It is remarkable that the return to what is fundamental was begun, for Marxist philosophers as for Christians, by a new study of the sources in order to discover what was specifically Marxist in the materialism of their doctrine, what Marx had brought to philosophy which was radically new.

This movement of reflection places us at the heart of our subject, for the majority of theoretical misunderstandings between Christians and Marxists come from a great confusion even about the word "materialism."

What distinguishes Marxism from all earlier forms of materialism is that Marxism takes the creative act of man as its point of departure. In his Theses on Feuerbach Marx underlines this radical difference:

The chief defect in all earlier materialism . . . is that the object, reality, sensuousness, is conceived only in terms of the object or of contemplation, but not as concrete human activity, as practice, not subjectively.

* Aggiornamento: Bringing up to date, modernising.
It is remarkable that in this text, generally rightly considered as the birth of Marxist philosophy, seven theses out of eleven are directly devoted to disengaging the various aspects of this creative act of man:

The active side of knowledge;
the criterion of practice, as the only criterion of truth;
the task of philosophy defined as transforming the world.

The Faustian primacy of action in Marx evokes the Fichtean and Hegelian origins of his philosophy. "The grandeur of Hegel's Phenomenology" (writes Marx in his Manuscripts of 1844) "lies in the fact that he conceives of man as the result of his own work." This will become the cornerstone of Marx's conception of socialism: "For the man of socialism, all that we call universal history, is nothing more than the birth of man by human work."

The moment of creation, and with it, the moment of subjectivity and that of transcendence, of going beyond what is given, are essentials in Marxism. Marxist humanism, if it lies, as Marx insisted, beyond all that is merely negative in atheism, is not interested in the questions men ask about the meaning of their life and of their death, about the problem of their origins and of their ends, on the exigencies of their thought and of their hearts.

The Marxist ask himself the same questions as the Christian, the same exigencies are at work for him, he lives in the same state of future-directedness, but — and here lies the difference — he does not believe himself to be authorized — because Marxism is a critical and not a dogmatic philosophy — to transform his question into an answer, his exigency into a presence. "Ever active spirit, how I feel you!" wrote Goethe, and Marxism, with its Faustian and Fichtean inspiration, does not yield to the temptation of affirming the existence, behind the act, of a being which is its source. My thirst is no proof of the existence of a spring. The infinite is for the Marxist both absence and exigency, for the Christian both promise and presence.

Here there is incontestably a divergence between the Promethean view of liberty as creation, and the Christian conception of grace and consent. Transcendence is for the Christian the act of God coming towards him and calling to him. It is to the Marxist an act of man overreaching himself towards his remote being.

I believe that Marxist atheism only takes from man the illusion of certitude and that Marxist dialectic, lived out to the full, is in the end richer in infinity and more exigent than Christian transcendence. Besides, it is probably only like this because it bears in itself the wonderful Christian heritage, and because it owes it to itself to question it still further: living Marxism, which has
proved its fertility and effectiveness in history, in political economy, in the revolutionary struggles of the building of socialism, owes it to itself, in terms of philosophy, to elaborate in more profound fashion a theory of transcendence which is not alienated. In this search, Christianity has much to teach us, and it would be a tragedy of history and a great waste of time for mankind if the dialogue between Christians and Marxists, their cooperation for mutual enrichment and for the common building of the future, of the city of man, of the complete man, were to be vitiated for much longer, perhaps because of the dead hand of the past.

A thousand years of strife exist between us. There is no way to get rid of it without facing it squarely. A balance-sheet of our complaints has been drawn up in Marx's lapidary phrase of 1843: "Religion is the opium of the people." The question is worth asking: "Judging from a purely historical and sociological point of view, has religion been and is it the opium of the people?"

The teaching of the Church in its official form and for the greater part of its history since Constantine, has put the brake on or fought against the struggles of the oppressed by placing the conquest of justice, liberty and happiness in another world, by lending the legitimacy of divine right to the established order and by teaching resignation to exploitation and oppression. To go no further than the experience of the West, the masters of Christian thought have legitimized all class dominations: slavery, serfdom and dependence on wages.

The fundamental thesis is developed in all its generality by Pope Pius X on the 18th December, 1903:

Human society, as God established it, is composed of unequal elements. Consequently, it is appropriate to the order established by God that human society have princes and subjects, owners and workers, rich and poor, learned and ignorant, nobles and members of the lower classes.

Obviously a social doctrine founded on resignation to one's lot flows from this thesis. The encyclical Quadragesimo Anno (1931) advances this conclusion explicitly: "Workers should accept the place which divine providence has allotted them without complaint."

Is that as much as to say that religion is only the opium of the people? With the same force, we reply: No. The Marxist conception of religion cannot reduce itself and does not reduce itself to this summary formula. The thesis according to which religion, in all times and in all places, turns man away from action, from struggles and from work, is in flagrant contradiction with historical reality. This thesis was never Marx's. In the very next text where the famous formula "religion is the opium of the people"
is found, Marx, a few lines later, underlines the fact that Christianity "is, on the one hand the expression of real distress and, on the other, protest against real distress." Here is the first dialectical approach to religious fact. This dialectical conception alone allows us to understand the history of Christianity while distinguishing at each stage, reflection and protestation, opium and stimulant, faith and ideology, the moment of Constantine and the moment of the apocalypse, existential exigency and its alienation.

The acute sense of opening to the future has thus degenerated in vulgar apologetics, into an attempt to slide faith into the temporary cracks of knowledge and to demean the idea of God so that he becomes, in Fr. Durbarle's expression, "the little supplement to our intellectual insufficiencies." It was against this sort of thing that Teilhard de Chardin reacted with violence.

Efforts of this kind, more and more frequent in our time, help Marxists to become aware of the blessed illusion, left as a legacy to the proletariat by the 18th century in France (which radically misunderstood the specificity of religious fact), that a good scientific propaganda would finish off religion. Science helps to make superstition, magic and myth recede.

Does science touch upon the fundamental in religion? We do not believe that it does. The crucial debate between Christians and atheists is not located on a scientific plane, but on a moral plane. There is, however, a profound split between Christians and Marxists, and it is important to place it exactly in perspective.

For us Marxists, faith in our task does not presuppose any reference to the presence of and appeal to a God. The previous success of thought and action in the humanization of nature and the humanization of history give us enough strength, we think, to continue the human epic which began more than a million years ago. We freely admit that there is a risk in acting on this certitude, since no one and nothing guarantees us victory in advance. But it is also true that no one and nothing lets us assert that this guarantee exists.

Faith in God makes the Christian live as consent the life we live as creation, although for both parties it is an opening onto the future, a self-transcendence. The certitudes which we postulate at the end of our effort are postulated by the Christian at its source. But the fact remains that both parties live out the same tension. And what is important is that the completely human faith in our task should not rob man of any of the dimensions historically conquered from the starting-point of faith in God, and that faith in a transcendent Deity should never limit or put brakes on faith in the human task.
Any other divergence is not a religious divergence. Any polemic on the institution, as for example on the social role of the Church or the behaviour of socialist states or communist parties is political and historical discussion. Any polemic on religious ideology and Marxist theory is scientific and philosophical discussion.

At the ideological and institutional level two human plans confront each other and can mutually enrich each other, and the problem of atheism and faith can constitute neither a precondition nor an exclusive condition. It is no doubt for Christians to say what Marxism brings to them, so that their very faith may be incarnate in historical reality and become an effective force in the struggle to create the political and social conditions for the realization of the complete man. But, as Marxists, we cannot possibly evade the search for what Marxism itself, as a world-view at the basis of a methodology of historical initiative, owes to Christianity as the religion of the absolute future and to what it has brought to the exploration of two essential dimensions of man: those of subjectivity and transcendence.

This is the surest basis for dialogue, the best guarantee of its faithfulness: the profound certainty that if each of us recognizes what is fundamental in his certitudes, he will discover, the one by his faith in God, the other by his faith in the human task, a common willingness to stretch man's creative energies to the maximum in the direction of the realization of the complete man, and he will recognize the mutual enrichment which will result from dialogue, from cooperation and emulation between the Marxist's Promethean humanism and the humanism of the Christian.

To be fertile, this dialogue must be demanding. The worst danger would be that of idealizing it, that is to say of believing that all other problems have been solved and that a dialogue among a few disincarnate "well-meaning souls" will bring the world salvation—that is, unity. Let us be quite sure about the fact that we are as yet only on the verge of a great turning-point in the human epic, which will only be truly passed when we move from the meeting of a small number of isolated pathfinders, who are sometimes suspect in their own communities, to a real dialogue among the communities themselves.

But on both sides, the obstacles and the misunderstandings will only be removed by our going over from anathema to dialogue. For our part we accept and desire this dialogue with all our strength. We offer a dialogue without precondition or exclusive condition. We do not ask anyone to stop being what he is, but on the contrary we ask him to be it more fully and to be it better. We hope that our interlocutors would formulate the same stricture for us.
Denis Kenny

"While rejecting atheism, root and branch, the Church sincerely professes that all men, believers and unbelievers alike, ought to work for the rightful betterment of this world in which all alike live. Such an ideal cannot be realized, however, apart from sincere and prudent dialogue."

Vatican II.

IT SEEMS that the prevailing attitude of Catholics to communists and communism has been sub-rational and sub-Christian. Sub-rational first of all, because it is often generated by ignorance. Sub-Christian, secondly, because it entails a refusal to understand, to sympathize, and to forgive. The challenge to understand many of the intricacies of communist theory and the devious and tortuous paths of communist policy is difficult: it is also difficult to sympathize with many of the means used by communist regimes and to forgive the violence, the destruction, the suppression of civil and religious liberties that they have perpetrated. But we must remember that loving enemies and forgiving persecutors though not part of their official platform is essential to ours.

The Four Phases of Dialogue

There are four phases in this task of developing the appropriate basic attitude for dialogue. Most of these are concerned with removal of ignorance, of mistaken impressions and with the need to understand. If this task is successful, some barriers will be broken down and some obstacles to peace removed. You will recall Christ's injunction to remove the beam from your own eye before you attempt to remove the mote from your brother's! Initially it is difficult to say which of the two parties is afflicted with the beam and which with the mote. Only history will tell.

Phase One: Motives

The first phase in the removal of beams is that of understanding the motivation of communists. Almost invariably communists are accused of seeking world domination. This is a slander for it is not what they claim to seek. Communists seek the emancipation of the exploited classes of the world. This is a rather different ambition, and one with which a Church, which claims to be the church of the poor, should feel some sympathy. The aim in using the catch cry that communists seek world domination is that they are more easily identified with a Nazi style ideology and it conjures up fears of the consequences of appeasement and compromise. A task for Australian Catholics therefore, is a thorough
investigation of the fundamental communist aim. The shift in focus and emphasis away from world domination to that of concern about the two-thirds of the world which is in thrall to ignorance and poverty, brings with it a greater possibility for mutual understanding.

Phase Two: Foreign Policy

The second phase in the removal of beams concerns the field of international affairs and foreign policy. In this we have to become more acutely aware of the defects of foreign policy with which Australia has been associated. There is an increasing volume of evidence that the West and especially the USA have been to some extent responsible for the generation of cold war tensions; we have been subjected to twenty years of partisan propaganda in the interests of a capitalist political ideology and often this propaganda has been taken up and amplified by the Catholic press and the popular religious magazines and periodicals. There is a tendency to ridicule and denigrate the positive achievements of communist regimes; a failure to recognize and appreciate that in a country like China these regimes have succeeded in a short period of time when all the western nations seemed capable of was destruction and exploitation.

It is important to appreciate that there is a discernible difference between revolution and violent revolution. There is some evidence to believe that the social and economic problems of the underdeveloped countries of the world can be solved only as a consequence of a radical reorganisation of the present social and economic structures. Christian charity could demand—and this is something that would have to be frankly and thoroughly investigated—that we support revolution as the one hope of the redemption of Asia from chronic poverty, yet insure, by the influence that our support gives us with a communist regime, and by a willingness to give sanctuary to reactionary refugees, that violence is reduced to the minimum. Our present policy insures that we often effectively frustrate the implementation of needed reforms at the maximum cost in violence and bloodshed.

Phase Three: Religion

The third phase in the removal of beams is an attempt to understand the profoundly atheistic and anti-religious strain in communism and the consequent suppression of religious freedom by communist regimes. The difficulty is that Christians naturally tend to see their Church in the best light and usually have a rather limited historical perspective and consciousness. They are
usually unaware of the abysmal impotence of Christians in general to cope with the gross injustices of the industrial revolution. They are usually unaware that Christianity became, or at least appeared to become an instrument of exploitation by the industrial capitalists of the industrial proletariat. To Marx and the communists religion was sapping the creative potential of the masses to rise above poverty and throw off the yoke of social injustice. Even in the emerging nations, Christianity often appeared part of the whole process of western imperialistic domination and not infrequently the Christian missionaries invoked the military power of the west in the interests of religion.

We need to recall Christ's warning that not everyone who says "Lord, Lord" will enter his kingdom. He insisted that the essential qualification was a willingness to do the will of His Father. There can be no doubt that the economic reform and development of the world is, today, part of this.

Catholics and Christians generally are profoundly disturbed by the militant atheism of some communist regimes. In many cases this is incompatible with the atheism of Marx himself about which the leading Catholic German theologian Johann Baptist Metz says:

Marxism does not appear primarily as a world-design for existence against God, but as the offer of a possibility of existence, a total humanity without God. Thematic atheism is thus truly not an object but a presupposition of Marxism . . . it is here, I believe, that the possibility of responsible conversation and exchange offers itself. Christianity must take this humanitarian claim at its word and let its own solidarity in the struggle for the humanity of man be recognised — and this more decisively than ever. The threatened man: he could be the place where the truth of belief and unbelief is today tested and manifested. (Journal of Ecumenical Studies, Vol. 4, No. 2, P. 233).

The conflict between belief and unbelief will be resolved in the crucible of historical reality where the results are chalked up. Remember Christ's remark about inductive criteria: By their fruits you shall know them. In the early 19th century, the results showed a victory to the great religious orders of charity. In the twentieth century, the communist dialectic appears to be triumphing.

Many Christians have not yet faced an important fact of twentieth century life. As Stanley Windass says in an essay "Living with Communism: Creeds in Dialogue" (Peace on Earth: The Way Ahead, ed. Walter Stein, p. 119).

The fact has to be faced that communism is the most dynamic creed to take possession of men's minds since the medieval papacy proclaimed its ideal of a universal Christian monarchy. It is a creed which has already taken possession,
in one way or another, of half the population of the world, and which shows no sign of having run its course; and while it must be admitted that there are some countries where the communist regime lacks popular support and may be expected to 'crumble' in appropriate circumstances (we all think of East Germany) there is little doubt that in most countries where it is established, communism is sufficiently rooted in the loyalties of the people to stand up to storm and tempest, whether material or spiritual. If we are concerned, therefore with the unity of the human race, we have indeed to live with communism; this is a marriage from which there is no divorce.

**Phase Four: Affinities**

The fourth and more positive phase in the developing of an attitude of dialogue is that of seeking affinities between the Christianity of the New Testament and the positive values and insights of communism. The claim of the Catholic New Left in England is that there is greater compatibility between the spirit of the last supper and the Marxist vision of the international community of the classless society based on co-operative ownership and endeavour, than there is between Christianity and a society which is radically competitive and consumer oriented.

The appeal of the New Left is to the early Marx, and they claim that communism requires the same kind of “aggiornamento” which the Catholic Church has subjected itself to, in order to slough off the institutions and ideological accretions which have disguised and even eliminated many of the human and personal values Marx wished to champion.

It is not intended, of course, to gloss over the profound misgivings, which Christians may inevitably have about marxism whether these be philosophical, historical or economic. Many dedicated marxists themselves are realizing that marxism in all its dimensions must be treated as an hypothesis to be modified as new empirical data, not available to Marx, come to light. The important point is, however, that no matter how implausible marxism may be as a political or economic theory or as a philosophical system, the fact remains that it is the ideological dynamic which effectively controls half the world and as such must be reckoned with. It cannot be smugly discounted because of some real or imagined logical inconsistency in its basic metaphysical structure.

**Communist-Catholic dialogue at the domestic level**

So far I have concentrated on some prevailing attitudes to communism and communists at the international level which can be important factors in generating a violent military response at times of political, social or economic crisis. But Catholic attitudes to communists are important also at the domestic level.
In the first instance, many Catholics still think of communists in Australia as subversive elements, as representatives of a foreign power, and they can reach only too readily for confirmation of this in the writings of Lenin. If the same kind of confirmation is used to substantiate the same kind of slander against Catholics, the latter would want to appeal to more recent ecclesiastical documents to assert and vindicate their patriotism. Yet so far they have shown little willingness to allow recent developments in the communist world to count against the slander of their being subversive elements. Catholics demand the right to be intensely concerned about the fate of Catholics in other parts of the world, but are not willing, generally, to concede this right to Australian communists when they show a similar concern for fellow ideologues in other parts of the world. It is beyond doubt, that in the past, Australian communists have been guilty of subversion. But there are still people in Australia who would want to lay the same charge at the door of certain elements in the Catholic Church, for their political activities in the not so distant past.

What we now have to accept is that times have changed and brought in a new set of circumstances and a new set of problems.

Catholics in Australia would like their fellow citizens to be familiar with the Vatican II document on the Church In The Modern World and with the Declaration of Religious Freedom. I should imagine that Australian communists would want their fellow citizens to be familiar with the Documents of their 21st National Party Congress held recently, especially when it states:
The building of a mass Communist Party requires that communists break decisively with dogmatic attitudes and develop policy, theory, organisation and activity that accords with the requirements of contemporary Australian life in all its aspects.

