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TWO WEEKS BEFORE the National Liberation Front launched its Tet offensive, this column commented:

In reality, the war is running against the Americans. The battles are still being fought in the areas declared 'cleared' a year ago, the most 'secure' US bases are still open to National Liberation Front attacks, and daring probes are made up to the very outskirts of Saigon. The NLF forces alternate guerilla and positional battles with bewildering variety and brilliance. Indeed, the NLF army is proving superior to the US in both strategy and tactics. Its forces are better equipped than ever, and they have been able to counter every new tactical weapon the Americans have thrown into the war.

Then, it seemed necessary to challenge the U.S. Administration's propaganda line, backed to the hilt by Hasluck and Co., that the "allies" were winning, that the NLF had lost the initiative; "pacification" was succeeding; it was now only a matter of time before the war was over.

How different today! Deep gloom pervades Washington (and Canberra, too); the policy-makers thresh about trying to find a new strategy and new tactics. How many more American troops — 20,000 or 100,000, perhaps 206,000? A general mobilisation by the puppet South Vietnamese regime — or would this only increase the danger of ARVIN troops joining the NLF, as some did already in February? How to get more Australians, in face of Gorton's "no more" statement? (This is a minor worry, since Gorton has precedents in his predecessors' assurances that no more would go — usually just before more went.) Most dangerous of all, how to escalate with some chance of success; dare we use nuclear weapons? This is the momentous decision they mull over in their vicious circle.

THREE STRATEGIES HAVE BEEN TRIED. First, to arm and "advise" the puppet Diem regime; second, "special war," in which Americans took the field with the Ky-Thieu puppets; third, an all-out conventional "limited war," in which the main brunt had to be borne by the United States. All have failed, each more miserably than the one before. What new strategy is there, except more of the same, or nuclear war?

Stubbornly basing themselves upon their military power, above all technological superiority, the US imperialists refused every chance of an honorable peace offered by the Democratic Republic
of Vietnam. They do not want peace but control of South-East Asia as part of their global strategy of imperialist domination. Now, when it becomes clear that not only can the Americans never win — and this was always clear — but that they can be defeated, they are placed in a dreadful dilemma. Victory is impossible, ultimate defeat is probable, but political "face" makes withdrawal a bitter draught almost inconceivable to swallow, all the harder since the presidency is up for decision.

Until recently, even many who oppose the Vietnam war could not believe that the Vietnamese people were able to win. The Vietnamese have always thought differently. In April, 1967, General Van Tien Dung wrote an analysis of the war that explains much of what has happened in the past year, and projects the future course:

Obviously, the US imperialists' strength is of a material and technical nature. They have a big economic and national defence potential, a numerous army with high mobility and a strong fire-power, especially that of the air force. All American schemes and strategic and tactical plans in this war of aggression against Vietnam are based on this point. That is why our people's struggle is a very arduous one. But in our country, the strength of the United States has a limit. It cannot be brought into full play due to US political weaknesses, the terrain conditions and our people's war combat methods. Moreover, the enemy's weak points are fundamental, on both the political and the military planes. They spell out his doom in strategy and tactics... The prestige of the US trump cards — infantry, air force and navy — have been debunked... Ballyhoo about the United States' unimaginable military might have gone bankrupt...

There are still terrible resources of destruction left in the American armoury, that can cause still greater suffering to Vietnam, but cannot avert ultimate defeat. This underlines the need for a stronger political campaign against US imperialism the world over, to demand an immediate end to the bombing, peace talks to negotiate the withdrawal of all foreign troops, and acceptance of the option always open — a return to the Geneva Agreement. This is a demand that history, conscience and international solidarity places before the peace forces and the working class movement the world over.

THE AUSTRALIAN WORKING CLASS and peace movements have a greater responsibility than most. It is no exaggeration to say that struggle against the Vietnam war is decisive for Australia's national independence, honor, even its future peace and security. Further national development, living standards for wage and salary-earner, social services and education are threatened by involvement in this war that, if it was once described as a swamp, then as a bottomless pit, must now be regarded as a maelstrom that can consume so much in lives, living standards and moral attitudes that most Australians believe themselves committed to.
The official mythology explains Australia's part in the war like this: "We" are in Vietnam to defend the non-communist Asian nations from Communist Aggression, to allow the Vietnam of Diem-Ky-Thieu to become an independent democratic nation. "We" want to be friends with Asia, and certainly have no feelings of superiority or condescension to Asians. "We" believe that the United States is the only nation capable of defending this right of the non-communist nations, and of course "we" know that the US has neither selfish investments and interests, nor any anti-Asian sentiments either. Somehow, this is mixed up with a feeling of fear and uncertainty, that "we" have to be defended against some vague but menacing hordes of "they" who yearn for the open spaces of this wealthy continent, against whom the United States is our shield. And the more the United States is involved in Asia, the stronger and surer this shield. Muddled and contradictory as all this may be, it is still the complex of belief upon which Australian foreign policy is based.

