and trade unionists for their lack of appreciation of the need for recording labor history. In my view, the approach is valid. I would go further, indeed, and assert that trade union officials, with rare exceptions, underestimate the value of even taking the elementary step of preserving and classifying their records, let alone ensuring that their story is told.

Mr. Ford correctly complains of an "anti-intellectual" approach on the part of some union leaders, but I have a word for the intellectuals, too! Academics should do much more to encourage trade unions to do their job by rendering material assistance and extending publication facilities... it is an open secret that University pigeon-holes are stacked with documents on trade union history, written as theses, unhonored and unpublished.

Mr. Ford does well to emphasise the value of trade union history. He points out that the general reaction to industrial crises is to cry for some new law or "a more severe application of old laws" rather than to study the historical causes of the crisis. I would underline that by making so bold as to say that trade union leaders would not make so many mistakes today if they had examined what happened yesterday.

Sutcliffe spoke prophetically when he wrote, in 1921, that the trade union movement would be called upon to play "a most important part in the solution of economic and social problems after the war." The period was to see perhaps the greatest ferment of ideas in labor history, leading to the adoption of the socialisation objective by the Labor Party, the attempts to form a One Big Union of the working class, and the formation at last of a national trade union centre in the Australian Council of Trade Unions.

Sutcliffe's words apply with equal force in this period, after the second world war.

Has comparable progress been made? Material on origins and early development like that provided by Sutcliffe's *History* is essential reading, and the chronicle needs to be brought up to date. And the vast changes that have been made in industrial technology and the class structure of Australian society need to be thoroughly examined from the standpoint of the role, policies and mission of the trade union movement. The quickened interest in labor history which Mr. Ford goes so far as to call "a new era", of which the reprinting of this book is an example, gives some promise of the need being fulfilled.

EDGAR ROSS

ERA OF MAN OR ROBOT?
by G. Volkov,
Progress Publishers, Moscow, 183 pp, 55c.

THIS SMALL PAPERBACK deals with the sociological problems of the technical revolution and no one concerned with today's and tomorrow's world can afford to miss reading it. The author surveys the vital sociological issues, many of them controversial, which spring from the current swift scientific and technological progress. This is done from a marxist view of the trends and laws of technical and scientific development. It raises vigorous polemic with anti-marxist and reformist theories and conclusions.

Some woolly thinking and careless use of terms revealed in the Communist Party pre-Congress discussion could have been avoided and greater clarity reached on the issues of the day had this book, particularly its final chapter, been available. So if you want to know the difference between the "second industrial revolution" and the "scientific and technical revolution", and lots more, be sure you read this booklet.

VIN BOURKE