In the Vatican Council, Catholics embarked on a process of rigorous self-examination and self-criticism. The same kind of process is gaining strength among communists.

The fact is that there have been radical changes in the theory and practice of the Australian Communist Party—a process of adaptation and renewal. An ignorance of the changes can have serious political consequences for Australia. To the extent that sub-rational attitudes and fears about communism in Australia prevail, then to that extent a whole area of the political spectrum comes under interdict; a whole area of political activity, a whole range of attitudes and policies is disqualified from rational consideration and becomes anathema because it is "left." This results in a weakening of our political structure, for it limits the choice
of policy options and the range of rational possibilities by automatically excluding any which happen to be espoused by the communists. People with these sub-rational attitudes, therefore, contract out of the arena in which democratic influence can be exerted and expose themselves to ruthless political exploitation, with an inevitable, though scarcely discernible erosion of civil liberties.

Catholics have the self imposed task of being the agents of reconciliation and unity among men, not as a remotely religious but as an immediate task. This task is not fulfilled if we are preferred simply to tolerate or coexist with communists in the Australian society. It is fulfilled only in and through the practical steps which are taken to assimilate groups. This process of assimilation will be achieved not by a cloying and condescending exercise in charity nor by feeble bonhomie. It can result only from a sincere attempt to understand and cooperate.

If we have to look for one area of mutual concern, to the best opportunity for united action in Australia between Catholics and communists, it is that of poverty, social inequality and economic injustice. Anyone with any knowledge of communists would have to concede to them a fundamental, sometimes even a fanatical concern for poverty, a sensitivity to injustice in all its forms and a dedication to doing something about it. Not without some justification, Catholics and Christians generally fear that these pathological social situations have occasionally been exploited by communists in the interests of furthering their domestic and foreign policies. Nevertheless, at the core of communism is this concern for the poor, the underprivileged and the exploited. Communists today, in Australia, regard themselves as a leaven, as a social irritant, and in this role they are not far from Catholics who in the Vatican Council proclaimed themselves officially as "the Church of the poor and the oppressed."

Yet there is the danger, in Australia, that affluence in the Catholic Church makes a mockery of this claim. As Johann Baptist Metz points out, it is not enough merely to make this claim as a merely religious, theoretical and theological escape from the Church's historical responsibility to the poor. It would be insidious if this claim was allowed to remain merely pious rhetoric. The various Catholic religious orders and organisations such as the St. Vincent de Paul Society do magnificent work for the poor, but one could not claim, in Australia, that the Catholic Church is altogether credibly the Church of the poor and oppressed. Indeed, in the interests of its many institutional commitments, it tends to join the ranks of the exploiters. When the Catholic Church
announces itself as “the Church of the poor and the oppressed,” it poses itself with the challenge of “Put up or shut up.”

The question that Catholics have to ask themselves is whether Christ would have been more at home with the atheistic materialists of the right who dominate modern society in their own interests or with the atheistic materialists of the left who seek, through revolution, the emancipation of the underprivileged and the exploited.

The major difficulty with co-operation with communists in Australia is that the Communist Party is basically a political party and shares the defects common to all political parties, among them, the tendency to make political capital out of any project which can rebound to its credit. Consequently, while many Catholics can see the need to break down many of the sub-rational barriers which stand at the moment, and while they can see that co-operation in achieving worthwhile objectives is one of the most effective ways of doing this, nevertheless, the problem of avoiding further difficulties and of generating deeper conflicts and antipathies in the Australian community as a consequence of this co-operation has yet to be solved.

Conclusion

The consequence of the line of reasoning I have been advocating is not to recommend communism or marxism. The consequence is rather that some of the sub-rational and sub-Christian obstacles to a human attitude to a world-wide and challenging ideology will be removed. Where ignorance and fear prevail world peace is in danger and the chances of an adequate human and Christian response to the problems for which communism claims to have the solution are frustrated.

At the moment an anti-communist phobia is an important factor in blinding many Christians to the evil which is the war in Vietnam. This phobia has rendered even the word “peace” an object of suspicion. Ignorance of communist objectives and achievements, ignorance of the failures of the colonial powers in the underdeveloped countries, fear of the horrors which communism is thought inevitably to bring in its train and a repudiation of the violence which we inextricably associate with communist revolution, have provoked us to endorse, in Vietnam, the infliction of bloodshed and violence of which the Viet Cong would be technically incapable; they have provoked us to endorse, in Australia, the erosion of political freedoms which even the communists deplore.
Throughout the western world Catholics can still be relied on, even by those who in most respects are insidiously un-Christian, to be intransigently anti-communist. In most ways this has been the factor which has accommodated the Catholic Church to an otherwise alien culture. But in Australia this characteristic has led us actively to support what could prove to be one of the most unjust, one of the most violent and one of the most futile military adventures in modern history. When at long last the Vietnamese are left to settle their own destiny Christians in Australia may realise with anguish and remorse that once again the Church has, at least tacitly, endorsed the use of might and violence in the service of right, in the cause of some sacred and abstract ideal, at the expense of the suffering and death of hundreds of thousands of human beings.

The fundamental Christian stance is not "anti-" anything or anyone. For Catholics to be known as profoundly anti-communist is a slur, and to the extent that it is justified then Catholics are untrue to the Church's own description of itself in Vatican II. A more authentic Christian image is described by Bishop Huyghe of Boulogne in France:

That man is a Catholic who opens himself to all . . . He is a Catholic who . . . becomes . . . overwhelmed by distress, whatever form that distress may take. He is a Catholic who instinctively rejects everything that is a source of division, who cannot meet anyone without tirelessly seeking out an area of agreement. He is a Catholic who sees in each man not . . . the label which is applied to him, of unbeliever, or Protestant or Jew or communist, but the brother for whom Christ died, and who has been placed in his path in order to receive his love.

Dr. Leo Clareborough

The Genesis of the Cold War — Do We Share Responsibility?

The co-operative spirit of Yalta seems to have been broken more by the West than by the USSR in the period 1945-47. Thus it was recognised at Yalta that only governments friendly to Russia would be acceptable in Eastern European states, yet there seemed an unwillingness to accept pro-communist governments in Poland, Bulgaria and Rumania. Did the West really believe at Yalta that western style democratic governments were to be the rule in Russian occupied Eastern European states? Compromise solutions reached on Poland, Bulgaria and Rumania were recognised as appeasement.

There was a reluctance on the part of the West to accept a Soviet sphere of influence in Eastern Europe despite the active building
by America of a sphere of influence in the Pacific. Other factors which point to the conclusion that the West does share the responsibility for the Cold War are:

1 The strong allied antagonism to the Russian revolutionary government at the end of World War I. Stalin’s reply to Churchill’s Fulton speech indicates that this factor was contributing to Russian attitudes. It would appear that Western attitudes, particularly on the part of America, to communist governments, were potentially more antagonistic after World War II than after World War I. It is possible that this potential may not have developed as it did if diplomats of the calibre of Roosevelt and Hopkins had survived longer.

2 The abrupt termination of Lend-Lease Aid to Russia.

3 Clear lack of co-operation by America with her Russian ally at the time of the atom bombing of Japan.

4 The failure of the West to take due account of what appear to have been sincere Russian worries concerning her safety from attack by the West, particularly in relation to the devastation suffered by Russia in the war, and the American possession of the atomic bomb.

Dr. Max Charlesworth

Conditions of Dialogue between Catholics and Communists

If there is to be dialogue between Catholics and communists, both must be prepared to spell out what they can learn from each other. This presupposes that communists are willing to distinguish between the ideals, good intentions and essential values that Christianity represents, and the abuses and distortions that those values and ideals have suffered at the hands of individual Christians in the past. Catholics have a right to ask communists to judge the Church, not on its record in, say the Inquisition or the nineteenth century when (so most Catholics would admit) the essence of Catholicism was distorted and betrayed, but rather on its record in Vatican II.

Equally, if Catholics wish to undertake dialogue with communists, they must be prepared to discern between the essential values of communism and the historical abuses of those values, as for example in the Stalinist era or the present phase of Maoism. If communism is seen as being on a par with nazism, with its racism and totalitarianism, then any attempt at dialogue would be futile. (This is in fact the way in which a good many Catholics, in Australia at least, view communism at the present time. For
them there is no possibility of distinguishing between the ideals of communism and its historical abuses, in the same way as they could claim this is possible with regard to Catholicism. For them the abuses of communism are simply the outward symptoms of the intrinsically anti-human and anti-Christian essence of communism.) If however communism is seen as a movement that does enshrine certain human and social values despite the terrible distortions that it has been subject to in most communist regimes over the last fifty years, then dialogue is possible.

Some crucial points on which dialogue ought to bear:

1. Do communists necessarily claim a kind of "infallibility" for their position, or are they willing to admit, as Catholics now do regarding Catholic doctrine, the possibility of "development" within marxism-leninism?

2. Are communists committed to an "error has no rights" position so that in a communist society those with non-marxist views would have no strict right to propagate them, but at best be allowed freedom for their views on grounds of expediency? Put another way, are Communists committed to a "confessional" view of society, so that the State espouses marxist ideology as the official "creed" and, accordingly, penalises non-marxists? Or can communists admit the possibility and even desirability of a "pluralist" society i.e. a society where non-marxist groups are allowed the same equal rights before the law as marxist groups? The Catholic Church has now given up the "error has no rights" view and the confessional view of society and welcomes the idea of pluralism. (See Vatican II Declaration on Religious Freedom); but many Catholics have the idea that the communists are still, on these matters, where they, the Catholics, were before Vatican II.

3. Are communists committed to violence and class warfare as necessary means of social evolution? Are communists committed to the Leninist view of the Party?

Brian Stanfield

The Church, Communism and Revolution

The success of communism underlined the failure of the Christian Church. In the nineteenth century the socio-economic structure posed an inhuman threat to all but a certain privileged class. The proletariat was large, poor, hungry, diseased, ill-housed and overworked. Some voices in the Church were raised in protest
but the Church on the whole tended to preach contentedness and to take the side of the capitalists and of the established order.

The Church thus became alienated from the working class. Karl Marx was left to fill the vacuum and to father "social thinking." It was not the churches of the time that rose up in defence of the most elementary rights of man, but the marxists, socialists and communists. It was for Marx to make the discovery that only a radical break-up of the socio-economic structure could put an end to the miseries of the proletariat. Despite the deficiencies and the inhumanities of extreme marxism, there were major positive values in marxism to which the Christianity of the nineteenth century ought to have been open and to which the Church today must be receptive. Marxism was and still is a terrible indictment of a "churchified," remote, middle-class, laissez-faire Christianity.

If we identify communism with the devil, we should question whether this particular devil has not been conjured up by the errors and shortcomings of Christianity itself. Instead of being God's avant-garde in the extension of a kingdom of justice, freedom and peace, the Church has far too often been content to be His rearguard.

Today the plight of the so-called Third World with its proclivity for reactionary, right-wing regimes, the hopeless maladministration of land, the resulting hunger, disease, homelessness and despair of the poor, all cry to Heaven for vengeance. Revolution is rapidly replacing passive acceptance. The danger is that Western civilisation, in particular the United States, will see such necessary revolutions as imperilling its own interests, and view them as examples of communist revolution leading to world conquest.

Do the vital interests of the United States require it to ensure that no country in the alleged free world adopts, by whatever means, a communist form of government? If that assumption remains unchallenged, then the present UN involvement in the internal policies of scores of countries can be justified; the Bay of Pigs can be justified; the destruction of Lumumba can be justified; the invasion of the Dominican Republic can be justified, as can be as many plots and counterplots, lies, murders and aggressive acts as the intelligence and military establishments may find necessary to arrest the spread of communism.

The problem of our age is not how to stop, fight or eradicate communism. It is how to cope with its challenge and its appeals in such a way that the competing systems of the planet may produce more benefits to mankind than threats and suffering. A means to this end is the Christianisation of marxist values and radicalisation of the drive for social justice in the deprived countries.
Ron Marstin

RECENT YEARS have seen a radical change in theology from a static body of propositions about God and man to an investigation of a God who is progressively being realised in the world, and of a mankind in a state of constant evolution. The Church is changing into an “incarnational” Church, living in and for the world of men. Such a Church is necessarily a dynamic, changing Church, and so too is its theology in continual flux and development.

Christianity arose at a time when the world was conceived as a static whole, and in succeeding centuries, it reflected the limitations of its age, becoming less and less relevant to the problems of men, turning more and more from this world to the next, upholding the status quo and teaching resignation in the face of exploitation and oppression.

But in recent times, this static, absolute theology has been challenged more and more widely, so that the centre of Christian concern is shifting back to man and this world. Thus the second Vatican Council states: “Everything we have said about the dignity of the human person, and about the human community and the profound meaning of human activity, lays the foundation for the relationship between the Church and the world, and provides the basis for dialogue between them.”

As a result, Christians are coming to see the task of man not in terms of passive resignation, but as the active planning of the world’s future, the progressive liberation of man from the domination of nature, and the differentiation of social structures to provide the maximum freedom for all people.

Since Vatican II the Church is committed to a dialogue with the world. Integral to this “aggiornamento” are changes in the Church’s attitude to communism. In Pacem in Terris Pope John wrote (in a context which made it clear that he was referring to communism): “who can deny that these movements, insofar as they conform to the dictates of right reason, and are interpreters of the lawful aspirations of the human person, contain elements that are positive and deserving of approval?”

Theology is no longer concerned merely with the definition of absolute truths. It is no longer bound to rigid, immutable conceptions of the world. It is a theology of progress, of continual development—of the progress of science, of the development of a new society. Change, moreover, has not been limited to the Christian side. Marxism is experiencing an “aggiornamento” of its own. Communism, which, as a closed ideology, has long offered its own dogmatic answers to the questions men ask about the
meaning of their life and their death, is itself becoming much more open. In this regard, Garaudy maintains that Marx has been misunderstood. Marx acknowledged no ultimate goal of the world, and consequently marxism remains an open system. Communism does not regard itself as the final movement of history, but sees its own domination as the eve of man's liberation. Marxists are coming to realise that there is much of value which they need to assimilate from the Christian heritage. Garaudy has written:

We neither despise nor criticise the Christian for his faith, his love, his dreams, his hopes. Our own task is to labor and to struggle, lest they remain eternally distant or illusory. Our task as Communists is to draw near to man in his most glorious dreams and his most sublime hopes, to draw near to him in a real and practical way, so that Christians themselves might find here on earth a beginning of their heaven.

Marxism is asking the same questions as Christianity does and, if it rejects the Christian's answers to these questions, then this is not because it provides dogmatic answers of its own, but because it insists on remaining wholly open to the future, a future which is open on the infinite. Marxists share with Christians the experience of the inadequacy of all relative and partial being. So far from believing that this search can be enough for man, contemporary marxists envisage a transformation of the earth which implies not only its social and technical re-organisation, and the institution of new economic and political relationships among men, but which is also a profound spiritual metamorphosis of man. "This new frontier of hominisation, making of every man a man, questioning and creative, will mark a new detachment from the earth. (This detachment) will free the spiritual energies of each man and of all men with such force that it is absolutely impossible for us who are caught in the alienations of our pre-history—to imagine their nature and their use." Here is absolute openness to the future, to the infinite, to transcendence. Here again is the invitation for co-operation with marxists—a co-operation in the building of the future, the realisation of the complete man, the rising above the domination of the past. After we eliminate what is accidental, both to Christianity and to marxism, we find our common ground; ground on which we can construct together the common city and the future of a man who lacks none of his dimensions (Marx's "total man", Teilhard's "entire man").

If Christians and communists are able to find common ground not only in their concern for humanity, but also in their openness to the absolute future, then it may well come about, as Teilhard de Chardin put it, the only God whom we shall in the future be able to adore will be a synthesis of the (Christian) God of the Above, and the (marxist) God of the Ahead.
THE WRITINGS of the French Roman Catholic priest, Pierre Teilhard de Chardin (Tay-ard de Shar-dan) have been a major influence on the development of modern Christian thought and have contributed to the development of dialogue between Christians and non-believers. Although Father Teilhard died in 1955 his main writings were published later. Sir Julian Huxley in an essay devoted to Father Teilhard explains his influence in the following words:

Through his combination of wide scientific knowledge with deep religious feeling and a rigorous sense of values, he has forced theologians to view their ideas in the new perspective of evolution, and scientists to see spiritual implications of their knowledge. He has both clarified and unified our vision of reality. In the light of that new comprehension it is no longer possible to maintain that science and religion must operate in thought-tight compartments or concern separate sectors of life; they are both relevant to the whole of human existence. The religiously minded can no longer turn their backs upon the natural world; nor can the materialistically-minded deny importance to spiritual experience and religious feeling.

Pierre Teilhard de Chardin was born in 1881 into the family of a small landowner, the fourth of eleven children. At eighteen he decided to enter the Jesuit order. In the years until he was ordained in 1912 he studied or taught philosophy, science and theology both in England and in the Jesuit College at Cairo.

In Cairo he developed considerable ability in geology and palaeontology (the study of fossils) which led him to a deep interest in the theories of evolution.

In 1922 he took his Doctorate and lectured as Professor of Geology at the Catholic Institute of Paris. The following year he visited China but on his return to France he found that his views were considered unorthodox and he was forbidden to continue teaching. He soon returned to China, where, with certain short breaks, he spent most of his life.