The contradictions are being exposed daily. On the one hand, there are the official protestations of friendship with Asia, on the other a viciously destructive war against an Asian people. "We" foreigners fight to defend them — against their own brothers; to defend them we bomb, shell and burn their homes and their cities, beat, torture and kill indiscriminately. "We" find they don't want us, laugh behind "our" backs, won't warn "our" Vietnamese police even when the NLF knocks on their doors and warns that the Tet offensive is about to begin, give aid and information to the NLF... So our officers and gentlemen become angry, and in their anger cry out the truth behind the official stories, expressing crude racialism, bitter hatred of Asians and an ultimate reliance upon violence and brutality like the torture of an 18-year-old girl.

SUCH INCIDENTS are the inevitable, logical consequence of official Government policy. More, they are the direct result of Army training for Vietnam, that sets out to brainwash the conscript to regard Asians as the enemy, to teach bayonet drill with cries of "get the slant-eyed yellow bastards before they get you," that trains him to "search and destroy" the villages, to regard his service in Vietnam as defending Australia by "fighting them over there so we don't have to fight them here." This indoctrination is debasing, racist and incredibly dangerous, and it inevitably produces a psychology of racialism, brutality and contempt. The blame for this must be laid at the door of Government policymakers, the propagandists of the Liberal Party and those controllers of news media who try to justify an unjust war.
Only an unjust war needs such indoctrination. NLF victories, won against such odds, are understandable only in terms of a people's war, in which the odds are balanced only by the burning conviction and incredible courage that people's war has generated for thousands of years. In all the sordid story of torture of an 18-year-old girl, one fact illumines the truth. This girl, questioned with threats and torture, refused to betray her comrades and her cause. Official statements laconically add that she was "handed over to the South Vietnamese authorities" — television reports have shown us a fraction of what that means. This unnamed heroine is but one of a whole people who are fighting for a cause that has moved them for 100 years, enabling them to resist French, Japanese and American might.

The Government's moral degeneration was starkly revealed in the parliamentary debate on the torture case. It first attempted to lie its way out, then promised a full inquiry. Pinned down, Gorton and his supporters revealed an essential brutality. It was a case of torture, but only a "little one," the girl could walk; at any rate, Australian lives were involved; there was a worldwide conspiracy of the communists, the western press, the Labor Party and the churches to insidiously undermine the "free world's" cause in Vietnam. They have decided to brazen out the whole affair, relying upon the public's short memory, appeals to a spurious patriotism, a continued campaign of anti-communist propaganda drawing heavily upon concealed racialism, and their big parliamentary majority. To meet the new situation, threats of censorship and suppression are coming from those extreme Liberal Party rightwing elements who knew what they were doing in enthusiastically supporting Gorton as Prime Minister.

Plaintively, these hawks call for more publicity of alleged "Vietcong atrocities" while they screech out the demand for censorship of the undeniable brutality of the United States and its allies. They argue that American brutality is no worse than that of the NLF, that the Americans are fighting for the cause of "freedom" and one cannot be too squeamish about the means used to win.

ATROCITIES ARE NECESSARY in an unjust war against an armed people. The strength of guerilla war lies in its national character and popular support. The anti-popular forces, usually supported and controlled by foreign powers, have to terrorise the population since they cannot win their allegiance. Those who clutch at the straw of "Vietcong atrocities" ignore the terrible chain of continuity of oppression, massacre and torture that links
American occupation with the French, and the Thieu regime with that of Ngo Dinh Diem.

Diem, now acknowledged a bloody-minded dictator, was selected, installed and supported by the United States. His regime set out to terrorise the population, and began by massive violations of the Geneva Agreement. Article 14c of the convention stipulates:

Each party undertakes to refrain from any reprisals or discriminations against persons or organisations on account of their activities during the hostilities and to guarantee their democratic liberties.

During the first year of its activities, the International Control Commission investigated 40 violations of this article in the South — only a tiny fraction of all that occurred. Although Diem put all possible obstacles in its path — and in 1957 prohibited any further investigations under Article 14c — the International Control Commission Report No. 4 states:

In cases where inquiries were possible, we have verified 319 cases involving the loss of human lives... The Commission was unable to determine that, apart from the cases cited, there have not been other reprisals and discriminations.

This was 1955; the reign of terror thus begun continued and intensified until the people took up arms in 1960. Repression, murder, atrocities had raged for five years, supported and encouraged by the American Government. The shamefaced defenders of civilised barbarism weep for the “Revolutionary Development” teams who have been executed by the National Liberation Front. These “Revolutionary Development cadres” go into the villages behind the United States, Australian, South Korean and puppet troops. When a village is “pacified,” after “Vietcong” are killed, questioned, tortured, taken away, these cadres govern in the name of Saigon. They are imposed from outside, not elected; they are corrupt; they govern through terror. The people hate them, correctly regarding them as the representatives of their enemies, the Saigon regime, the landlords and the United States.