While his superiors doubted his views on human evolution his work in China strengthened his convictions. He worked with leading scientists from many countries taking part in many expeditions including that which unearthed the skull of Peking man. His major work The Phenomen of Man was completed in 1938 but he never succeeded in gaining permission from the Church to publish any of his controversial writings.
The outbreak of war prevented his return to France until 1946. He was there directed not to write any more on his "dangerous thoughts" and his vow of obedience was further tested in 1948 when he was refused permission to put forward his candidature for a professorship in the College de France although this position was open to him and was the highest academic position to which he could aspire.

He was, however, accorded many scientific and public awards in this period.

Father Teilhard spent the last four years of his life in the United States working on anthropological studies. His works came to be published after his death because he had left his manuscripts to a friend and because permission to publish is only required for the work of a living priest.

Concerned as he was with the immense possibilities for the development of man he considered many questions fundamental to marxists. He once expressed the problem of human beings as "torn between marxism whose depersonalising effects revolts them and a Christianity so lukewarm in human terms that it sickens them". He saw the marxist and the Christian as "two extremes... each a convinced believer in his own particular doctrine, but each, we must suppose, fundamentally inspired with an equal faith in Man." He felt that between the two positions there was, "... a basic human sympathy for the other — not for any mental reason, but arising out of the obscure recognition that both are going the same way, and that despite all the ideological differences they will eventually, in some manner, come together on the same summit."

The new currents in Catholic thought, represented in the works of Teilhard de Chardin find their reflection in the discussions of the Vatican Council and in Pope John's social encyclical Pacem in Terris.

Roger Garaudy

IN THE DISCUSSIONS between Christians and marxists the name of the marxist who has done so much to promote and influence this discussion is Roger Garaudy. Although he has published widely it is only recently that his book From Anathema to Dialogue has been available in English. First published in France in 1965 it followed the Second Vatican Council and the lead from Pope John XXIII's encyclical Pacem in Terris which posed the question of the Church's dialogue with the world.
Recognising that Pope John did not address himself solely to the clergy and the faithful but “to all men of good will” Garaudy sets out, as he says in the preface to his book “to ask a few questions of his own about possibilities, the limitations and the perspectives of this dialogue, so as to offer his contribution to the common effort of reflection”.

By any standard Garaudy must be counted as an outstanding marxist theoretician. In France he is professor of philosophy at the University Institute of Poitiers. He is a Doctor of Letters of the Sorbonne and holds a doctorate in science from the Soviet Academy of Science. A member of the political committee of the French Communist Party, Roger Garaudy is the Director of the Centre for Marxist Studies and Research in Paris.

His published works include studies of marxist humanism and ethics, marxism and existentialism and the problem of freedom in the twentieth century. His book Karl Marx: The Evolution of his thought is soon to be published in English while his latest work, 20th Century Marxism is now a best seller in France. This work is being widely and critically debated in communist and other circles.

In recent years he has participated in Christian-marxist discussions in many countries. Twice in the past year he visited the United States speaking at the Union Theological Seminary in New York, the Harvard Divinity School and Jesuit-run St. Louis University. He was a notable contributor at the meeting of Salzburg held under the patronage of Cardinal Koenig, head of the Vatican’s Secretariat for Non-Believers.

Christians have found that one of the most positive contributions of Garaudy is his ability not to sidestep difficulties. While he accepts the need for dialogue he does not see it as some exercise in which individuals hide differences or make concessions rather he says, “We do not ask anyone to stop being what he is. What we ask is on the contrary, that he be it more and that he be it better.” Garaudy comes to dialogue to express faith in man. It is here that he sees common ground between Christians and marxists no matter what else divides them, or distorts their positions. “... faith imposes on us the duty of seeing to it that every man becomes a man, a flaming hearth of initiative, a poet in the deepest sense of the word: one who has experienced, day by day, the creative surpassing of himself — what Christians call his transcendence and we (marxists) call his authentic humanity.”
DISCUSSION:

ON THE "NEW LOOK" CPA

THE STUDY OF POLITICS involves the study of any institution in which power relationships exist. The prevailing attitude of the political scientist is that he is concerned with who gets what, when and where. Significantly, he does not consider it his business to ask why. Yet without asking why power struggles go on his study is meaningless. What makes contemporary "objective" political science so meaningless is its refusal to discuss anything which cannot be quantified—hence the question why is out.

The latest of the Current Affairs Bulletins, which deals with the new national communist look of the CPA, suffers mainly from the defect inherent in neglecting to ask why? It describes a CPA anxious for power. This is true. All parties are anxious for power. Then, when it shifts to the study of disputes within the party it describes factions of ambitious men vying for control of the party. This too is true. Men do seek power. But because the author does not ask why the CPA seeks power or why Aarons seeks power or why the CPA changes its policies the description of the CPA becomes a description of internal struggles in which A replaces B and then tries to hang onto his power forever and in which the CPA's essential quality does not change. The description of the dispute with Hill becomes, not a matter of principle but a matter of ambitious rivalry for power. Aarons' object becomes to increase the power of the "Royal Family of Communism" by placing more members of his family in key positions. So the tale runs.

However, men seek power for a purpose and without discussing that purpose their actions are meaningless. We understand their actions in the inadequate way of a deaf man who does not understand French watching a French film. He sees the actors move around, posture, fight—some triumph—some are defeated—he understands something but without the language and the explanations he understands too little.

This is not to say that the CAB is not worth reading. As far as it goes it is competent. Considering the animosity in contemporary scholarship towards men who attempt to ask the eternal non-quantifiable question "Why" we can almost sympathise with the author. People do not ask why any more. Furthermore, it is always salutary to read the reports of a "devil's advocate". He will say as much that is true about you as your own best friend. Everything written about the CPA should be read by the left. Until the left recognises, as the Italian communists have, that the Koestlers of this world have something to say about communism it will never achieve self-knowledge.

A lastair Davidson

ACTU AND WHITE COLLAR WORKERS

Bernie Taft (ALR No. 5, 1967) adequately covers the essential reasons for the change of direction at the last Congress of the Australian Council of Trade Unions. However, the method of conducting Congresses, marked by tight Executive control and adherence to traditional conservative Labor Party and trade union attitudes and procedures, is likely to repel many white collar workers.
At Congress, not only is democracy not practised sufficiently but the leaders make little attempt at even an appearance of democracy. An air of tired, worldly cynicism issues from the top table.

Take the matter of an increase in affiliation fees. Under the 1965 Congress decision, the Executive was to submit proposals for any increase to affiliates, for discussion before the 1967 Congress. Instead the proposition of an increase was distributed as an Executive recommendation about ten minutes before debate on it began, in the midst of another debate and the unions had not been consulted between Congresses. Laurie Short spoke against the recommendation (though he voted for it!) as a "protest against the way this Congress is being run." The motion was passed by use of the machine.

Some increase is no doubt justified and would have been approved by most unions but the point is, they were not consulted. Small wonder that Vice-President Evans' criticism (when he explained his refusal to stand again) received an attentive hearing.

By such contemptuous treatment of the unions the ACTU leadership will defeat its own purpose—to draw the white collar unions increasingly into a "safe", right-wing dominated ACTU, away from centres like the Australian Council of Salaried and Professional Associations, of "doubtful" origin and too independent to be readily controlled.

The trade unions should be extending democracy not strangling it.

While ever the Labor Party right-wing maintains its traditional tight control over delegates Congress may continue to be run in this way, unaware of the big changes taking place in the workforce.

In many of the white collar unions, for whom recent Congresses have been their first experiences of the "Parliament of the Trade Unions", Labor Party policies and attitudes do not prevail.

Frequently they are accused of a degree of expression and democracy much greater than that in evidence at Congress. They commonly have allegiance to the Labor Party and will not accept the kind of "rough justice" handed out at Congress.

More importantly the white collar unions have their own share of right-wingers, often Liberal Party people or Democratic Labor Party members, who are only too willing to drag their unions from the ACTU or ACSPA. The ACTU leadership supplies them with ammunition!

In this way division can be fostered between blue and white collar unions.

Congress could be much improved by:

1 Distribution to delegates at least one week before Congress of the Agenda paper (this year two hundred and eighty-six items), the Executive report and Executive recommendations on the various topics.

2 Revitalising the industry groups so that they function as originally intended.

C. A. HAWKINS

WOMEN AND EQUALITY

ALTHOUGH in Australia today women constitute one third of the workforce, and half of these are married, very little has been heard of them, apart from an annual equal pay function. However, in one week recently in Victoria, two events occurred; first on
September 30 the Professional Women's Committee of the Australian Labor Party held a seminar on working mothers and their problems; then on October 6 the Technical Teachers' Association held an evening "Talk Out" on equality for women.

The ALP Seminar was organised in three sections, dealing with the economic, psychological, and social implications, and 600 women and a handful of men attended one or all of the sessions. The majority were professional women, who in the main already get equal pay, with the notable exception of teachers, but certainly not equal opportunities.

The average working class mother has to do a weekend shift in the home on Saturday—she cannot afford professional cleaners, or laundry charges on the "mini-rate" paid in factories to women workers. She would have difficulty even raising the $2 entrance fee for the seminar. It is important that some type of activity suitable for lower paid workers be devised to carry the campaign for equality still further.

Many women at the Seminar represented unions and Labor Party branches who were quite willing to pay for a delegate to attend, but did not consider the Seminar of sufficient importance to warrant a male union official giving up a Saturday—they looked around for an office worker, or even in one case, a mother-in-law to represent them! The lack of real understanding of the need for equal pay for equal work in both men and women is one reason why the campaign has dragged on for so many years.

Two aspects of the question were brought out very forcibly by speakers—firstly the difficulties facing women who must work to support a family: the lack of sufficient creches and reliable child minding centres, the absence of facilities for after-school and holiday care, and where any facilities are available, the large slice they take out of a wage already reduced by 25% because they happen to be women.

Secondly, a very strong case was put, particularly by younger women, for the right of women to continue in a job they enjoy rather than being tied to caring for a house and children. Many said they resented not having an income of their own. They cannot use the government creches since these are really only available to mothers supporting a family—some are catered for by the University Family Club creche, but this, apart from being expensive, can only take limited numbers. They too want adequate child care facilities where they can leave their children with a clear conscience.

It was rather fortunate that Prof. Lebedev, a visiting gynaecologist from Siberia, who made a special trip down from Sydney for the Conference, could not understand English very well. She would have found it very hard to understand why a country that is advanced in technical matters just does not recognise that women are people too, and makes so little provision for them to reach their full potentiality.

Prof. Lebedev outlined the facilities increasingly available in the Soviet Union to pregnant women and young mothers, and also the child care facilities available. She willingly answered questions on how she coped with working full time and caring for her daughter. The problems facing working women seem to be similar, but there they are not so complicated by economic worries or by problems of inadequate child care centres.

From the psychological angle, Prof. Elwyn Morey, of Monash University, was inclined to the view that while
young children are usually better being cared for by their mother, the main consideration is that they be cared for by a happy person. If the mother is frustrated and unhappy, then the child is better with someone who enjoys caring for him.

A case for mothers not working was put by a pediatrician mother of nine, but as hers was a long course of study, it is obvious that she had exceptionally favorable facilities for child care at home while she completed her training.

A strong case for the need for complete equality for women from the trade union point of view, was put by Mr. J. J. Brown, of the Australian Railways Union. Miss Molly Bayne put forward a good case too and pointed out that it was vital to build up a political demand for what is needed to enable women to take their true place in society, whether it be more creches and kindergartens, effective after-school care centres, or adequate family allowances for widows or deserted wives with children.

M.B.O.

MORE ON WOMEN

1967 HAS FOCUSED a lot of attention on the question of working women and attention is starting to be drawn to the special problems of the displaced women intellectuals who are urgently needed in our society with its present shortage of teachers, research workers and other skilled people.

Women constitute one third of the work force in Australia today, a large number of whom are married women. In Sydney 24% of homes have a second wage packet supplied by the wife and a good percentage of these would be unskilled workers such as shop assistants.

Whilst equal pay is the starting point other needs are vital such as pre-school centres, after school and holiday facilities to relieve the mother of constant emotional strain and worry; compassionate leave to care for sick children; and working hours which provide shopping time for the housewife. (In the case of shop assistants, shopping for the home is a mad panic.)

Thousands of women with a tertiary education who have worked before having a family, find that they have been educated in a different way from today's generation and are not readily employable, as Governor-General Lord Casey would have us believe. The September 1967 issue of the Bulletin in an article entitled What Shall We Do With the Educated Woman? comments that Lord Casey forgets that women were educated to be pleasant companions and not specifically for any real occupation other than teaching. A study of this question discussed by Madge Dawson in her book Graduate and Married reveals that all women questioned knew they needed additional training before they could return to active participation in their sphere of work.

The Communist Party Program on the needs and rights of women entitled Wanted a New Style of Living for Modern Women seems to cover most of the points required if women are to take their rightful place as equals in the Australian work force and in society. One thing that perhaps could be given a little more consideration as the campaign for fulfilment of the program gets under way is the three months paid maternity leave listed under the heading "Special Leave". Why start from the minimum? Overseas experience has shown that longer periods are necessary. In France some
sections of women workers have won paid maternity leave of fourteen weeks, and in Czechoslovakia it has been raised to five and half months, the longest in the world, six months in the case of single girls, and in Hungary to five months, where it is thought that a shorter period contributed to the low birth rate. In the U.S.S.R. when I was there a lot of discussion was taking place about increasing the paid maternity leave time.

The Bulletin comments on pregnancy being a barrier “it would appear that the employer must be prepared to take a risk on both sexes. If statistics were worked out, probably as many mature men succumb to stomach ulcers and heart attacks as women do to pregnancy.”

Would something like the Macquarie University idea of organising pre-school centres and after school minding facilities be more appealing to women than being organised to press governments and councils to start these projects? How can such pressure be strengthened and how long do working mothers and children have to wait for these things? In the average locality are women drawn more readily and more enthusiastically to assist with something real that they can help establish themselves?

Would Governments and Councils be persuaded more easily to contribute and assist when the project is already under way?

Perhaps a special day for Mothers would draw more attention to the very much neglected problems of the working mother.

If “Mothers Day” was held on a working day how many employers would give their working mothers a day off?

Betty Lockwood

MIGRANTS AND THE WORK FORCE

IN the limited space available I can only afford some general observations on what I, too, consider a neglected field. And I hope also that much more will be said on this subject on which a discussion was initiated by George Zangalis in ALR October-November 1967.

The literature on Australian immigration is of course enormous and it is growing almost daily. It is a pity that the Australian left isn’t making more use of this literature whether compiled by government agencies or by specialists working on particular fields of immigration and Australia’s immigrant body. This material could be of considerable value to the labor movement struggling as it is with the imposing problems that resulted from the entry of two million or so migrants in the last 20 years.

Of the many things that can be said about Australian immigration one thing is fundamental and that is that immigration has resulted from the demand for labor by Australian expanding capitalism. This in turn has determined largely the quantity and quality of immigrants. The demand for labor as a factor was so powerful in the postwar period that it has completely negated the pre-war discriminatory policy against Southern European immigrants on the grounds that these were not capable of becoming assimilated. The demand for labor, moreover, was high enough for the Australian Government to waive past practice and give considerable assistance to certain classes of immigrants. Apart from Britishers, Displaced Persons and North and Western Europeans, Commonwealth assistance was given to Southern Europeans, but mainly to certain age-groups considered necessary to industry. Between
1953-60 for example, of the Greeks coming out on assisted passages 43.3 per cent fell in the 20-24 age group and 53.8 per cent in 25-29 age group.

Any analysis of Australia's postwar immigration policies and practices confirms the view that Australia needed labor and this because of her growing industries. The political and humanitarian side of Australian immigration has been a decidedly secondary consideration if not purely coincidental.

Consequently most postwar immigrants (certainly most of those in the labor force) started as employees. It is also significant to note that the further south one's place of origin in Europe the lower he found himself in the occupational ladder in Australia. This, of course, poses some very special problems. For many Italians, Greeks and East Europeans their first entry into a factory was in Australia and the associated problems of such a radical change in their mode of living call for some careful and sympathetic treatment. Little can be achieved by the trade unions by insisting that Southern Europeans join them on the former's terms, which requires knowledge of English, of trade union practices, regulations, history and politics. Still less when a migrant worker pays his union fees to a union representative who also happens to be his foreman or the "grey coat" in the workshop. And it is necessary also, as Mr Zangalis and others have pointed out often enough, to utilise the bi-lingual and poly-lingual migrant workers in trade union organisation if the gap between native and foreign-born worker is to be bridged at all.

For the labor movement outside the factory, the formation of ethnic communities is yet another field that poses special problems. I am not sure whether one can talk of ethnic communities or national minorities in the traditional sense, but among some migrants, notably Greeks, Yugoslavs and Ukrainians, there is the tendency of ethnic community formation which means the formation of typical national institutions such as newspapers, churches, schools and fraternities and in the case of the Greeks also the ubiquitous coffee house. This also means that ethnic communities tend to confine their politics to themselves and, therefore avoid participation in the wider Australian political process. But the fact that this state of affairs exists surely warrants analysis. Admittedly wide cultural differences between Australians and immigrants precipitate ethnic communities, but I am not sure that ethnic communities are not also strengthened by traditional hostility to them from Australians and Australian authorities. Discrimination and intimidation, e.g. the denial of citizenship rights to radical, leftist and communist immigrants, discourage open political activities by prospective immigrant leaders of the labor movement. On the other hand immigrants engaged in rightwing and anti-communist activities such as the Ustashi are condoned and even encouraged by Australian authorities.

All of these as stated before pose some special problems for the labor movement. What we are witnessing here are numerous peculiar factors which in their sum total work and have worked towards weakening somewhat the strength of the labor movement. To state them and perhaps reiterate: large numbers of immigrant workers, particularly non-Britishers, have entered Australia but have not been successfully assimilated by the Australian labor movement; many immigrant workers have found themselves in the bottom rung of the occupational ladder; these workers are in a pretty servile position with little
knowledge of existing conditions and for at least five years without political rights; fear and intimidation against immigrant labor movement leaders has discouraged immigrant workers from fully participating in the trade unions and Australian political life. These factors in turn, among others, have facilitated the employer class parties, the Liberal and Country Parties, prolonging their stay in power.

It now remains for the labor movement to consider the special problems of immigrants, and their ethnic communities, where they exist, and find the way to assimilate them in its ranks. One signpost of thought should guide the labor movement—that there is a migrants' point of view.

M. Tsounis

MIGRANTS AND UNIONS

In the splendid article by George Zangalis in the October-November issue of ALR there are some interesting facts and some rather provocative conclusions.

I welcome both because in my opinion very few people in the Australian labor movement are at all aware of the importance of the immigration problem. If they are they usually “sweep it under the carpet” because they don’t see the answers to it.

In the recent pre-Congress discussion of the Communist Party of Australia some of the contributions to the discussion dismissed the industrial working class as unimportant and dying out, whereas in fact it is growing rapidly.

Probably this is because many of the writers do not see industrial workers in their everyday experience.

Forty or 50 years ago almost all children from working class families had only primary school education and started work at 13 or 14.

Later more such children went further, but then only to technical school in order to qualify for apprenticeships.

Now it is most common for the children of working class parents to attend universities and teachers' colleges in preparation for professional careers. So it is easy for people affected by such changes to feel that the industrial workers are disappearing.

They exist however, but instead of the unskilled workers being drawn from native born Australians, they are more and more being drawn from the ranks of the migrants and in many factories, building and construction jobs the majority of the unskilled and semi-skilled are foreign born.

Also there are growing numbers of foreign migrants among the tradesmen. Many Dutch and German migrants come here as tradesmen, and the Australian born sons of Southern Europeans are entering the tradesmen's ranks in increasing numbers.

Many Australians like to pride themselves on the racial tolerance that exists here as compared with the situation in the United States for example, but reality is not quite so rosy.

It is most common even among militant workers to hear expressions such as "Dago", or "Wog", to experience Australians shouting to make themselves understood to those whose knowledge of English is limited, as if it was deafness which was the obstacle to free communication, or adopting an attitude of benevolent paternalism as though dealing with children.
George Zangalis is correct when he says that the labor movement should combat the concept that migrants have an obligation to Australia. They get the dirtiest, hardest, poorest paid jobs, they are under-privileged in many other ways, so what do they owe to Australia?

Thinking Australians have the duty to combat prejudices in every way, be it overt or covert but I think Zangalis puts his finger on the main point, that is that the labor movement has no real policy on immigration, at best it has a non-immigration policy, at its worst an anti-immigration one.

The time is long overdue to develop a positive policy which faces reality, and which is designed to bring into activity the large number of migrants, who are now passive through no fault of their own.

As well as the development of a positive policy immediate steps of an organisational nature are needed.

The number of non-British migrants who hold leading positions in the political parties and trade unions is depressingly few. The undoubted talent that exists should be looked for, encouraged, and given help with the English language which will enable migrants to play an all-round role of leadership.

For Australians to learn other languages is useful but the best demonstration to migrants that the labor movement is their movement is to see and hear their own people in the leadership.

Southern Europeans find it very difficult to understand the Australian labor movement. Take for example the Italians. Many of them came from peasant villages and had no industrial or trade union experience before migrating. Even those with industrial experience coming from industrial cities such as Milan or Turin are used to a completely different political set up to ours.

The Communist Party of Italy is the biggest party of the working class and plays a prominent and public part in Italian life. There is no deep-rooted tradition of support for any other party such as exists here in the traditional loyalty to the Labor Party.

The unions are industrial unions, without craft divisions.

There are divisions but on political and religious grounds.

Few Australians understand these differences but Italians do and can explain them to their countrymen and help them to overcome their puzzlement.

Finally, steps to bring migrants into more prominence in the leadership of the labor movement must not be considered as a concession as foreign born workers, given the opportunity, will make a tremendous contribution to Australian workers' organisations, helping them to become more attuned to the needs of present-day Australia.

ERNIE THORNTON

"WORK VALUE" CASE

THE FEDERAL Metal Trades Margins case, commenced in November 1966, is being watched with great interest by all sections of the community. The final decision will have a very definite effect on other awards whether this decision is made to flow to other awards or not and could establish new marginal relativities which would have repercussions throughout all sections of the wage and salary earners.
The proceedings have already been strewn with the wreckage of old ideas of obtaining decisions based on skilful advocacy, the reliance on arbitration methods and the permanency of its standards.

“Work value” investigations are not a new type of procedure, awards are constantly being work valued. That is, the value of the skill, responsibility or nature of the work is being estimated or re-examined for the purpose of deciding margin payments or in the case of total wages, to decide the adjustment to the total wage, as is now the case in the Metal Trades Award.

Since the workshop inspections have been completed witnesses have been heard by the Commission. Union submissions will commence from the week commencing November 6, in Sydney.

The Commonwealth Government has created a precedent by participating almost as if it were a party to the award by making far reaching proposals basically reducing wage levels by recommending the creation of first and second class tradesmen, with a small minority being treated as special class tradesmen.

The same technique is already known by its use in the 1957 Metal Trades Award which resulted in the creation of a “Special Class Welder” working on a specified wide range of metals, thus excluding the vast majority of welders from receiving the extra rate and blanking off a general upward trend in margins.

The Commonwealth Government advocated the use of a “job evaluation” scheme, which allocates points for numerous factors, such as education, skill, adaptability and experience, compiled in the form of a sum total upon which the individual making the assessment bases wage valuation. The main weakness in this scheme is that the evaluation depends entirely on the personal estimates of the individual and once fixed, acts as a barrier to future wage claims for increases based on “work value,” increasing the difficulty created by the “total wage” straight-jacket of annual reviews limited to argument on economic grounds.

Other proposals of the Commonwealth Government included alterations and exclusions of existing classifications and that when the Metal Trades decision is made it should not flow to other awards and each award should undergo the same work value “job evaluation” procedure.

The advocate for the Commonwealth made the following main points in his submissions:

1 The Job Check Sheet system used by the Commonwealth in this case should be adopted as the method of handling all work value cases.

2 Work value cases must be conducted on an award by award basis, so there could be no test case basis where what was done in one award flowed to others.

3 Any review of an award or classification should be solely on a comparison with the last review carried out.

Technological change does not necessarily mean that wage rates call for a regular upward review, and in these days of technological change there is every reason for the assumption that relativities between classifications will change.

4 Work value is not to be assessed on the basis of changes in purchasing power, nor should the productivity of a particular industry be taken into account.

5 There is no room for argument on the grounds of the under-valuation of
skill, the scarcity of skills, comparative wage justice, and the existence of over award payments.

The most difficult fact for unions to accept is that despite the Commonwealth Government not having one employee under the Metal Trades Award they are making proposals which profoundly alter the award in a manner which helps the employers. It propagates the idea that lower wages apply as a result of technological change. This is ominous in view of the multitude of awards which will be directly affected by principles established in this case and rapid technological developments.

The private employers have based themselves entirely on that same principle, exposing their real aims in any new technical changes. Every argument possible has been made to support the claim that wherever work may be lightened or made easier as a result of new techniques a reduced wage standard should apply. So much for co-operation and collaboration in the establishing of new wage standards in an era of automation and technological change.

This highlights the inherent weakness in much of the propaganda aimed at proving the historic differences between employer and employee have been resolved; when it comes to wages and employment the conflict is as strong as ever and with the introduction of new technological developments the differences will become greater.

The Metal Trades Wage Case appears to be a long way from completion and the statement of the Full Bench that rates for 26 classifications plus a few others could be given first and envisaging a number of changes in the structure of the Metal Trades Award, almost surely means no decision before February 1968.

JIM BAIRD

THE OUTLOOK of dialectical materialism is powerful not mainly because it "has come to be adopted as the official world-view of the Soviet State, and indeed of the world communist movement as a whole. This fact is certainly important, but it by no means exhausts the problem. For there is every reason to think that the outlook of which this system is the most thoroughgoing expression is not merely representative of the world-view of the various communist parties, but also reflects the often unconscious or unspoken attitude of the average citizen of today, so far as he is not positively religious and Christian in his beliefs; and does so regardless of his political affiliations and social status which may often be such as to make this same average citizen an embittered opponent of communism. The doctrines underlying the whole system of dialectical materialism that nothing exists apart from matter and that the whole world as at present constituted has somehow come about of its own accord, are in accordance with the views held by what is doubtless the great majority of people nowadays, and not merely of those who are numbered in the ranks of the communist party. The penetrative power of the communist ideology at the present time may well be largely due to this fact."

Roger Milliss

THEATRE IN THE LUCKY COUNTRY

The author, drama critic for Tribune and an actor and producer with Sydney New Theatre, discusses the situation in Australian theatre against its historical background.

OUR TENNIS PLAYERS dominate the world's courts; our golfers more than hold their own on international fairways; our jockeys rapidly make their run on the rails on European racetracks; Jack Brabham burns the bitumen at Minneapolis and Monte Carlo. As Donald Horne might have it, for 80 years or more sport has been the symbol of the Australian national ethos, the highest claim which we, a remote historical and political accident in the South Seas clinging desperately to the European tradition, might lay to international equality.

The remarkable development in recent years has been the recognition accorded to Australian artistic and cultural achievement throughout the world. Twenty years ago John Manifold could lament that Australia failed to export two of her best products: wine and poetry. In both of these civilised commodities, that position no longer obtains, and if you add to the poets the popularity abroad of artists like Nolan, Boyd, Dobell and Drysdale, singers like Joan Hammond and Joan Sutherland, dancers like Kathleen Gorham, musicians like the violinist Beryl Kimber and novelists like Patrick White, Hal Porter and Randolph Stow, you have a success story extraordinary for such a small and Johnny-come-lately nation.

The problems and pressures besetting the arts generally in Australia which force the writer to publish overseas and the painter to seek foreign patronage are worthy of separate study. But the fact remains that in recent years there has been something of a cultural renaissance in Australia, symptomatic of the country's increasing sophistication and maturity—a quite exciting process in which theatre, perhaps the most underprivileged and least esteemed of all the art forms, has shared.

Its development—in qualitative terms at least—over the past decade has meant that theatre has at long last come of age. Acting
and production standards have improved tremendously; coming back to Australia after four years' absence, I was immediately struck by the level of the first two productions I saw upon arrival—the Melbourne Union Repertory's version of Peter Schaeffer's *The Royal Hunt of the Sun* and Edward Albee's *Tiny Alice* at the Old Tote in Sydney, both of which I felt would have compared favorably with anything to be seen overseas—certainly with several productions I saw in the West End and also with some of the best in Moscow. Australian actors have always been noted for their natural attack and virility—but this has now been tempered by a greater polish and poise, especially evident, for instance, in the elegance of Robin Lovejoy's stylish production of Sheridan's *School for Scandal* at the Old Tote earlier this year. Individual names spring to mind as being synonymous with quality: Peter O'Shaughnessy, Ron Haddrick, Edward Hepple, Mark MacManus, Ron Graham, Brian James, Dinah Shearing and Brigid Lenahan. There is also a considerable battery of younger actors of quite exciting potential—Ross Thompson, John Krummel, John Norman, David Turnbull, Carmen Duncan and Jennifer Hagan, to name but a few. And even that most conservative of managements, J. C. Williamson's, traditionally prone to rely more on imported stars than local talent, has come to realise that we can supply the wherewithal ourselves to cope with overseas musicals following Jill Perryman's success in *Funny Girl*.

Interest in the theatre has also increased proportionately, at least among certain strata of the community. The growth of world communications has meant a far greater familiarity with contemporary trends. Australian theatre-goers—now much more sophisticated and discriminating—no longer have to wait years—or maybe for ever—to see a new English, American or continental work. Many more young people are turning to the stage as a career, assisted—despite its substantial limitations—by the two-year course at the National Institute of Dramatic Art (NIDA) in Sydney, and encouraged also by the greater opportunities offering through the expansion of television. For the average professional, however, acting remains the same precarious and smell-of-an-oil-rag vocation it has always been; the acting trade perpetually resembles the waterfront during a bad season, without the benefit of appearance money. Playwrights, too, suffer the same disabilities: if the number of plays being written and submitted to theatrical managements were any barometer, Australian drama would be booming, but opportunities for the performance of Australian plays are tragically limited. Nevertheless, ever since the success of Ray Lawler's *Summer of the Seventeenth Doll* in the 1950's, a number of local playes of merit have seen the light of production and helped to lay the basis of a contemporary indigenous drama.
The significance of *The Doll* as a turning point in the development of Australian drama cannot be overestimated. It was written and performed at a time when there was a resurgence of interest in things Australian and re-assertion of the Australian spirit and tradition in the face of growing economic, political and cultural domination by the American influence. In the theatre the groundwork had already been laid by Dick Diamond's *Reedy River* — first produced by New Theatre in 1953 — and in *The Doll* was a play equally Australian in its setting and yet universal in its simple yet poignant theme of the necessity of facing up to reality — a play which marked perhaps the most successful representation of ordinary working people, without condescension or self-consciousness, in Australian drama. It was followed by a spate of plays — all performed by the Elizabethan Theatre Trust, in its best period — which, though varying widely in standard, dealt with aspects of contemporary Australian reality in a new and more sophisticated way: *The Shifting Heart, Curly on the Rack, The Bastard Country* and *The Slaughter of St. Theresa's Day*. Alan Seymour's *The One Day of the Year* marked a new point of departure: the most accomplished of all these plays, it brought under searching examination not only the hallowed myth of Anzac Day.
but the conflict of attitudes between generations occurring at a time when Australia was just beginning to feel the complex effects on human relationships of the new technological age.

Seymour's play in a way foresaw—even allowing for the vast difference in outlook—the work of Patrick White, who, as in the novel, has exercised the major influence on Australian drama over the last few years. In western drama generally today, two main trends may be distinguished: one of a theatre of "commitment", proceeding from the standpoint of being in Donne's phrase, "involved in mankind", displaying a positive set of values and regarding the human conditions as being basically improvable (instanced by writers such as Arnold Wesker, Arthur Miller, Max Frisch, Rolf Hochhuth, Peter Schaeffer, Peter Weiss, Jean-Paul Sartre, the late Lorraine Hansberry and Bertolt Brecht, who though 11 years dead, through his posthumous revival in the west remains the most vital force in drama) and the other—exemplified by Harold Pinter, Edward Albee, Samuel Beckett and, in a different sense, by the Absurdists like Genet and Ionesco—obsessed by the gulf separating people in an increasingly atomised world, by the breakdown of communication, and by the mutual terror and destruction in human relationships. Much as I disagree with this latter school from the moral and philosophical point of view, it seems to me that it has as much claim to validity as the other, in that, however pessimistically, it accurately describes the state of the western world at this particular historical moment, with man becoming increasingly dehumanised and estranged from both his fellows and his society, and life for increasing numbers of people assuming a greater futility and emptiness. To a great extent, White mirrors this latter school in an unmistakably Australian setting: his outlook is basically misanthropic and his attitude to people often despairingly cruel, but in plays like The Season at Sarsaparilla and A Cheery Soul, he has come closer than any playwright to dissecting the false values of the Lucky Country, with the insular existence forced on the inhabitants of its sprawling suburbs and its lack of adherence to a concrete moral system. His influence is plainly discernible on the work of several younger playwrights, particularly Rod Milgate’s hilarious though somewhat incomprehensible spoof A Refined Look at Existence—interestingly the only Australian play taken back for possible performance in his native Estonia by the Soviet director Voldemar Panso after his visit here late last year—and, in a different way, the searching historical analysis of the early days of New South Wales, Halloran’s Little Boat, by the gifted young Catholic writer Thomas Keneally.

This new development of the theatre, then, is a thing of ups and downs, but nonetheless it is a development—and all the
Spoofing the great Australian myth — two policemen (Michael Boddy and Helmut Baikatis) carry out the body of (Martin Herris) Penthouse Champion — part-Aborigine, soldier, Australian — in Rod Milgate’s "A Refined Look at Existence" at the Jane St. Theatre, Sydney

more remarkable for occurring in a country where, for many historical reasons, it seems to me that theatre has never been a deep-going popular tradition in the sense that it is an intrinsic element of the cultural way of life in Europe. The vast distances separating settlements in 19th century Australia, the resultant infrequency of contact between people, the slowness due to geographical and intellectual isolation alone in assimilating overseas values and the very fact of the country's rapid development without the basis of a longstanding tradition all served to impede the emergence of a native Australian theatre and body of drama, which depends on appreciation by relatively large groups of people, on an immediate and fairly formal contact between playwright, actor and audience, and no drama could develop satisfactorily in a country so dominated by the bush and bush ethos.

The result is that today the theatre-going habit is primarily a function of only a small section of the community — the upper and middle classes and the professional strata. I am referring here, of course, to the regular audiences of "serious" theatre rather than of the commercial theatre: it is a disturbing feature of modern life that what should be a mass activity, because it represents such
an important stream of mankind's cultural heritage, is the preserve of so few. The theatres themselves have contributed to this; they have tended to retreat continuously into remote corners of the cities. In the centre of Sydney, for instance, there is not one non-commercial professional theatre; one has to penetrate the distant grounds of the University of New South Wales or the meandering streets of Milson’s Point or the depths of North Sydney to get to them. For the average industrial or white-collar worker from the western suburbs, a visit to one of them is a safari in itself, and an expensive and forbidding one at that: the rather precious atmosphere prevailing in them would be sufficient to deter the average non-habitue from a second trip.