This is a civil war, and the Vietnamese patriots fight it as all national liberation wars have been fought, by attacking the government they regard as the enemy, and all its representatives. This was how the Americans fought their War of Independence, and, whatever atrocities they committed, these were more than balanced by those of his Britannic Majesty George III. So it has been through all history; so it is in Vietnam today. The US and puppet forces commit atrocities on a large scale, by indiscriminate mass bombing, napalm, herbicides and gas, and by torture and killing of NLF fighters or suspected fighters. It is inevitable, given Australian participation in this unjust war, that the Australian Government will try to justify use of similar methods, that are an end result of their own policy.
THE GOVERNMENT'S POLITICAL STRATEGY will fail. They cannot count upon the Australian people forgetting, still less on victory covering up their responsibility. The Vietnam war is the continuing ulcer of Australian politics, spreading its poison throughout the body politic. At every level — moral, political, economic and social — the war corrupts. The economic consequences of the war are now beginning to assert themselves. The financial crisis of world capitalism, revealed in open worship of the Golden Calf in world money markets, was precipitated and worsened by the drain upon American resources to fight the war. The United States now spends over 30 thousand million dollars annually on its aggressive war, causing inflation and cutting down on national welfare. Unrevealed billions of this sum are spent in foreign countries, hastening the US balance of payments crisis and making it deeper. American capitalism, deliberately made the keystone of Australian economic policy, now faces a most disastrous crisis of confidence. Whatever means are adopted to meet this crisis, they cannot stabilise the dollar for long. And for Australia, dependent upon foreign trade and equally upon foreign investment, the inevitable shakedown will bring serious results. The tentative remedial measures, already inadequate, have already restricted US capital investment; the Japanese monopolists upon whom Australia already relies so much, are tied closely to US capitalism; British investment and trade can no longer play much part.

Mr. Bury's notorious speech clearly spelled out the problems, and the solutions planned by the present government. Bury put this thinking very clearly with this keynote: Wages have to be pegged or at least rises severely limited; social services and education must also be restricted and taxes must rise, to pay for "defence," secured by foreign wars (in Vietnam now and perhaps in Thailand or Laos or some other Asian country later), and by a permanent Australian military presence in Asia. McMahon's shadow-boxing with Bury is an attempt to shift public attention from the real intent. McMahon argues that "real wages" are not stagnating as Bury said, but rising. This has a tactical aim, to reinforce from the opposite side the demand for an "incomes policy," i.e., wage-pegging, to justify the next Budget and earlier economic measures that will be needed.

CLASS STRUGGLE WILL BECOME SHARPER, because the authorities have not dropped their plans. Indeed, these plans have now become more urgent for the capitalists, for their government and their arbitration system precisely because of the cost of Vietnam and the world financial crisis. Their plans certainly include
a new attack upon unionism and the right to strike. The savage use of penal clauses, fines and padded costs (totalling around $150,000 for metal unions alone) is used against all strikers, from industrial workers to supervisors and air pilots. Sir Henry Bolte tried to make the Essential Services Act even more draconic, in face of the struggle of State Electricity Commission workers, industrial and staff, for higher pay. Another possibility freely canvassed is a reform of arbitration through legislation giving the courts power to control over-award payments and tying arbitration still closer to government policy.

In these ways, the authorities are combining industrial and political action, making it essential for the workers and their unions to lift the level of their struggle to the political plane, including the defence of democratic rights so basically attacked by attempts to outlaw or penalise strikes. Mr Bury went further, revealing that the Communist Party and other left-wing trends have been correct all along when they said that the struggle for peace was an essential part of the fight for higher living standards. His speech was an exercise in ideological preparation of public opinion for an attack upon living standards, inevitable as war expenditure grows.

The government plans a three-pronged offensive: wage restraint while prices rise; higher taxation; pruning of government expenditure on education, social services and those spheres of national development, like water conservation and housing, that are not immediately related to serving profit-making through extraction of mineral resources and other monopolised industries. The lesson is plain; the labor movement will have to fight on the peace front as vigorously as it does on the industrial front if living standards are to be defended and improved. There are many aspects to this struggle. They include the planned extension of militant action around wages and conditions; recognition by the movement that education, social services and national development are part of living standards and of equal concern to the trade unions. It requires also recognition that the Vietnam war is morally wrong, economically harmful and politically disastrous.

So long as the war goes on, and the imperialist policy is pursued, Australia is set on a collision course with Asia, committed to a series of wars that are doomed to military and political defeat because they run counter to the national liberation revolutions, a great historical movement of our times that is irreversible. Whilst the war and the imperialist policy is pursued, it must eat further and further into living standards and the whole economy. If the United States, wealthy as it is, cannot afford both Vietnam and the so-called Great Society, then how can Australia be developed.
The NSW Secretary of the Sheetmetal Workers' Union reviews the successful struggle against attempts by the Arbitration Court and employers to rob metal workers of wage increases by absorption of over-award payments. He predicts new struggles to achieve a flow-on in other industries and for the repeal of the penal clauses in the Arbitration Act.

The metal trades unions achieved a substantial victory in their recent struggles to defeat the moves of employers to absorb, in over award payments, the recent wage increases arising from the work value case, despite the fact that the Arbitration Commission decided to "defer" part of the increase.

There are a number of issues the trade unions still have to resolve, including the restoration of that part of the wage the Commission deferred, further increases for the non-tradesmen, the securing of the flow-on of the metal trades wage increases to other awards and the demands for the repeal of the penal clauses and remission of fines imposed by the Industrial Court and legal costs.

The key to the success in the metal trades dispute was the unity and struggles of the workers, their determination to win their demands. Consolidation of this unity and its extension in the trade union movement is essential to the achievement of the trade union demands still outstanding.