The reason for this depressing situation seems to me to lie in the nature of capitalist society itself. The existence under capitalism of “two cultures” — not in the C. P. Snow sense, but in that of one for the educationally and socially privileged and another for the culturally dispossessed — has become increasingly pronounced in recent years. A most dangerous polarisation of society is occurring with only a minority — admittedly a growing one, but still a mere fraction of the total population — having decent access to culture in its fullest sense, while for the vast majority a bread-and-circuses diet is intended to suffice. This inherent feature of capitalism has been accentuated by the rambling outwards growth of the cities, with the exigencies of paying off a home and the other personal comforts to which people are entitled precluding any real cultural enjoyment, whether of literature, art or theatre, through economic pressures alone. Television has dove-tailed neatly into this misleading “affluence”: for millions of Australians it has become the only form of cultural appreciation, a form costing only as much as the licence and the monthly time-payment, and, despite the many good programs filtering through, its basic fare is as shallow and pernicious as the society which produces it. Add to this the influence of the “club sub-culture”, as it has been called, as the only other means of suburban diversion, and you have a situation where any genuine form of cultural expression must of necessity fight a valiant but losing battle to penetrate the mass of the people and must eventually become the property of an exclusive and fortunate elite — not just in Australia, but in any other capitalist land.

Though socialism, I am convinced, is the only means by which culture can ever become a genuinely popular phenomenon, palliatives can and should be effected, and the socialist movement should fight tooth and nail for a meaningful program for the development of the arts. Apart from the aspects of content and quality involved, the major barrier is a material one: faced with burgeoning costs, the theatre, both professional and amateur, is in dire need of
extensive financial assistance. Government subsidisation in this field has increased greatly in recent years, but it is still painfully inadequate: large amounts of money are necessary to establish at least one full-time professional company, operating preferably on a repertory basis, in every capital city and some of the major provincial centres as well; to provide grants for Australian playwrights and to help underwrite productions—particularly amateur—of untried Australian plays, which, because of a peculiar pre-

Vietnam on stage: Parliamentarian Henry McKay (Michael Duffield, centre) and his family, including protestor Tony (Dennis Miller, left) argue out the pros and cons of the war while a bewildered Yuk (David Turnbull, centre) listens—a scene from Private Yuk Objects, by Alan Hopgood, presented by the Melbourne Union Repertory Company

judice against the local product and its lack of "name" are a serious economic gamble for any management; to finance companies to tour the hinterland and to extend the still meagre facilities for the training of actors. Hand in glove with this should go a drive for funds to finance the production of Australian television drama and the training of local TV playwrights and directors, and, perhaps even more importantly, the establishment, under official patronage, of an Australian cinema industry, the lack of which is one of the country's most shameful deficiencies. With the spiralling of governmental budgets, there is nothing to indicate that these demands are anything but practicable and realisable, even under
capitalism, and it is by no means to beat a propagandist drum to urge that the $7-8 million per annum necessary to meet this total program could not be quite easily lopped off the mammoth "defence" allocation.

A thorough reformation of the agencies through which sponsorship of theatre is at present effected is also in order. The Australian Elizabethan Theatre Trust is the major avenue through which government assistance to theatre is channelled, but since its establishment in 1955, it has largely disappointed the high hopes placed in it. In the first five years of its existence, under the imaginative leadership of Hugh Hunt, its progress was extremely promising, but since his departure in 1960 the Trust's effective contribution has diminished considerably: moving from its white elephant Elizabethan Theatre at Newtown, it failed to make any real impact with its part-time lease of the much more realistic Palace Theatre in the heart of Sydney and consequently retreated via a marquee in Rushcutters Bay to the 180-seat Old Tote at the University of NSW, together with its even more inaccessible 80-seat ancillary unit in Jane Street, Kensington, neither of which operates on a completely full-time basis. Its productions at these two theatres have been first rate, but the Trust is known to be riddled with serious internal conflict and bureaucratism which have vitiated much of its work. Its official subsidies from all sources have risen from something like $160,000 in 1955 to just on $700,000 ten years later, accomplishing a total loss in 1965 of $403,000, most of it on opera and ballet; losses on opera and ballet are only to be expected, but the proportion of its revenue devoted to these two forms vis-a-vis drama has been questioned, and in a prolonged controversy last year it was accused in responsible quarters of inefficient management. But the Trust's most serious weakness has been its remoteness from the community generally: its board of directors reads like a roll-call of captains of industry, knights and socialites, with a couple of academics and trade union leaders (Messrs. Albert Monk and Lloyd Ross) thrown in for good measure; its annual general meetings have often been quite ludicrous affairs, with its balance sheets and reports disposed of in half-an-hour or so. One feels that its structure needs complete reconstitution, to incorporate a more representative cross-section of society capable of providing more dynamic leadership, or, failing that, as has been alternatively suggested, its dissolution and replacement by a body akin to the Arts Council of Great Britain, with a greater degree of responsibility and lacking the self-perpetuating powers of the Trust. The announcement by the Commonwealth Government recently of the establishment of a national council of the performing arts under the chairmanship of Dr. H. C. Coombs (the present chairman of the Trust) is a welcome step in itself, but it will mean little if it is not accompanied by some re-organisation of the Trust itself.
A specialist in the field discusses Australia's increasingly acute water shortage, raising proposals for tackling the problem.

NORTHERN AND EASTERN AUSTRALIA has recently experienced a devastating drought. Characteristically it has broken in many regions with heavy rains and floods, a pattern typical of semi-arid lands and of Australia, the world’s driest continent.

It is interesting to compare Australian rainfall and river discharge volume with that of other continents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Continent</th>
<th>Area in sq. miles</th>
<th>Annual Rainfall Inches</th>
<th>Annual River Runoff Inches of rain</th>
<th>Million Acre *Feet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>South America</td>
<td>6,900,000</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>11,700,000</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>19,300,000</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>9,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North America</td>
<td>9,400,000</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>1,900,000</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>3,000,000</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 1 Acre-foot equals 272,250 gallons.

Australia lies astride the world’s rainless latitudes. Extensive mountain ranges above 2,000 feet elevation with their associated snowfields and rain are necessary to maintain large rivers; 45% of the USA land surface is above 2,000 feet as against only 7% of Australia, for instance.

As a further comparison the discharges of some of the world’s largest rivers are given below, including the Murray, Australia’s largest, both in size of catchment and annual discharge.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>River and Country</th>
<th>Catchment Area Square Miles</th>
<th>Average Annual Flow in Million Acre-feet</th>
<th>Annual Flow in Acre-Feet per sq. mile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amazon (Brazil)</td>
<td>2,100,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>1,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yangtze, China</td>
<td>750,000</td>
<td>725</td>
<td>965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danube, Europe</td>
<td>320,000</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ganges, India</td>
<td>588,000</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia, USA</td>
<td>237,000</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indus, Pakistan</td>
<td>360,000</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>River and Country</td>
<td>Catchment Area Square Miles</td>
<td>Average Annual Flow in Million Acre-feet</td>
<td>Annual Flow in Acre-Feet per sq. mile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nile, Africa</td>
<td>116,000</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento - San Joaquin, USA</td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado, USA</td>
<td>245,000</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murray, Australia</td>
<td>414,000</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Water conservation schemes on the scale of those in the Tennessee Valley, USA, the Volga-Don in the USSR or the New Aswan Dam on the Nile cannot be undertaken in Australia.

Limited schemes are still possible on the Queensland coast and a few other areas. What water resources we have will need to be carefully conserved and their use allocated according to carefully assessed priorities. It is in this context that the present controversies on Northern Development, the Ord River Scheme, damming of the Queensland-NSW border rivers and the future of the Snowy Mountains Authority must be seen.

For it is water more than any other resource that is going to determine the future scale and location of Australian agricultural and industrial development. There is no shortage of metallic mineral resources in Australia, especially the important ones. Measured black coal reserves are nearly 200 times present annual consumption, while inferred reserves are eight times as great again. Brown coal reserves in Victoria are additional and of even greater extent. Available known oil reserves are as yet small, but should be better known in the next decade. In any case technical advances and nuclear energy will provide alternative sources of energy, but cannot increase water resources.

Water in large quantities is necessary for the production of almost all commodities. The table below lists the water needed to produce one ton of product.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 ton of Product</th>
<th>Water required in gallons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Butter</td>
<td>5,380,000 (20.0 acre feet)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dried fruit</td>
<td>540,000 (2.0 &quot; &quot; )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soft fruit</td>
<td>80,000 (0.29 &quot; &quot; )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citrus</td>
<td>90,000 (0.33 &quot; &quot; )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rice</td>
<td>780,000 (2.9 &quot; &quot; )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rayon</td>
<td>190,000 (0.7 &quot; &quot; )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steel</td>
<td>60,000 (0.22 &quot; &quot; )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synthetic rubber</td>
<td>560,000 (2.1 &quot; &quot; )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For industrial plants, where most of the water is used for cooling purposes, it can often be recirculated, or else sea water used.

Many of the future great political debates in Australia will centre around water resources and their use.
The first requirement is an assessment of water resources in terms of quantity, quality and variability. State Public Works Departments carry out most stream gauging in Australia. The Commonwealth looks after gauging in the Northern Territory and ACT. The Australian Water Resources Council was established in 1962 to co-ordinate and extend this work, the appropriate State and Federal Ministers being members of the Council.

Since its inception there has been a considerable expansion of stream gauging, especially on remote and northern rivers. At present a major effort is going into assessing underground water resources. The Commonwealth Government provides the funds.

A publication "Review of Australia's Water Resources 1963" was issued by the Council in 1965 and represents the first official documentation of Australia's surface and underground waters.

The map below shows the main drainage regions of Australia together with the estimated mean annual discharge of the rivers in each region.

1; North-East Coast. II; South-East Coast. III; Tasmania. IV; Murray-Darling. V; South Australian Gulf. VI; South-West Coast. VII; Indian Ocean. VIII; Timor Sea. IX; Gulf of Carpentaria. X; Lake Eyre. XI; Bullo-Bancannia. XII; Western Plateau.
Fully one third of the continent is devoid of any recognisable drainage pattern at all. Two thirds of the mean annual discharge occurs in rivers north of the latitude of Brisbane. One eighth occurs in Tasmania.

However, this is only part of the picture. As in most semi-arid climates, stream flows tend to be erratic, nearly all mainland streams periodically dwindle to a trickle or dry up completely.

Rivers in Tasmania and southern Victoria have the least variable stream flows. Snow fed rivers show the least variation.

The northern rivers are among the most erratic and this together with the high evaporation tends to offset the relative abundance of water. For example, in Queensland on the Dawson River above Nathan Gorge over half the total stream flow between 1921 and 1956 occurred in ten floods. One flood in 1890 had a volume ten times the annual average stream flow. In this region dams need to have a capacity of nine to ten times their annual yield. Evaporation then absorbs about 50% of the yield.

Maximum annual flow on the Goulburn River in Victoria is about eleven times the minimum. As a comparison the Feather River of California, a tributary of the Sacramento and similar in size to the Goulburn, has a maximum flow only four times the minimum. Both are snow fed.

It is this variability of stream flow that makes water conservation in Australia an expensive proposition compared to similar projects elsewhere. Large dams with large spillway capacities are needed to give a low and hence expensive yield of water. The table below illustrates the position well.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Storage volume for irrigation. Acre feet</th>
<th>Areas irrigated Acres</th>
<th>Storage per acre irrigated. Acre feet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>14,000,000</td>
<td>2,200,000</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S.A.</td>
<td>92,000,000</td>
<td>26,000,000</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>6,100,000</td>
<td>7,000,000</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>20,000,000</td>
<td>58,000,000</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The proposed Ord River scheme in the Kimberleys will require 17.5 acre-feet of storage per acre irrigated.

In the urban water supply field, a similar situation applies. The table below lists storage requirements of some major cities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Storage per person served</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>London, Gt. Britain</td>
<td>4,000 gallons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glasgow, Scotland</td>
<td>16,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melbourne, Australia</td>
<td>34,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York, USA</td>
<td>55,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney, Australia</td>
<td>220,000 (five years supply)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The high cost (£40,000,000 plus pipeline) of Sydney's Warragamba dam is one reason why much of Sydney has not yet been sewered.

Dr. Davidson's objection to northern water conservation projects for irrigation purposes has one prime source in this low water yield of conservation projects. The return from necessarily large capital investment is small.

In many areas, especially those river basins with deep alluvial filled valleys, extensive underground resources are available. Many Queensland sugar fields are irrigated from these supplies (e.g. the Burdekin Delta). Conjunctive use of such underground water with surface dams and storages may prove the best way to utilise and conserve water resources, especially as evaporation losses can be minimised.

Available underground supplies (shallow and artesian) may exceed surface waters in Australia. In other parts of the world, e.g. California, underground aquifers are recharged using reclaimed waste waters such as sewage, and surplus waters from other regions.

Realisation of these possibilities has prompted the current program of assessing Australian underground water resources.

Australia's most extensive irrigation areas are in the Murray-Murrumbidgee valleys. Completion of current projects — the Snowy Scheme, Burrendong dam on the Macquarie River, Chowilla Dam on the Murray in South Australia and others would almost fully regulate the flow of this river system. Projects on northern tributaries of the Darling now commencing will complete the picture. Already 85% of the flow of the Murray tributaries in Victoria is committed to use.

Future expansion in the Murray and Murrumbidgee valleys can only come from more efficient and intensive use of existing water supplies. About 50% of diverted water at present is lost in leakage, wastage and evaporation. Water conservation authorities are beginning to tackle these difficult problems.

Conflict between the needs of irrigation, urban and industrial use will increase in the Murray valley and indeed everywhere in Australia. In fact this is becoming a world-wide problem. It is already an issue in Victoria with the Melbourne and Metropolitan Board of Works proposal to utilise the upper reaches of the Goulburn River to supply Melbourne.

South Australia, already heavily dependent on Murray river water is facing an increasingly acute water shortage. The quality of the water will become progressively worse as people upstream
make more intensive use of water, returning irrigation, saline drainage and other effluents to the river.

The proposal of a consulting engineer that a separate fresh water canal be built parallel to the river has merit. The existing river would then become a drain. This would be expensive, but then so is any other solution so far as South Australia is concerned.

Construction of Chowilla Dam has been postponed indefinitely by the River Murray Commission because of the greatly increased cost, now estimated at over £35,000,000 or nearly double original estimates.

There are other objections to this project. The 500 square mile lake formed by the dam would, when full, have an average depth of 15 feet in an area where annual evaporation is 5 feet. High evaporation losses and increased salinity would result. In addition water weeds and algal growths would be considerable with serious effects on water quality.

Alternatives need to be considered. Desalination of sea water is feasible, but expensive and for technical reasons will always be so. Cheap power is essential for large outputs and nuclear energy will probably be the only practical source. Los Angeles, USA is currently building a 150 million gallons per day nuclear powered desalination and electric power plant, by far the largest such plant in the world today and the first to be nuclear powered. It is claimed water will be produced at the plant for about 50 cents per thousand gallons, but this remains to be proven. However, this type of large combined nuclear power and water plant will probably produce the cheapest desalinated sea water in the long run. A nuclear powered desalination and power plant in South Australia could meet that state's growing urban water needs before long, but irrigation with desalinated water is far too expensive at present.

Some interesting experiments have been made in Israel irrigating with salt water, even sea water. The key apparently is to use gravelly or sandy soils with suitable attention to sub-soil drainage. This could have immense possibilities. Further research is needed.

Northern Australia and a National Water Policy

Few of the rivers on Australia's northern coast are suitable for large scale water conservation. Only the Ord and Fitzroy in WA and the Katharine in the NT appear to have suitable sites for large dams (over 1 million acre ft. capacity). All the other rivers despite high annual discharges are only capable of limited local development due to lack of adequate storage or irrigation sites. In chapter seven of his book "Struggle for the North" (Australasian
J. H. Kelly explains the problem in some detail. One fifth of Australia's water resources are in Cape York Peninsula. Recent newspaper reports claim that American investors hold interests in over half the land in this area.

Apart from rivers on the Queensland and northern NSW coast there is little scope left in Australia for large scale water conservation projects like the Snowy Scheme. The Federal Government's decision to discontinue the Snowy Mountains Authority as a construction body needs to be viewed with this sober fact in mind. At the same time the decision highlights the lack of a long term national water policy. The Federal Government's belated offer to consider projects submitted by the states to a total of £25,000,000 is pitiful. It highlights the present Government's attitude of "leaving it to private enterprise", of only acting when some large firm wants help — often on a project of dubious worth in the first place. The Humpty Doo rice project near Darwin is a case in point.

Nothing could be more barren and short sighted in a matter so vital to this country's future. The decision to retain the nucleus of the Snowy Mountains team, while a step in the right direction appears largely as a sop to public opinion.

The work started by the Australian Water Resources Council is good, but quite inadequate in scope. A continuing assessment of water resources is needed together with a study of economical methods of conserving and utilising them at all levels including the farm. Such questions as hydrology, agricultural economics and markets must take precedence over purely engineering matters; what is realisable rather than what is spectacular, especially where irrigation is concerned. Irrigation for the export market would almost certainly be uneconomical.