The metal industry unions were aware in advance that when the Arbitration Commission, on December 11, 1967, gave its decision in the so-called "work value" case, varying the Federal Metal Trades Award, the employers would seek to absorb the wage increases in existing over-award payments.

Notice of this intention had been given during 1966 when following an increase of $4.30 in margins awarded to shipwrights, the employers combined forces to absorb the increase in over-award payments. Mainly through the use of the penal clauses of the Arbitration Act, the employers defeated the struggle of the Shipwrights' Union and carried through a general "absorption" of the increase.
Following the 11th December, 1967 decision, the employers’ organisations in the metal industry, which are united under the National Employers’ Policy Committee, advised all metal trade employers to use existing over-award payments to offset the wage increases, and promised full support in using the penal clauses of the Arbitration Act if the workers resisted.

In anticipation of strong resistance from metal workers, the employers had stressed their right to “absorb” during the work value hearing, and had succeeded in securing statements from the Bench affirming this right.

At first many employers did not reveal their intentions, as the award variations did not operate until the first full pay period commencing on or after 22nd January, 1968. Also a large proportion of metal working establishments close at the end of the year to clear annual leave. Nevertheless, there were immediate widespread stoppages and protest actions by the workers.

Before the critical date of January, the metal unions had combined their forces under the leadership of the Metal Trades Federation, working in association with the Australian Council of Trade Unions, to defeat any attempt at absorption. Meetings of shop stewards, including a meeting of 1,300 shop stewards in the Sydney Town Hall held 23rd January, left no doubt as to the militant determination of the workers to force payment of the award increases.

The firm stand of the metal workers brought some immediate successes, but a big majority of the employers either refused outright to pay the increases or stalled for time to “consider” the question. As an immediate result, strikes and other forms of industrial action, developed on the widest scale throughout the metal industry involving large masses of metal workers. In the meantime, the employers’ organisations had secured many orders from the Industrial Court under Section 109 of the Arbitration Act, and had instituted the follow-up procedure under Section 111 of the Act to penalise the unions for contempt of Court.

On Tuesday, 6th February, a twenty-four hour general strike, called by the combined metal unions, closed all establishments under the Federal Metal Award which had not paid or agreed to pay the Award increases to their workers. This involved some 200,000 workers. Two days later, the Metal Trades Employers’ Association secured a blanket order under Section 109 of the Act, covering some 3,500 establishments in N.S.W., an unprecedented step, marking a more vicious use of the Industrial Court and the penal clauses of the Arbitration Act.
Prior to the twenty-four hour general strike, the employers lodged applications claiming, in effect, that a new dispute existed, and asking that the Metal Trades Award be varied again by cancelling the increases, or reducing the amounts, and/or including provisions for "absorption." The President of the Commission referred this to a bench of five, including the three responsible for the 11th December, 1967, decision. During the period of the hearing, struggles continued on a wide scale, and penalties against the unions began to mount.

The majority decision given on 21st February, 1968, represented a substantial success for the workers, as it stated that absorption had proved "impracticable" and the application of the employers for such a provision was rejected. However, while confirming the amounts awarded on 11th December, 1967, it was decided that 30% of all increases greater than $1.60, should be "deferred" to a date which would be decided by the Bench which would be dealing with the national wage claims, to be heard in August, 1968.

It would now appear that the metal trade employers will be compelled to pass on the wage increases, although the employers' organisations in N.S.W. and in some other areas, are leaving the question to the individual employers. Struggles are continuing because of some attempts to absorb in whole or in part.

The metal unions have declared that they will not be content to wait until August next for a decision regarding the deferred payments. They will campaign for this payment and the full claims which have been submitted in the work value case.

For the great mass of process workers, and some classifications on the same wage level, the unions had sought an increase of $4.30. The decision gave only $1.60 to male process workers, and only $1.00 to 178 other classifications, with women receiving only 75% of these increases. The full claim of $7.40 was awarded to 47 tradesmen classifications and of this amount $2.20 is now "deferred."

The work value case resulted from an application by the metal unions, lodged in November 1965, for increased margins. This application, made in conjunction with the ACTU, was intended to follow the customary pattern of a general case, the increases to flow on to other awards in accordance with long-established practice.

Following a hearing, taken together with a basic wage application, the Commission in July 1966, refused any increase in margins until a work value investigation had been made. Commis-
sioner Winter was given this task, and to report to the Commis-

This work value case, forced on the metal unions, was part of
the long-range plans of the Commission to replace the basic wage
and margins by a total wage, concerning which there would be
general hearings corresponding to former basic wage hearings, and
separate work value proceedings for the various awards instead of
general cases on margins.

The work value case became bogged down, leading to strong
protests from the metal unions, and a four-hour general strike on
25th July, 1967, following which action was taken by the Commis-
sion to speed up and finalise the hearing. On 5th June, 1967, the
Commission finally adopted the “total wage” abolishing the basic
wage and margins, and giving $1.00 increase to adults of both
sexes.

This was the logical outcome of the step taken in 1953, when
the system of quarterly cost-of-living adjustments to the basic wage
was abolished. It was intended to obliterate the old basic wage
and margins concept, and already the principle of maintaining the
purchasing power of wages has been destroyed and the dominant
consideration is the nebulous “capacity to pay.”

However, it is well to remember that the Arbitration Tribunals
under our system of compulsory arbitration have never been at
a loss to adopt new “principles” and to make radical departures
from established practices, to assist the employing class. What a
shock it was to the workers when the sacred principle of the basic
wage as inaugurated in 1907 was thrown overboard by the Com-
monwealth Arbitration Court in 1931 when the basic wage and
all wages were cut by 10 per cent.

It was the Arbitration Court also which in 1954 was responsible
for the greatest feat of legerdemain ever perpetrated in Australia,
effecting complete disappearance of the chief gain won by metal
workers in 1947. As a result of vigorous strike struggle in the
metal industry in 1947, centred mainly in Victoria, wage margins
were raised not only to the highest level to date for tradesmen,
but to a much higher relative rate for the mass of semi-skilled
workers in the industry. As a result of the 1947 struggles, the mar-
gin for tradesmen rose from 36/- to 52/-, while that of the process
worker increased from 11/- to 22/-, that is by 100%.

This great advance for non-tradesmen was lost when the Court
in 1954 decided that margins would be fixed at two and a half
times the 1937 level, when tradesmen received 30/- margins, and
process workers 8/-. This meant that the tradesmen’s margins ad-
vanced from 52/- to 75/-, while the process worker on 22/- received no increase, as the existing 22/- was 2/- more than provided by the formula. Margins' claims of the metal unions since 1954 have been based on attempts to restore the 1947 relativities.

Main advantage in the "total wage" for the Arbitrators, is the greater scope for manipulation. The Commission has the choice already indicated by it, of fixing increases on the basis of a flat amount, a fixed percentage of the total wage, or a graduated percentage. The Commission at all times will control not only the "total wage," but also the "relativity" of wages.

As each Bench has the right to disregard the views of earlier Benches, and frequently does so, the muddle and confusion brought about, particularly in the past fifteen years, is likely to be worse confounded. For example, the cost of living indexes show a considerable variation in price changes in the various States, a position which was taken into account in the previous system of quarterly cost-of-living adjustments. All basic wage increases after 1953 have been flat amounts applying equally in all States, leading to a growing differentiation and unequal purchasing power for the basic wage, and now the "total wage", so that in place of one uniform basic wage, there are now in effect, six different wage standards. Adjustment of the basic wage according to the "C" series index to June 1961, and since then to the Consumer Price Index, show this disparity. This disparity is reduced and concealed by the new practice of applying the Consumer Price Index retrospectively to 1953 in the formulation of claims.

The most urgent immediate problem arising from the work value case, and the struggle of the metal workers, is that of the flow-on to other awards. The Commission has reiterated that the metal trades decision is not intended to flow-on as in previous cases. The trade union movement is emphatic that the practice of flow-on must continue. In the past, many other sections of the trade union movement benefited, almost automatically from increases gained by the metal workers. Now, if they are to benefit, it should be obvious that very much will depend upon the organisation, unity and struggle waged by the workers to enforce the flow-on of the metal trades decision.

All trade unions concerned are lodging their applications and there will be growing pressure for early satisfaction. The alternative of compelling these unions to conduct work value cases, if they are other than short formal cases, could lead to an intolerable situation, because of congestion and delays. The lessons of the metal trades struggle will not be lost on the workers in other industries. The A.C.T.U. has given its State branches, the metro-
politain labor councils, the task of co-ordinating this activity in each State.

Extended use of the penal clauses against the metal unions has awakened the trade union movement, more than ever before, to this menace, and the importance of defeating the penal clauses. A big step forward was the adoption by the A.C.T.U. Disputes' Committee recommending national stop work demonstrations on an industry basis in the event of further penalties. The A.C.T.U. is to co-operate with the metal unions in seeking to have fines remitted and to secure relief from the heavy legal costs involved.

This is a matter of prime concern to the whole of the trade union movement. The penal clauses are a vicious class weapon used by employers against the trade unions. During the just struggles of the metal unions these laws were used to the limit in an effort to force the unions to submit and to accept absorption. Fines and legal costs imposed on the unions exceed $100,000. The trade union movement should use every means to secure the repeal of this vicious anti-trade union legislation.

A review of the metal trades dispute should take note of the views expressed by the Minister for Labor and National Service, Mr. Bury. After criticising the Arbitration Commission for granting wage increases, he is quoted, in the "Sydney Morning Herald" of 1/3/68, as stating: "In broad although not altogether accurate terms one can say that the resources, which would have gone into further raising the standard of living in the last three years, have had to be diverted to defence." In other words, Australian resources must be used to support the criminal war of the U.S.A. in Vietnam at the expense of the workers' standard of living. Instead, the workers will demand wage increases and withdrawal from Vietnam.

In addition to demanding repeal of the penal clauses in the Arbitration Act, the trade unions should demand abolition of the Industrial Court and reform of the Arbitration system, abolishing all features of compulsion. Under such a system conciliation committees representing employers and unions would provide the main means for settling disputes. Prospects now are that the struggle, beginning in the metal industry, will extend to other industries, and will merge with the national campaign of the unions in support of claims for a general wage increase which the Commission declared it would be prepared to hear in August, 1968.