The scope for small scale water conservation in the north and elsewhere is real and possibly the best way to start in this region. Prof. Munro's suggestion for developing a particular site solely as an experiment has merit. With the experience gained more ambitious projects could be tackled when the need arises. Future urban and industrial water requirements should be surveyed, matching needs to available supplies at a reasonable price. The sites for future major cities need to be surveyed in this context.

The ground work has been started by the Australian Water Resources Council. An extension is needed into the fields outlined above and into basic research in such fields as evaporation, hydrology, meteorology, desalination of sea water, waste water treatment and renovation and the broad spectrum of water resources utilisation. It is a task the University of NSW based Water Research
Foundation of Australia attempts on a shoestring budget. The Federal Government has persistently refused financial help to this organisation that is deserving of much greater support from the labor movement. Developing a public awareness of Australia's water needs is among its objectives. This task is one that could be based on the Snowy Mountains team.

Australia's water resources are so limited that a national plan of priorities for their use in relation to future location of industries, agriculture and centres of population is vital. Growing numbers of Australians are beginning to realise this. The present Federal Government with its philosophy of minimum governmental action and of leaving the initiative to private and foreign investors, seems unable to take the necessary steps. A great responsibility rests with the labor movement to undertake this task.

Nearly all the nations of the world are co-operating with UNESCO in a decade of work to systematically assess the water resources of the world. It is hoped to publish a book outlining the river flows and water resources of the world at the end of the decade, much as the Australian Water Resources Council has already done for Australia. International bodies such as the World Health Organisation (WHO), World Meteorological Organisation (WMO), Food and Agricultural Organisation (FAO) are participating. One aim is to study the hydrological cycle of the world as a whole. Another is to systematise and standardise methods of measuring and recording data.

The work begun during the International Hydrological Decade will certainly not stop in 1974. Rather will it be a beginning, a great step forward in integrating the entire world into one economic unit. Continental wide development of water resources is beginning to become both possible and necessary in many parts of the world as water shortages and pollution are becoming a world wide phenomenon.

... Luther was one of the greatest of all revolutionaries, surpassed, perhaps, only by Christ himself and by Karl Marx ... Yet Protestants must also be aware that in the past fifty years the influence of their Churches has declined catastrophically (though) this decline should not be exaggerated ... Secularism, science and rationalism seem everywhere triumphant ... Indeed, it is now obvious that the real conflict is not between Catholics and Protestants, but between humanists who believe that man must rely on himself and Christians who believe that without God humanity cannot purge itself of the universal taint of selfhood ... What is needed is a new intellectual effort ... The great fault of the Protestant Churches in Australia is the great fault of Australia as a whole — a most un-Lutheran contempt for intellectual effort.

*Sydney Morning Herald*, Oct. 8, on the 450th Luther anniversary.
The symposium in Melbourne to mark the centenary of the publication of the first volume of Marx's Capital was held under the joint auspices of ALR and the Melbourne University Labor Club. A summary of the papers delivered there appears below. A summary of the papers read at the Sydney symposium was published in our previous issue.

DR. IAN TURNER of the Monash University opened with a paper on "Marx as an Historian". He pointed out that to discuss Marx as an historian, one must consider his theory of history, which flows from his theory of society, rather than his writing about historical events which, although brilliant, was not extensive.

The great paradox of Marx as historian, Dr. Turner stressed, is that, while many of his specific predictions about the future of capitalist society were wrong, he nevertheless remains the most influential thinker of his and our time. To understand this paradox, one must think of Marx as a man of his own time and place — mid-nineteenth century Britain, when Britain was the dominant world power economically, politically and intellectually. Like other thinkers of his time, Marx believed in progress, but unlike the others he did not regard mid-nineteenth century Britain as the culmination of progress. Rather he looked to the class struggle and the victory of the proletariat to consummate man’s progress towards freedom. This is the source of the paradox. Marx was an ideologist as well as a social theorist — an ideologist in both senses of the word, in that he believed in the good society, and in that he constructed a system of historical theory which sought to prove the inevitability of what he wanted to happen, of the good society.

Present day marxists, Dr. Turner declared, must use Marx's own method of thought about history and the part played by theory and ideology in social change in order to separate Marx's ideology from his methodology. A realistic analysis of contemporary bourgeois society suggests that the inevitable collapse of capitalism and victory of the proletariat predicted by Marx is unlikely to occur, Dr. Turner claimed. But such an analysis can only be made by using Marx's method — by investigating the effects of technolog-
ical change on social structure and ultimately on social theory, and the new conditions under which social change will occur.

To do this means also to adopt the other aspect of Marx’s ideology—the belief in and search for the good society—while recognising that this is ideology and not science. For what Marx is finally concerned with is a value—freedom, the belief that man alone can unchain himself.

BRUCE McFARLANE, from the Australian National University, opened his paper on “Marx as an Economist” by asking: “Increasing concentration of wealth, rapid elimination of small and medium-scale enterprises, progressive limitation of industrial competition, incessant technological progress accompanied by an ever-growing importance of fixed capital and machinery. Is this a recent analysis of US capitalism? Is it a text book on contemporary institutions? Is it the US census? No, it is Kark Marx, Das Kapital, Volume 3, in a series of superb prognostications.” Mr. McFarlane pointed out that Marx not only discerned the “laws of motion” or the dynamics of capitalism, his work also embraced the exposure of exploitation under capitalism, the paramount importance of understanding the relations between men in production and not only the problems of the exchange of physical goods.

The influence of Hegel is evident in Marx’s work. It accounts for certain difficulties about reading the first part of Capital, where Marx “flirts with Hegel’s terminology”, it is also involved in Marx’s presentation of the labor theory of value.

Mr. McFarlane contrasted the more primitive and simplified presentation of Marx’s economic theories in the Communist Manifesto with the more complex presentation in Capital. Unfortunately some “marxists” have reduced marxian economics to the more primitive level of the Manifesto.

Marx’s method is to explain first the social relations between men, then the operation of the main laws of capitalism and then to take into account exceptions, counter-tendencies. The primacy of social relations between men which underlie market relationships and determine the size and utilisation of economic surplus is stressed, and it is this basic method of Marx which is a most useful way of laying bare the economic laws of a given social system.

Marx’s idea of “surplus value” as the source of capitalist accumulation or of saving which is the basis for investment and economic growth, has been generalised to the concept of economic surplus as the difference between current output and actual current consumption. Mr. McFarlane stressed that this idea of economic
surplus and the mode of its utilisation is an extremely important tool for understanding the essence of various economic systems.

After criticising some distortions of dialectical and historical materialism by Stalin, Mr. McFarlane dealt with some problems of alienation for which the labor theory of value and the concept of surplus value are key elements in Marx's approach to alienation under capitalism. On the problem of producers' versus consumers' interests, Mr McFarlane made the observation that this may not have been due to the difficulties of the Soviet industrialisation process but that the ability to neglect consumers may also have roots in Marx's theory itself.

In conclusion Mr. McFarlane expressed his disagreement with two current tendencies of interpreting Marx. The first one is the fashion of splitting Marx and Engels, and ridiculing Engels as a mere vulgariser of Marx's work. There is no basis for such an interpretation. The second tendency is to re-interpret Marx by the growing emphasis of the "Young Marx". It is said that the "early" Marx, embracing Hegel's vision and methodology, stressed humanism, showed how the concept of alienation could be used to explain the essence of the State, of systems of exploitation—and that this humanitarianism was overshadowed by later economic analysis. Such an approach leads to the ridiculous notion of value—judgment free, "neutral" social science. It is really a retreat to Hegel, a shying away from the struggle against the specific character of modern capitalism and colonialism. It misrepresents the true Marx who was above all a fighter who stood unreservedly and passionately with the oppressed. That is where he would stand were he alive today.

DR. ALAN ROBERTS, of Monash University, stated that Marx was a philosopher before he was an economist or historian, and the unique structure of Capital has been shown to depend crucially on his philosophical positions. Yet these are given much less attention than his other researches; why? Partly, Dr. Roberts claimed, it is due to the retreat of philosophy in general from the spotlight which it occupied in Marx's day, to a backstage obscurity in which it is valued only by various scattered social groups. The fragmentation of knowledge, which is linked with an aggressively empirical methodology, is so current that even as unified a thinker as Marx is "picked over" and selected from.

But even among those still interested in philosophy, we find for example the mainstream of English-speaking academic philosophy running clear of marxism, and not even confronting it. Some recent examination has revealed the inbuilt mechanisms in the empiricist outlook which do not so much deny marxist positions
as exclude them from consideration altogether. Moreover, the empiricist school has produced its own formidable critic in the person of the later Wittgenstein, whose positions on a number of fundamental issues resemble strikingly those common to Hegel and Marx.

Another reason for this academic neglect of marxist philosophy, Dr. Roberts claimed, has been its widespread identification with the “official” version taught in the USSR and of wide currency in most Communist Parties. This version replaces the essence of Marx’s philosophy, its critical approach, by an anxiety over “correctness” and a recitation of formulas. The acceptance of Engels’ “dialectics of nature” has greatly assisted this process. Criticisms of this “scientizing” of Marx’s essentially human-oriented outlook have been made by Lukacs, Sartre, Hyppolite and others; Sartre’s arguments in particular need to be considered.

Despite their comparative neglect, in favor of his other studies, Marx’s philosophical positions still have great value today. Two of his aphoristic Theses on Feuerbach illustrate the deep contemporary significance to be found in his criticisms. The XIth thesis is not a pious bow to “practicalism”, as often thought, but contains a profound theoretical stand, implicitly critical of, for example, much present-day sociological research. The IIIrd Thesis, with its account of how the masses make and are made by historical change, is a theoretical refutation of all forms of elitism in history, and of “substitutionism”. It provides a theoretical perspective within which any programs for sweeping political change must be viewed—but seldom are.

IN THE FINAL PAPER, “Marx as a Political Leader”, Mr. Eric Aarons pointed out that it is possible to approach this subject in different ways. He suggested that the most fruitful course is to pose this question: “A politician has to react to, make decisions on or in political situations. How did Marx react, how did he make his political decisions and why?”

Before attempting to answer this question, Mr. Aarons dealt with the models of society that Marx had established. Noting that there is always a difference between the models or ideal types and reality, Mr. Aarons asks, if these models don’t actually exist, what use are they? Indeed there has been a trend in the US in particular to reject large theorising and to concentrate solely on detailed empirical investigation.

Conceding that the creating and proper use of models has many difficulties and that it can encourage dogmatism and rigidity of thought, he nevertheless pointed out that if we reject the use
of abstract and idealised models, we block in advance any possi­bility of achieving a better understanding of social life, because its complexities do not permit any other procedure for acquiring understanding.

Turning to the question posed above, Mr. Aarons suggested that in looking at the nature of political situations (on an international or national level) we may select three important characteristics:

1. They constitute what may be called a "whole situation."

2. They involve people—and as nations, classes, groups, organisa­tions and individuals in struggle, of one sort or another with each others.

3. They are real, they are merciless, they will not go away whatever one wishes.

Analysing those three characteristics Mr. Aarons first pointed out that we can not isolate or take out one aspect, one part of a whole situation except in theory. In fact all sides, aspects, forces, act and react together as a totality. Therefore no models or theories—which by their nature are abstract, idealised and partial—can provide directly the solution to a problem.

Each significant political analysis is a highly complex and creative endeavor, perhaps an art rather than a science. Marx's own political estimates were always based on attempts to analyse "the whole" situation and what flowed from it in the given condi­tions. This gave rise to different estimates, attitudes and slogans at different times. The resultant seeming inconsistency is in fact an example of actual political consistency in pursuit of his political aims.

On the second characteristic of political situations, Mr. Aarons pointed out that as they involve people, all the human qualities, the arts of communication with and between people, the rational as well as the irrational, the advanced as well as the backward are involved and play their part.

The third characteristic—real, merciless, and not yielding to wishes or desires—has many practical implications. Those who want to avoid politics, to opt out, to engage in some "purer" activity are really making a political decision. By refraining from intervening they are leaving it to the various political forces active in the situation. Try as they may they cannot avoid political decisions and their effect.

Mr. Aarons makes some interesting observations on the con­nection between long range and immediate aims, between revo-
volutionary perspectives and “the immediately possible practical steps.” He notes that those who reject the struggle round smaller issues on the grounds that “it is not revolutionary enough”—and this has been a continually recurring trend, including today—not only may not be particularly revolutionary but may even harm development of larger movements. If people are not in the ideological condition to achieve something limited, how can they be expected to achieve something far-reaching? Rather, they prepare for the latter struggling for the former.

Concluding his paper with reference to Marx’s extensive treatment of the oppression of the colored peoples by white imperialism, Mr. Aarons said: “Marx saw this not only as an assault on human rights and dignity of the colored; but as also robbing the white oppressor or condoner of oppression of his humanity and possibility of achieving significant social advancement. We see this with added force in the struggle over Vietnam today, which has many implications including for social advancement within Australia itself.”

KARL MARX

The papers presented at symposia held in Sydney and Melbourne, July-August 1967, to commemorate the 100th anniversary of the publication of Capital, the major work of Karl Marx, are now available.

Marx the man, C. Manning Clark; the philosopher, J. D. Blake and Dr Alan Roberts; the historian, Dr. Ian Turner; the economist, Bernie Taft and Bruce McFarlane; the politician, Eric Aarons.

One volume: Price $1.00 (post free).
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The following address was originally delivered to the Council for Aboriginal Rights in Victoria. It is reproduced here by kind permission of the author, who is vice-president of the Victorian Aborigines' Advancement League.

This subject is not an esoteric one for specialists: it has so many similarities with the Aboriginal situation in Australia that it is of particular importance to anyone interested in Aboriginal affairs in this country. There are 25 million Aborigines in India, living in 567 tribes in every State; and 25 million people, even judged by Indian standards, is a sizeable minority. They live in tribal communities, as Australia's Aborigines were wont to do, and their work is largely undifferentiated: that is to say, all the men may till the soil in a particular area, and all the women weave and look after the household. Their economy is simple and most live at subsistence level or lower on a rice and vegetable diet.

These Adibassi (the Indian word for Aborigine) were the original Dravidian inhabitants of India who were pushed back about 2,000 B.C. into the hill country by the Aryans and then by the Turko-Afghans, the technically superior invaders from the north, just as the Europeans who entered Australia gradually pushed the Aborigines into the harsher back-country.

The general population of India, though heterogeneous, is over 80% Hindu. The Adibassi, coming from totally different stock, have kept very much to themselves and surprisingly little miscegenation has occurred. There is, therefore, no problem of part-Aborigines and fringe-dwellers such as we know here. Those from the south, particularly, have a similar cast of features to Australian Aborigines, who are thought to have originally migrated through south-east Asia to Australia, where the rising of the sea-level isolated them. The Indian Aboriginal women do not wear saris but usually some form of skirt and blouse, and both men and women favor a lot of cane and wooden jewellery, hand-made. In religion, too, they differ radically from the Hindus, being Animists—those who regard the spirit world as manifesting itself in natural objects—and have no system of castes or untouchability. But,
being casteless, they are regarded by the Hindus as being in the same category as Untouchables (as, indeed, are Europeans).

Christian missionaries have been in the field for over a century, so a substantial minority are Christian, though sometimes the "conversion" has been superficial and is linked with the higher material standards the missionaries bring with them.

Section 275 of the Indian Constitution is concerned with what are known as the Scheduled Tribes: those who have been officially/ listed as tribals and who get many of the specific privileges afforded also to Harijans or "children of God"—as Ghandi called those who, before Independence, were dubbed Untouchables. Under this Section, laws have been passed which discriminate in favor of the Adibassi, since the government recognises that a minority community which, for historical reasons is economically backward, requires special assistance. These special laws may be considered in four main categories:

1 Areas where tribals predominate can only be represented in the Lok Sabha or lower house of Parliament by tribals.

2 Every effort has been made to raise Adibassi living standards by encouraging those who can benefit to take up secondary and tertiary scholarships which are freely available to all tribals who qualify. (For instance, all tribal matriculants are entitled to free university places). Tribal bishops, lawyers and doctors are encouraged to return to their own people after graduating, in order to set an example and help those about them; though there is no coercion in this. The success of the scheme is proved by the large numbers of professional tribals one meets, who are working in their own area.

3 Adibassi, unlike the rest of the population, do not pay income tax, regardless of income. Again the government has realised the difficulties facing people emerging from an economically simple, self-contained community into the more individualistic and complex society about them.

4 Tribal reserves are owned and administered by elected tribal councils, who are free to split them into blocks for sale to individual Adibassi, but may not sell them to non-Adibassi. Funds for their development and technical assistance are made available by the government, but the people themselves decide in what form the land is to be developed. Some tribes have opted for co-operative farming (for which interest-free loans are available for implement-buying), others for co-operative buying of equipment and/or selling of produce only, while yet others run small
farms on entirely individual lines. Decisions about these and other matters of community interest are decided by the village council, or Gram Panchayet, elected by adult franchise. Noted Indian anthropologist, Dr. Verrier Elwyn once commented, "Tribal programs must be community programs, not administrators' programs. We must build on the past, and not make a sudden break with it; and the emphasis of all planning should be on self-reliance."

5 Payment in all jobs in which there is an award is equal to Adibassi and all other groups alike.

One could say of the majority of Indians that, like Australians, they have had no contact with the Aboriginal population and are not particularly interested in them. However, among most officers of the Department of Tribal Affairs, from the Commissioner of Scheduled Tribes in Delhi to a humble village worker "out in the District" there is an element of pride and enthusiasm which is refreshing to encounter, pride in the indigenous culture of "their" tribals (with whom they readily identify), and enthusiasm in helping with the sometimes meagre resources available.