The unions should advance the demand for a minimum living wage based on the needs of a family, and if the total wage is retained, quarterly cost-of-living adjustments, to be applied to the total wage.
A senior lecturer in politics at Monash University gives a fully documented exposure of the activities of the U.S. Central Intelligence Agency among a section of US academics.

Those disciplines with a ready market in industry and government are favored and fostered: the natural sciences, engineering, mathematics, and the social sciences when these serve the braintrusting propaganda of ‘liberal’ government.—MARIO SAVIO.

... the government’s hiring of research groups in the country’s leading universities has tended to dry up an important source of critical analysis of foreign policy and to make some of our institutions of learning into factories of rationalization for policies that would benefit from sharp academic dissent.

The recent outburst of academic criticism of the war in Vietnam is a hopeful sign but it is a notable fact that most of the leaders of this movement of dissent have been linguists, historians and social scientists, rather than political scientists— that is to say, faculty members not involved directly or indirectly as advisers to the government.—JAMES P. WARBURG.

... it is difficult to imagine how the social scientist in the United States would now go about rebutting the reiterated Russian claim that Western social science is not much more than thinly veiled bourgeois ideology—JOSEPH LAPALOMBARA.

THE ROLE of US trade unions and student bodies in Cold War projects inspired and financed by the huge, international agency of subversion known as the Central Intelligence Agency, is now widely known in Australia. Far less publicity has been given to the ties that were shown to exist between the CIA and the US Information Agency (USIA), the propaganda arm of the US government, while nothing at all has appeared in the press on the links revealed between the USIA and Dr. Evron M. Kirkpatrick, Executive Director of the prestigious American Political Science Association (APSA), which has a membership of about 16,000. Before being appointed the first full-time Executive Director of APSA in 1954, Kirkpatrick held a succession of senior posts in the State Department: Chief of the External Research Staff 1948-52, Chief of the Psychological Intelligence and Research Staff 1952-54, and Deputy Director of the Office of Intelligence Research 1954. In 1956 he edited Target: The World — Communist Propaganda Activities in 1955, which was published
by the Macmillan Co. of New York. In the Preface, he drew
attention to the fact that the US Government had devoted
systematic attention to research on Communist propaganda: “Many
social scientists are aware of the work the government is doing
and have seen some of its results; many have participated in it.
The present volume has been made possible only by drawing upon
this government research, and it is the product, therefore, of
the work of many people.” In the following year, Kirkpatrick
edited and Macmillan published a companion volume entitled
Year of Crisis — Communist Propaganda Activities in 1956. Both
works bear all the earmarks of a USIA operation.

More recently, he has become a member of the Education
Advisory Committee of the Freedom Studies Centre, the latest and
one of the largest private Cold War institutes, which has a
grandiose $US 11m. development program including a campus
to accommodate 400 students a year. The Administrative Direc­
tor of the Centre is Air Force Major- General Edward G. Lons­
dale, who played a key role in introducing “counter-insurgency
operations” in South Vietnam. The public figures connected
with the Centre are a mixed bag, ranging from Governors Rom­
ney and Hatfield to a large collection of extremely conservative
figures including Patrick J. Frawley, Jr., supporter of Fred C.
Schwarz’s Christian Anti-Communism Crusade, and former Con­
gressman Walter H. Judd. The crucial Planning and Develop­
ment Committee of the Centre is dominated by members of
the rightwing American Security Council, including Professor
Stefan T. Possony of the Hoover Institute and Professors Lev E.
Dobriansky and James D. Atkinson, both of Georgetown Uni­
versity.5

Poisoning the Academic Wells

Kirkpatrick has also been President of Operations and Policy
Research, Inc. (OPR) since its formation in 1955. A non-profit
research organisation set up by a group of social scientists, law­
yers and businessmen to help the USIA distribute more per­
suasive and polished literature both in the US and abroad, OPR
reads and gives expert opinion on books which USIA then plants
with publishers, without the sponsorship being publicized. It em­
ployed on a part-time basis, according to Kirkpatrick, more
than a hundred social scientists, many of them members of
APSA. Sol Stern has correctly summed up OPR as “a Cold
War-oriented strategy organization.”6

During February, 1967, and later, it was revealed that OPR
had been receiving subsidies from two CIA foundations. Via
these “conduit” foundations, it was given grants in 1963, 1964,
and 1965, "principally," Kirkpatrick has admitted, for studies of Latin American elections. The grant in 1965 amounted to $US 68,000. Sol Stern has reported that one of the CIA’s best-known "conduits," the Sidney and Esther Rabb Charitable Foundation of Boston, made two large contributions in 1963—one for $US 25,000 to OPR, and $US 15,000 to the Farfield Foundation. The Rabb Foundation also acted as a conduit for CIA funds to feed the National Student Association, but it gave four times as much to OPR as it gave to the students. The Farfield Foundation, it is interesting to recall, was a frequent contributor to the Congress for Cultural Freedom. Another foundation helping to pay for OPR’s work is the Pappas Charitable Trust of Boston, whose grants during 1965 and 1966 came to $US 120,000. The Pappas Trust also supports the International Development Foundation Inc., a CIA front interested in Latin American affairs and launched with a grant of $US 187,685 from the CIA-connected Radio Free Europe and $US 30,000 from the Beacon Fund, identified by Congressional investigators as having put money into another CIA "conduit" foundation, the J. M. Kaplan Foundation. (The Congress for Cultural Freedom was funded for years by the Kaplan Foundation). In 1964 alone, the Pappas Trust gave the International Development Foundation $US 102,000. In the same year, the International Development Foundation received $US 25,000 from the Rabb Foundation. OPR was supported solely by USIA in the early years of its existence and it still accepts $US 60,000 a year from this source. Today it also receives money from the Pentagon, the State Department and other government agencies. However, whether the money comes from the CIA or the State Department, the consequences of the grants are identical: "to expedite America’s foreign penetrations, and to render them legitimate; to decorate the gendarmerie of the world with ribbons of rationality and liberalism."

Despite the CIA revelations of 1967, it is most unlikely that OPR will ever lack for funds. Kirkpatrick is one of the closest friends of Hubert Humphrey, Vice-President of APSA 1954-55 and now US Vice-President, having served him for a long time as adviser as well as campaigning for him in elections. Another close friend of Humphrey's is Dr. Max M. Kampelman, Vice-President of OPR since its formation, Treasurer and General Counsel of APSA since 1956, and one of Washington's leading "Establishment" liberals. When Humphrey was chosen as Democratic Vice-Presidential candidate for the 1964 election, Kampelman was described as "his closest political adviser." Previously, he had played an important role in having the Democratic Convention choose John F. Kennedy as Presidential candidate.
An editorial essay in a recent issue of *Ramparts* skilfully summed up Humphrey's political position:

Back in 1949, when Arthur Schlesinger Jr. published a call to American liberalism to enlist totally and uncritically in the Cold War, he used the phrase 'the Vital Centre' as a title, in reference to the pragmatic liberals (of whom Hubert Humphrey was the prototype) who would join the ideals of domestic social reform with uncritical support for the new, emerging military hard line . . . The men of 'the vital centre' came to be the most enthusiastic of cold warriors, often rivalling those in the military.

The commitment of the Cold War liberals to the hard line hardened in inverse proportion to the liberalizing trends within the Communist world. "In the process, Cold War liberalism lost even the pretence of vitality in the pursuit of truth and change, and instead came to acquire the stench of decay."

For the genuine liberals, Humphrey "represents the most perfect embodiment of this decay, and he is the symbol of perverse accommodation. . . ."13

While Humphrey was Senator for Minnesota, Kampelman served as his legislative counsel from 1948 to 1955. In 1957 the New York publishing firm of Frederick A. Praeger brought out Kampelman's best-known book, *The Communist Party vs. the C.I.O.: A Study in Power Politics*, which covered the history of the Congress of Industrial Organisations from 1936 to 1955, when it merged with the American Federation of Labor. Describing the unsuccessful efforts of the Communists to win control of the CIO, and how the Communist-controlled unions were expelled in 1949-50, he wrote in the Introduction:

The Communist infiltration of the CIO was a direct threat to the survival of all of our country's democratic institutions. The CIO victory over the Communist Party was a significant victory for our nation. It was also a crucial defeat for the international Communist conspiracy.

The Preface was written by Humphrey who noted that Kampelman "has made a valuable contribution to the understanding of one of our democracy's great modern problems, that of Communism within our society."

It is also interesting to note in passing that Kirkpatrick, Kampelman and Humphrey all had close associations with the University of Minnesota. Kirkpatrick had been on the staff from 1935 to 1948, working up from the position of Instructor in Political Science to that of full Professor in his final year. Kampelman had been an Instructor in Political Science 1946-48 and had also gained from the university the degrees of M.A. and Ph.D. in 1946 and 1952 respectively. Humphrey had graduated A.B. in 1939 and had been a Teaching Assistant in Political Science 1940-41.
Caesar's Wife

Kirkpatrick's wife, Mrs. Jean J. Kirkpatrick, is a staff member of Trinity College in Washington DC, a Catholic women's college conducted by the Sisters of Notre Dame de Namur. From 1951 to 1953 she had been an intelligence research analyst in the State Department, and since 1956 she has been a consultant to OPR. Mrs. Kirkpatrick has also had close connections with the USIA. She edited and wrote the introductory essay for _The Strategy of Deception: A Study in World-Wide Communist Tactics_, which was published in 1963 by Farrar, Straus and Co. of New York, and made a "special alternate selection" by the Book-of-the-Month Club. At no time was it mentioned that the USIA subsidised the book's creation. The USIA described its venture into covert publishing as the "book development program," of which the USIA official then in charge of it, Reed Harris, stated in testimony before the House of Representatives Appropriations Subcommittee in March 1964:

This is a program under which we can have books written to our own specifications, books that would not otherwise be put out, especially those books that have strong anti-communist content, and follow other themes that are particularly useful for our program. Under the book development program, we control the thing from the very idea down to the final edited manuscript.

Subsequently, the Director of the USIA, Leonard Marks, appeared before the same body in September 1966 and was asked why it was wrong "to let the American people know when they buy and read the book that it was developed under government sponsorship?" His reply was straight to the point: "It minimises their value."