Tribal people themselves are trained in large numbers as officers of the Department of Tribal Affairs, at all levels, on the assumption that they, knowing the local language and customs, will be more suitable. All departmental officers, whether tribal or otherwise, are given a minimum of three months' special training, which includes courses in local culture and customs, and principles of Community Development.

Villages are grouped together as Development Blocks, of which there is one to every thana or police district. Typical of such Blocks is the one in Simdega, in the state of Bihar. This consists of 96 villages and 65,000 people. It is headed by a Block Development Officer whose function is to plan economic and social development for the area and to co-ordinate the work of government officials working in the Block. Under him are engineers and area planners, who advise on roads, bridges, wells and houses. Wherever possible, materials and a choice of plans is given to the local villagers, who are encouraged themselves to execute the plans, under expert surveillance if need be. Also, there are medical officers, hampered by the vast areas they have to cover to administer both preventive and curative medicine (there is one fully trained doctor to every 6,000 of the population in India, one to every 600 in the Soviet Union); and hampered, too, by having to frequently double up as veterinary surgeons. Agriculturalists, working within the community development idea, advise
on stock improvement, use of fertilizers, irrigation and the myriad problems of small lot-holders operating poor soil without capital. To every ten villages, there are three field workers, whose main job is to make personal contact with the wants of villagers and to act as a bridge between the Adibassi and officialdom. They comprise a social worker, a gram seveka (literally: village service) and a karamchari or revenue officer who sees that land boundaries are respected and other legalities are observed. These three work on an informal basis, as a liaison between people and government.

The Department of Tribal Affairs is a Union Government agency, with offices in all States. The States officers' function is to advise on the problems of that particular area and to spend funds allocated from Delhi. Curiously enough, State officers' main problems seem to centre around spending funds allotted, rather than obtaining them, since they are constantly beset by lack of communication and of shortages: shortages of agricultural equipment, of building materials, of even the simplest nails and screws; and, too, there are problems of villages which are periodically completely cut off by the monsoon in a surrounding sea of mud.

Annually, there is a check on tribal programs by senior officers of the Department, who administer a questionnaire to officials in various areas. The sort of questions that are asked include:

- Of the facilities provided, how many were used, by how many people?
- What methods are adopted to consult regularly with the people? Are these satisfactory?
- What are the main needs of your area? How have you arrived at this conclusion?
- By how much per capita has income been raised in your area last year? If the answer is "not raised," why not?

and many others, aimed at ensuring efficiency of administration and a high level of consultation with those administered.

The main drawback of the Community Development plan in India, a most serious one, is that so far it has only reached 65% of all villages. The "poverty, passivity and over-population" which the Abbe Dubois observed in 1800 are by no means yet overcome.

It is a part of Indian Government policy that all minorities be encouraged to maintain their separate culture, not as a method of holding them back, of keeping them as museum pieces, but of maintaining cohesion of group spirit, a pride in the achievements of their people. In the case of Adibassi, this assistance comes in various forms:
Government-paid scribes are employed to record myths and legends of the tribes. These are published in well-printed, well-illustrated books which are on sale at city bookshops. Though many tribals are illiterate, they are aware of the existence of these books, and of their government sponsorship.

2 All-India Radio has a permanent team out in the field, recording tribal songs and music for preservation purposes and also to play in frequent sessions on the radio.

3 Traditional arts and crafts are encouraged and an attempt is made to steer a course between a Woolworths-type degradation of traditional art forms and a stultification of artistic expression. Aeroplanes and other appurtenances of every-day modern life appear in design; traditional woodwork is turned to marketable objects such as toys and candlesticks, school pillars and doors; and a District Officer will wear a tie which has been locally designed. Both in tribal areas and in the cities the Government maintains Tribal Museums which only exhibit the best pieces of craft and art works; pottery, carving, jewellery, painting. The honor of having work so displayed is considerable and the effect is to make artistic standards competitive, and so, higher.

4 Similarly, dance groups of the various tribes practice throughout the year for their public performance in the open air in Delhi as part of India’s Independence Day which has been celebrated each January since 1947, and is attended by the Prime Minister and many local and overseas dignitaries. In this National Day ceremonial the Adibassi play a prominent part.

The attitude among officialdom is one of humility, of trying to assist Adibassi along the lines they wish to pursue. The elected Panchayat or council existing in every village, has every facility for communication with Block officers, at the planning level, at the execution level (where projects for the people are usually carried out by the people concerned, if necessary under expert supervision) and channels of communication to the Government allow for complaint over what has been achieved and what has not been achieved. This constructive approach to the problem of tribals is fostered by the six Anthropological Institutes dotted over India and also by the attitude of the late Prime Minister Jawarhalal Nehru, who stated in New Delhi, on 9th October, 1958: “Tribals should develop along the lines of their own genius and we should avoid imposing anything on them.”

The illiteracy rate among tribals is high (in West Bengal, for instance, 90.8%, as against 64% for the rest of the population), despite active government assistance with scholarships; their tradition is against it, areas in which they live are often without a
school building or a teacher, a big majority of today's parents are totally uneducated and do not value formal education. But it is official policy to teach children in their own language for the first four years of schooling so that the big step from home to school environment is bridged more easily, and also to inculcate the idea that their own language is something of which to be proud. Hindi, the national language, is introduced after fourth grade and, in secondary school, English, too, becomes a compulsory subject.

It cannot be stressed too emphatically that the whole of India suffers from under-development of the economy and therefore intense poverty among the big majority of the population, whether tribal or non-tribal. There are tribals as well as non-tribals who suffer from severe malnutrition, homelessness, diseases that are easily curable were facilities available, a tiny cash income or none at all. In the words of Sir Hugh Casson (English "Observer", January 1960): "In between these brave islands of endeavour washes a great sea of poverty and people." The figures speak for themselves:

Only one family in 4,000 has an income of more than $400 per month.
Per capita income is $72 per annum.
Half the population live on less than ten cents a day, including the food they produce.
Only 10% have an income of more than twenty cents a day.
Life expectancy is 42 years.

It has proved impossible for India to pull herself up by the bootstraps. Massive investment is required to build up secondary industry and to render agriculture more productive, and there is not a big surplus of production to set aside for this purpose. Investment has only been running at the rate of 11% in India, as compared with an average of 10-15% in Western (developed) countries and 25% in socialist countries. The only way out of the dilemma of misery and starvation, made worse recently by bad seasons and crop failures, appears to be massive aid from the developed countries, which can be invested in heavy industry.

But though the aid rendered to tribals is nothing like enough in quantity, the quality nevertheless remains admirable and gives us, in Australia, something to ponder over in the Aboriginal situation, when a country so beset as is India with almost every conceivable problem—economic, social, cultural, political—can yet plan and put into effect such an enlightened policy of tribal advancement.
THE UNFINISHED REVOLUTION,
by Isaac Deutscher
Oxford University Press,
115 pp, $3.60.

AMONG all the great and stormy changes of the twentieth century, the transformation of backward Czarist Russia into the modern Soviet Union stands out as the greatest single event, the most powerful permanent influence of the last 50 years.

Despite enormous handicaps and serious errors, the achievements of the USSR, including its crisis-free economic system providing full employment and rapid expansion in the age of automation, its outstanding health and educational services and cultural facilities, its practical equality of the sexes and of nationalities, have done much more than benefit Soviet citizens: they have indicated what all men can gain today.

An enormous amount of material—good, bad and trivial, has been written about the Soviet Union, from almost every conceivable viewpoint. Almost every journal of any significance has found it necessary to give its readers some account of marxism, and of its influence in the development of the Soviet Union. The quality of the material being produced varies greatly. The best of it recognises the tremendous influence of marxism in the development of the modern labor movement, and the importance of the great renaissance of marxist thought since 1956.

"Today", as P. P. McGuinness conceded in the Australian Financial Review of September 14, "the influence of marxism is felt throughout the entire world. It is not the influence of a dead, rigid system, but that of a living and changing movement".

"The Bolshevik Revolution", says R. Palme Dutt ("The Internationale", 1964, p. 145) "was in fact the most democratic revolution in history. It was also the most bloodless. The bloodshed and heavy armed struggles only came during the subsequent years, through the interventionist wars, military plots and subsidized civil wars organised by Western imperialism."

The authority of the Bolshevists rested—as it could only rest—on the firm support of the people, represented by the rank and file Soviet organisations, which found the strength to resist and defeat all that internal and external reaction could throw against them—famine and disease included.

The emergence of a single-party government in the grim conditions of the life and death struggle of Soviet Russia for
survival in the first few years of socialist power was an accident of history, not the result of any sinister Bolshevik plot. On the contrary, the Bolsheviks wanted a coalition government and managed to establish one with the Left Socialist Revolutionaries for a period. But parties and groups other than the Bolsheviks lost their strength and following because they proved unequal to the tremendous test of the time.

In an Open Letter to America written when the German armies had overrun the Ukraine and stood at the gates of Petrograd, Arthur Ransome of the London Daily News said (New Republic, July 26, 1918) reprinted by the Worker newspaper (Brisbane, 1919):

"From the moment of the October Revolution on, the best illustration of the fact that the Soviet Government is the natural government of the Russian people . . . has been the attitude of the defeated minorities who oppose it. Whereas the Bolsheviks worked steadily in the Soviets when the majority was against them, and made their final move for power only when assured that they had an overwhelming majority in the Soviets behind them, their opponents see their best hope of regaining power, not in the Soviets, not even in Russia itself, but in some extraordinary intervention from without. By asking for foreign help against the Soviet Government, they prove that such help should not be given and that they do not deserve it."

(The analogy of the situation in Vietnam today is obvious).

In a review of the book The God That Failed written by a number of ex-communists after 1956 and quoted by C. Wright Mills in his last work: The Marxists, veteran critic of the Soviet Union Isaac Deutscher sharply criticised the lack of substance in such works accusing them of appearing to seek mainly self-justification.

His own works suffer from the same fault yet it stands to his credit that, as the years passed, he began to see and acknowledge much of the position in Soviet development, much of the inevitability of stringent measures adopted by the Soviet Government to save the revolution.

Perhaps his most important work is The Unfinished Revolution (Oxford University Press, 1967, $3.60). This is a book of only 115 pages, containing the six George Macaulay Trevelyan lectures delivered in the University of Cambridge by Deutscher in January-March 1967. It was his last book, he died soon after.

Deutscher, of course, is well known as a veteran supporter of Trotsky, a critic of the
Soviet Union, of Stalin in particular, and of the Communist Parties.

The lectures in *The Unfinished Revolution* clearly show that he maintained his essential criticisms until the end, and they suffer from this. There are curious omissions, contradictions, and doubtful evaluations, yet the series as a whole is of considerable positive value as an informed effort to understand what happened in the USSR and why, and to estimate the significance of the Russian revolution for our generation and age.

Opening the first lecture *The Historical Perspective* Deutscher warns that, even though half a century has passed since the fall of Tsarism, and the establishment of the first Soviet Government, the distance may still be too short for an historical perspective because “This has been the most crowded cataclysmic epoch in modern history. The Russian revolution has raised issues far deeper, has stirred conflicts more violent and has unleashed forces far larger than those that had been involved in the greatest social upheavals of the past. And yet the revolution has by no means come to a close. It is still on the move. It may still surprise us by its sharp and sudden turns. It is still capable of redrawing its own perspective.”

Closing the sixth and last *Conclusions and Prospects*, he says: “The East has been the first to give effect to the great principle of a new social organisation, the principle originally conceived in the West. Fifty years of Soviet history tells us what stupendous progress a backward nation has achieved by applying that principle, even in the most adverse conditions. By this alone, these years point to the limitless new horizons that Western society can open to itself, and to the world, if only it frees itself from its conservative fetishes.”

“The fact is”, he says, “that, regardless of all Keynesian innovations, our productive process, so magnificently socialised in many respects, is not yet socially controlled . . . Among all the dark images of declining capitalism ever drawn by marxists, not a single one was so black and apocalyptic as the picture that reality is producing.”

Deutscher's second lecture, *Breaks in Revolutionary Continuity*, is an effort to summarize the essence of Soviet development from 1917 and the present, in a few (18) pages. Inevitably, it fails to do so, misses essentials and leaves much to be desired, much open to question. The lecturer is befuddled by the problem of how to reconcile the basic Trotskyist charge that the Party and bureaucracy took real power out of the hands of the workers with the fact that the revolu-
tionary tradition has remained intact. And his basic conclusion is vital; "Behind these ideological and political phenomena, there is a real continuity of a system based on the abolition of private ownership and the complete nationalisation of industry and banking. All the changes in government, party leadership, and policies have not affected this basic and inviolable 'conquest of October'. This is the rock on which the ideological continuity rests. . . the malaise, the heart searchings and the gropings of the post-Stalin era testify in their own way to the continuity of the revolutionary epoch."

"Since the Second World War", he adds, "the feats of Soviet industry and aims have appeared to justify retrospectively even the violence, the blood and the tears. But it may be held, as I have held through all these decades, that without the violence, the blood and the tears, the great work of construction might have been done far more efficiently and with healthier social, political and moral after-effects."

Few nowadays would not wish that many things might have been otherwise in the history of the building of the Soviet Union, few would dispute that there were serious and unnecessary violations of Socialist law under Stalin. Yet who could seriously believe that the path could have been pain-

less? Deutscher is tentative in his historical judgment, aware that the practical realities of building from bedrock in conditions of hostile capitalist encirclement and threat often compelled decisions which would have been unnecessary in an atmosphere of peace and security.

Criticising the collectivisation of agriculture in the early 1930's and its forcible methods, he nevertheless reminds us that: "Under the ancien regime the Russian countryside was periodically swept by famine, as China's countryside was and as India's still is. In the intervals between the famines, uncounted (statistically unnotic-
ed) millions of peasants and peasant children died of malnutrition and disease, as they still do in so many underde-
veloped countries . . . This cannot excuse or mitigate the crimes of Stalinist policy; but it may put the problem into proper perspective."

It is in the fourth lecture Stalemate in Class Struggle that Deutscher raises questions of perhaps the greatest importance and adopts positions with which I cannot agree. Here he expounds the more or less classical Trotskyist view that, compelled by the ebbing of the revolutionary tide in Europe to endeavour to try to build socialism alone, the Soviet Union in effect did not do so, but betrayed the cause of revolution
in the world, imposed defence of the USSR on the Communist Parties of other countries to the detriment of their work on behalf of their own people, and sought above all to retain the status quo in international relations.

He develops the Trotskyist view that "the myth of socialism in one country has bred an even more deceptive myth—a colossal myth about the failure of socialism."

Elsewhere (p. 83), he says: "We in the West do not have to rely on Stalinist or Maoist 'rewrites' of history" but his own "rewriting" is not very reliable. As a major example of what he asserts was the dominant aim of Stalin and the Soviet Party—"pursuing the mirage of security within the international status quo, the mirage of socialism in one country"—he cites "the utter impassivity and indifference into which, in the early 1930's, Moscow received the rise of Nazism". He suggests that the Nazis need not have come to power in Germany and the second world war could have been averted had it not been for blunders by the German Communist Party, prompted by the CPSU. And he asserts that greater socialist gains could have been made in the post-war world except for similar errors by other Parties.

Most truthful historians, irrespective of their "isms" will find this hard to swallow in face of the masses of documentary evidence of Soviet warnings to the German people and the world of the dangers inherent in the rise of Nazism, the suicidal "Western" policies of financing and re-arming Hitler Germany. The belated admission of the USSR to the League of Nations in 1934 gave the world Litvinov's passionate appeals for collective security and his slogan "peace is indivisible". The German communists made mistakes but it was they who appealed for unity with the Social Democrats and the right-wing Social Democratic leadership which refused it, making possible the Nazi accession to power. It was the Communist International which, in 1935 called for the United Front against fascism and war in all countries and whose appeal for international working class unity was rejected by the 2nd International leaders.

It is strange indeed, that Deutscher in 1967 found it possible to describe Soviet policy and the attitudes of Communist Parties in other countries without referring to the really great issues of our times: the struggle against a Third World War, Korea, Cuba, the Middle East, and, above all, Vietnam.

Even so, he honestly admits some of the major difficulties imposed on the USSR by the "West":

"The rapacious peace of
Brest Litovsk, the allied armed intervention against the Soviets, the blockade, the cordon sanitaire, the prolonged economic and diplomatic boycotts, and then Hitler's invasion and the horrors of Nazi occupation, the long and clever delays by which Russia's allies postponed the opening up of a second front against Hitler, while the Soviet armies were immolating themselves in battle, and after 1945 the rapid reversal of the alliances, the nuclear blackmail, and the anti-communist frenzy of the Cold War.

Deuscher's fifth lecture: *The Soviet Union and the Chinese Revolution* is unsatisfactory. He breaks no new ground on it, and shows little real knowledge of China.

In this lecture, he says, he planned originally to deal with the impact of the Russian revolution on the colonial and semi-colonial peoples of the East. It is a major fault of the book that he did not pursue this first intention, a curious (and very great) omission. For the story of the October Revolution is by no means the story of the Russians alone. It is also the story of the liberation of over one hundred nationalities in the old Czarist empire and their transformation into modern nations.

The impact of this transformation has been felt not only by China but by every colonial people on the face of the earth. The Soviet example has been a major factor in the world-wide sweep of the movement for national liberation throughout the former colonial world since the second World War, and the material help of the Soviet Union is vital to the future of the new underdeveloped nations.

The essential justness of the Soviet attitude to the rights of human beings contrasts sharply with, for example, the treatment of Negroes and other minorities in the USA or the Australian official treatment of the Aborigines, Torres Strait Islanders and New Guinea peoples.

It is easy—and very misleading—to attribute the defects and failures of the socialist movement outside the USSR to errors made by the Communist Parties in following the imperfect Russian "model" too closely. This has become rather fashionable in some circles, but the socialist cause would be better served by all round, objective analysis of the history of the world socialist movement and the place in it both of the Russian revolution and of the Communist Parties and other socialist groupings in other places.

Deutscher's last book, with all its defects, at least poses some of the main questions that need to be examined by socialists today.

Ted Bacon.

THE BATTLE OF STALINGRAD is widely recognised as the turning point of the Second World War in Europe. That it was also the turning point of the war in Asia and the Pacific isn't so widely believed, but it is the only inference to be drawn from a passage in Sir Alan Watt's new book on Australian foreign policy.

He quotes Japanese author Toshi-kazu Kase's report that "when the news of the surrender of the German army at Stalingrad reached Tokyo on January 31, 1943, a conference was held at the Japanese foreign office to study the European situation." The majority of government leaders agreed that there was now little chance of an Axis victory and "consequently Japan must reorientate her policy before Germany collapsed." Prince Konoye, Marquis Kido and other leaders began moves towards peace. "Bitter fighting in the war with Japan still lay ahead," writes Sir Alan Watt, "but the fear of actual invasion of Australia by a ruthless enemy was lifted."

That Soviet actions and policies can powerfully affect Australian security even today does not seem to have made much impression on Sir Alan because he says nothing more about it and in a book devoted to the evolution of Australian foreign policy, 1938-65, gives only a passing glance at Australia's relations with one of the world's two superpowers. He does not mention the rupture of 1954, the renewal of contacts in 1959 or the trade treaty of 1965.

He is content to repeat, without question or analysis, the main stock phrases of the cold war mythology, resolutely shutting his eyes to the volumes of evidence presented by Professor D. F. Fleming, Professor P. M. S. Blackett, Mr. David Horowitz (in his newly-published Penguin From Yalta to Vietnam) and other writers that "Stalin" did not, after all, start the cold war.

This is a pity because Sir Alan, having retired from the post of head of the External Affairs Department, is no longer officially required to believe what his governmental superiors were saying and the book shows that he doesn't believe quite a lot of it.

Sir Alan begins, in fact, with an exposure of the Munich Pact of 1938.

The contention of the Left at that time that an alliance of the western powers with the Soviet Union in support of Czechoslovakia could have stopped Hitler without a war is strengthened by Sir Alan's analysis.

If there is one legend of the recent past for which Sir Alan has little respect, it is the infallibility of "Brilliant Bob". In Sir Alan Watt's "afternoon light" Menzies shows up as a blunderer whose conceit and arrogance had a wholly evil effect on Australian foreign policy during the time he dominated it.

His blind support of Sir Anthony Eden in the invasion of Egypt in 1956, his clash with Nehru in 1960 and his refusal to join even such a crusty Tory as Harold Macmillan in acknowledging the Afro-Asian "winds of change" are all dealt with.

In one speech, which Watt quotes, Menzies came as close as anyone could these days to justifying the use of force as an instrument of national policy.
Even Lord Casey, it seems, was not reactionary enough to suit Menzies. In 1954 Casey opposed US plans to intervene in Vietnam and, says Watt, "one is tempted to speculate whether a contributing cause of (Casey's retirement as external affairs minister in 1960) was the belief that Australian foreign policy by this time had become too rigid to meet the challenge of a rapidly changing Commonwealth of Nations and world at large."

Still too much the diplomat to call anyone a fool, Sir Alan says that Menzies "could not cast an active, fertile and imaginative mind towards the future." Perhaps his readers will be content to leave it at that.

All the more disappointing is Sir Alan's concluding chapter, called *A Re-Appraisal*, in which he comes out for those very Australian policies which the ultra-reactionary, too rigid, force-loving Sir Robert was most instrumental in framing and imposing on the Australian Government and people.

He barracks for the American war alliance directed against Asian progressives; he recites, with scarcely a glance at the opposition's case, the Johnson-Rusk-McNamara line on Vietnam. Yet he objects to Holt's All the Way statement and says Australia must not only have, but appear to have, a foreign policy of its own.

Seeking a solution of the dilemma which he apparently recognises, Sir Alan claims that "foreign policy is plural not singular. A country has many objectives and it is usually possible to pursue several of these at the one time." His contention, in line with this, that Australia can have "both friendly relations with Asia as well as an alliance including the United States" is unconvincing in the context of today. Can anyone really think that a few Colombo Plan crumbs for the "good" Asians will undo the effect of all the bombs on the "bad" ones?

Sir Alan notes that as long ago as 1937 the Australian Prime Minister, J. A. Lyons, proposed a Pacific security pact to include the USA, the USSR, China and Japan, as well as others. His readers may be inclined to think that what has happened to Australian foreign policy, mainly under Menzies' influence, since then has been not "evolution" but regression.

W. A. Wood

**THE LIFE AND ADVENTURES OF WILLIAM BUCKLEY, by John Morgan, Ed. by C. E. Sayers, Sketches by J. H. Wedge, Heineman, 116 pp, $4.50.**

Most people will vaguely recall from school history books the story of the wild white man who burst into Batman's camp on Port Phillip in 1835 with a cry of "Don't shoot, I'm a British object!" Some may associate this wild white man with the proverbial phrase "Buckley's chance". Very few will know that Buckley dictated his memoirs to John Morgan, a Van-demonian journalist, or that these were ever printed. Well, here are the memoirs, and they are fascinating.

William Buckley was born in Cheshire in 1780, served in the infantry in the Netherlands, and while on furlough was arrested on a charge of receiving stolen goods, and transported. He was selected to go with Lt. Col. Collins' party in the first abortive attempt in 1803 to found a settlement on Port Phillip. He absconded, and fell in with Aborigines who, instead of spearing him, adopted him. He lived...
with these and other blacks for thirty-two years.

Buckley was no anthropologist, but he was observant, tactful and adaptable. Few members of the "educated classes" could have got on so well with the aborigines as he did. He observed and recorded the habits, arts and customs of his hosts in an admirably unprejudiced way: exogamy, ritual cannibalism, basket-weaving, cookery, hut-making, burial-customs, weapons, tactics in hunting and warfare. No one else ever got so close to the Victorian tribes and their distinctive culture as he did.

Some of his innocent statements will make people's hair stand up. He caught glimpses of what his hosts called a Bunyip; he even went hunting it, though without success. He describes the Pallidurubarrans, the copper-coloured maneaters of the Otway—who have long been set down as a myth—and tells how neighbouring tribes tried to wipe them out. Modern anthropologists are less sweepingly sceptical than their predecessors, and I expect that more than one, reading Buckley's account, will murmur, "Negritos?"

(I treat with silence and contempt the alternative theory, circulated by certain malicious newcomers to the Western District, that the Pallidurubarrans were ancestral Manifolds.)

It will shock many readers, particularly those accustomed to regard war as a product of imperialism, to find how constant and destructive a state of warfare existed among the Port Phillip tribes. Buckley's wife and in-laws, his adopted son, and most others of the tribe he first lived with, were speared; several were roasted and eaten. But he himself, being regarded with some religious awe as the reincarnation of an ancestor, managed to survive. As his influence spread, he was able to prevent fights. In particular he was able to dissuade his tribe and its allies from making a concerted attack on Batman's settlement.

Then he took his longest chance. Fully aware that he might be treated as an absconder, he joined Batman's party. But he was pardoned. He wanted to stay on as a kind of liaison-officer between whites and blacks, but Fawkner distrusted him and sent him back to Van Diemen's Land, where he became gate-keeper at the Female Nursery! He died in 1854, having spent half his life in an Australia that no other white man ever could know.

Mr. Sayers has done a fine job of editing. His notes are brief and highly informative, particularly as regards the identification of place-names. This is an admirable little book, though expensive. If you do not buy it yourself, you should at least see that your local library gets a copy.

When you finish reading, it is hard to resist the temptation to speculate on what might have happened if "Buckley's chance" had not come off—even if it had come off only once, not twice. Suppose there had been no one to dissuade the Putnaroo and the Wainwarras from attacking the settlement. Or suppose that Buckley had been re-arrested as a bolter, and that his friends had tried to rescue him. Governor Bourke, jealous and jittery, would have been glad of the pretext for cancelling the articles of the Port Phillip Association. Official settlement would have been held up for years, while unofficial, antiofficial, settlers continued to slip in through Point Henry and New Belfast and Portland just as before.

Why, Western Victoria would have been a Transvaal full of voortrekkers! The Flag of Stars would have been run up at Portland in the '40s, rather
than at Ballarat ten years later, and run up by Edward Henty and William Learmonth rather than by Lalor and Raffaello. When the diggers decided to fight at Eureka, there would have been cavalry to guard their flanks, and Eureka might have been our Majuba!

Oh, well, better luck next time. No wonder the Victorian government gave Buckley a pension in the end. If they had had an inkling of the amount of trouble he had saved them, they would have knighted him.

JOHN MANIFOLD

CHINA — THE OTHER COMMUNISM,
by K. S. Karol, Heinemann, $8.15.

THIS IS a book which no professional or amateur "China-watcher" should miss. It was written on the basis of an extensive four months tour during 1965.

The book is particularly noteworthy because of Karol's personal and political background. Now residing in Paris, and Polish by birth, he spent seven years in the Soviet Union, serving in the Red Army during the war and leaving the Soviet Union after the conclusion of the war.

A severe opponent of the Stalinist period in the Soviet Union and of the Communist movement, and a critic of many contemporary Communist and Soviet policies, Karol is no enemy of socialism. He has written widely on the Soviet Union, Poland and the Communist movement, having been Paris correspondent for the New Statesman and a contributor to the annual Socialist Register. He is currently writing for Nouvel Observateur.

The book is no mere travelogue. It is chock-full of history, commentary on political, theoretical and ideological attitudes, interviews with top men in the regime and obviously faithful records of enlightening conversations with peasants, Commune leaders, workers, artists, students.

Correctly Karol dwells upon the fantastic achievements of the new China. He indicates that before visiting China he was personally convinced that the old regime was morally and politically indefensible but it was an abstract conviction. He had no real conception of the hell which was the daily life of millions of Chinese peasants. "It is often said", writes Karol, "that the Maoists are more the continuers of certain Chinese traditions than they are disciples of Marx. And, indeed, it would be absurd to deny that a traditionalist element informs their methods. But what other country in the world has known such a radical break with the past? The Russian rural areas were profoundly changed by the October Revolution, then by collectivisation. But in the time of the Czars the peasants did not sell their children or wives and did not live in a permanent state of near-famine.

"The Chinese revolution has advanced the peasantry—that means the vast majority of the population—more than 'twenty years in a day'. At one swoop it abolished hateful centuries-old customs. It has made an unprecedented break with the past, and to the new generation of Chinese that past will be (it already is) as incomprehensible as it is to us. I even ask myself if, for example, the young people who have grown up since the revolution fully understand why Article 3 of the 1950 marriage law states that the sale of children is vigorously forbidden in China."

Karol briefly discusses the Chinese army and soldiers. He points out that
we in the “Western” world are frequently appalled at inflammatory statements and articles appearing in Chinese journals which seem to call for the militarisation of the country presenting a spectre of aggression and conjuring up images of jack-booted, steel-helmeted soldiers “intoxicated with nationalism and possessed by the spirit of conquest.” He claims, with complete justification in this reviewer’s opinion, that the Chinese army is essentially defensive, that Chinese soldiers in no way resemble those of Hitler or Mussolini, but quotes Field Marshal Montgomery’s advice to “western” leaders, given ten years ago, “Never land even a single soldier on the Chinese mainland.”

One of the most interesting and enlightening chapters is devoted to culture, art and intellectuals and contains an extensive description of an interview with the since-deposed “cultural” leader Chou Yang. Returning to Paris after that interview, Karol was amazed to read of Chou Yang’s “fall”, for imputed to him were views which he vehemently argued against in the interview. As reasons for Chou’s denunciation Karol advances the following: “while he was a supporter of art in the service of the people, he seems to have claimed a certain autonomy for the cultural section, an indirect co-ordination, and a more cautious indoctrination. He may, as they allege, have declared, in defending books which were not strictly political, that it is not by talking all the time about Chairman Mao that one best applies Mao’s thought...”

However, one feels that for such titans of the Chinese Communist Party as Liu Shao-chi, Teng Hsiao-ping, Peng Chen, Peng Teh-huai to be denounced in similar terms to those used against Chou Yang, much deeper policy considerations were involved.

An extensive chapter China and the World comments upon the split in the world communist movement, the withdrawal of Soviet experts from China, the Sino-Indian border conflict, China’s dubious association with Pakistan, relations with the ill-fated Indonesian Communist Party and the seldom discussed Sino-Soviet row over nuclear weapons. Karol’s views on these matters are interesting and highly controversial. Often his assessments while obviously valid in part also contain many dubious and incorrect aspects.

In discussing the reasons for the growing isolation of China in the communist movement Karol is more penetrating. “A party”, he maintains, “which succeeded in making a victorious revolution in its country is not necessarily the best adviser for those comrades who are struggling in other countries and in other parts of the world. It has inevitably a tendency to recommend the formulas which were successful in its own case, and its prestige is such that those formulas are uncritically accepted as if they were infallible weapons.

But revolutions neither lend themselves to export nor to imitation: they are “children of necessity” and the necessities are different in each country.”

The author’s conclusion is that a fundamental fact must be faced: “China is at the centre of world politics and too many things depend on her for one to be content to condemn or ignore her. Rather it is time to understand her.”

Many readers will disagree with some of Karol’s views and statements. Some may even be outraged by them. But no serious reader will lay the book aside.

JOHN SENDY
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HENRY LAWSON,  
COLLECTED VERSE
Vol. 1: 1885-1900, ed. by 
Colin Roderick, 
Angus & Robertson, $6.50.

BY ANY STANDARD this is a splendid book, and coming as it does on the occasion of the Lawson Centenary it makes a fitting tribute. Here, gathered into one volume for the first time, is all the verse Lawson wrote up till the time he settled in England at the end of 1900. "The Ballad of the Drover", "Faces in the Street", "The Star of Australasia", "Second Class Wait Here", "The Uncultured Rhymer to his Cultured Critics" - verses as well known as these need no introduction.

But what we have here is not just the complete text of all the pre-1901 verse. As well, the notes record all the original forms and drafts which Lawson shaped and worked over to produce the final product. So for the first time it is possible to watch Lawson at work, as it were. On top of this Professor Roderick has gathered a great deal of background information about the verse, and this is all included in the last 70 pages of the book.

This is not the place to discuss Lawson's merit as a poet. Indeed he seems never to have referred to himself by such a title: his books were always verse, not poetry. Nonetheless, as Professor Roderick remarks in his Introduction, Lawson has come in for a good deal of critical attack over the past decade or so, an attack which anyone who is interested in Lawson's place in our literary history cannot ignore.

It's certainly true, as Professor Roderick grants, that Lawson sometimes wrote bad verse. But it's also true that his best was very good indeed. As a short story writer he may have been more consistently good, but it's a fact of Australian history that much of Lawson's verse, (specially that published in The Bulletin and The Worker) played a significant role in the development of working class consciousness - largely because, at its best, it had force and an honesty which set it apart from the general run of jingoistic rhymes.

It would be untrue though to deny that a good deal of Lawson's own work depended over-much on sentimental emotionalism and jingoism. He himself was aware of these excesses - a fact probably indicated by the violence of his reaction to unfavourable criticism ("My Literary Friend", "The Uncultured Rhymer").

But reading through his verse again I was struck by the range of his interests as much as by the vitality which he brought to his work. At times, of course, it is mere doggerel; but at those times where Lawson seemed to feel and believe what he was writing, it is verse of a higher order. For those for whom he is simply the rhymster of floods and swag-men and bush-fires, there is the bitter and frequently moving verse written from the centre of Sydney's Depression of the early 1890's. And for those for whom he is simply the blindly nationalistic Australian, the last verse in the book, "With Dickens", will no doubt come as a surprise. Not only does it show an amazingly wide knowledge of Dickens's work and characters, but it also shows the way in which Lawson was able to use the new environment and resources he found in England.

The other volume of Collected Verse is due to be published soon, and the set will no doubt take its place as the standard for many years to come.

L. N. C.
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THE FIRST ISSUE of The Broadsheet, a new venture by a group of artists and poets is directed against the Vietnam war, and is headed “Napalm Sunday — coming next year — Ash Wednesday.” One of the works it contains is reproduced below.

The broadsheet was a popular form for satire and lampoon in Australia about the middle of last century.

Each edition is limited to 1000, printed directly from the artists' blocks, and selling for 45 cents a copy.

Financial support and contributions for publication are sought.

The publisher is A. Turner, 205 Lennox Street, Richmond, Victoria, 3121.
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NOW AVAILABLE

Three booklets expressing the main decisions of the 21st Congress of the Communist Party of Australia held in June 1967.

AUSTRALIA AND THE WAY FORWARD

This booklet contains the main views of the Communist Party on the problems facing our country and the way the labor movement may advance and win thorough-going reforms and social change.

Price 20 cents.

FULL HUMAN RIGHTS FOR ABORIGINES AND TORRES STRAIT ISLANDERS

Beginning with an historical survey this booklet sets out views on the future prospects of the growing movement for the rights of the peoples concerned. It lists a program of demands supported by the Communist Party.

Price 10 cents.

THE CONSTITUTION OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY

This document sets out the rights of members, explains conditions of membership and the aims and purpose of Communist Party organisation.

Price 10 cents.

Place orders for any of these three booklets or order the set for 50 cents, post free.