The USIA did not pay Farrar, Straus; it paid $US 16,500 to _The New Leader_, whose editor, the late S. M. Levitas, conceived of the book and sold the idea to the USIA. A liberal militantly anti-Communist journal, _The New Leader_ was for more than thirty years under the editorship of Levitas, "a bitter anti-Communist out of the East European Socialist tradition" who died in 1961. In recent years, _The New Leader_ has lost much of the blind anti-Communism which allowed it to accept too readily the positions of the "China Lobby" and the "Vietnam Lobby." Paul Jacobs has observed:

_For Levitas, the primary role of the magazine was fighting the Communists and very often he subordinated all else to it. Considering the bitter experience the non-Communist left had with the Communists, Levitas' position was understandable. But the tragedy was that it led not only to an obsession but to an inability to accept the fact that changes were taking place inside the Communist world._

_The New Leader_ school of anti-Communism, shared in the 1950's by the Congress for Cultural Freedom in the United States,
was extremely important in helping to shape the Cold War. Instrumental in helping the State Department and the Pentagon formulate their “sophisticated” and “tough” anti-Communist policies were the circles of disillusioned ex-radicals and social democrats such as Levitas. “Where a State Department career man might be insensitive to the crimes of the Third International against the intellectuals, old Bolsheviks and the Jews, a former East European Socialist like Levitas would speak with passion about who were the good guys and who were the bad guys — and which side the United States should support in the name of anti-communism.”

Mrs. Kirkpatrick dedicated The Strategy of Deception to “the memory of S. M. Levitas with affection, admiration and respect.” She pointed out in her Foreword that work on the collection of essays had been begun by Levitas, but the pressures of ill-health prevented him carrying the volume to completion. Not surprisingly in a book planned by Levitas, all the essays share in the deficiency of not mentioning the Sino-Soviet dispute and its effect on the Communist movement which is no longer monolithic but speaks with dissonant voices.

These disclosures regarding USIA money have led observers to view in a new light the brochure distributed by the Book-of-the-Month Club. Among the endorsements by Allen W. Dulles, former CIA Chief, Senators Thomas J. Dodd and Paul H. Douglas, and Hubert Humphrey, there was a note from the Club editors:

... the Book-of-the-Month Club is embarking on a distribution crusade on behalf of the book among institutions of higher education. To match every copy of The Strategy of Deception purchased by a member, a complimentary copy will be sent, pro bono publico, to the library of a college or university in the United States or Canada; and wherever it seems needed, two copies. Also, it will be suggested to the authorities of every such educational institution that the book be made required reading in all social studies and political courses ...

Mrs. Kirkpatrick said in 1967 that she had no idea that the USIA was subsidizing her book — a statement hard to accept in view of the fact that one of its chapters (“Communists in the C.I.O.”) was written by Kampelman, her husband’s close associate in dealings with the USIA. Kampelman’s conclusion was that the Communists, despite their skill and dedication, had failed to make even greater headway than they did because of their inability to adjust to “the prevailing philosophy of humanism within the American labor movement.”

In testimony before the House of Representatives Appropriations Subcommittee, a USIA official subsequently stated that 25,000 copies of The Strategy of Deception were printed for sale in the United States. Moreover, the work was sold in bookshops without
any indication that the government had paid for it. Although the public records now show that the money came from USIA, the administrators of the USIA’s “book development program” were under the definite impression that funds passed on to The New Leader originated in the CIA or, as it was delicately known, “the other Agency.”

The full extent of the cooperation between the USIA and the CIA will probably never be completely uncovered. They cooperated not only to indoctrinate people living outside the US but also American students and unionists. They secretly used publishers, foundations, institutes and universities for their own purposes. “When Congress begins its investigation”, wrote Robert G. Sherrill last year, “it might like to talk with Dr. Kirkpatrick about the extent to which he has induced the nation’s political scientists to cooperate.” Suspicions had been aroused before the CIA revelations of last year. As long ago as 1965, at least two speakers at the APSA annual convention stated that too many political scientists were taking on full-time intelligence services, and they also warned that the part-time activities of others could influence their judgments and injure their reputations.

The Three Wise Men

Before turning to the repercussions within APSA caused by these disclosures, it is interesting to note that three election experts having close connections with the political science “Establishment” accompanied President Johnson’s 22-member observer team to South Vietnam during the “election” in early September 1967. They were Professor Richard M. Scammon, Director of the Elections Research Centre at the Governmental Affairs Institute in Washington DC since 1955 who was on leave as Director of the US Bureau of the Census 1961-65, Professor Donald G. Herzberg, Executive Director of The Eagleton Institute of Politics at Rutgers University, and Professor Howard R. Penniman, Chairman of the Department of Government at Georgetown University.

There have been close ties for many years between APSA and the Governmental Affairs Institute: research programmes, for example, were frequently jointly sponsored. Kirkpatrick’s predecessor as (part-time) Executive Director of APSA, Edward H. Litchfield, was President of the Institute 1950-55 and since then has been Chairman of its Board of Directors. During the early fifties the Institute was in effect an affiliate or operational adjunct of APSA, but after Litchfield’s departure as Executive Director of the latter, there were moves to sever the organizational ties between the two bodies. Kirkpatrick has been a member of the Board of Directors of the
Institute since 1954, while his wife was Assistant to the Director of its Economic Cooperation Project in 1953-54. The Institute is said to have received grants of $US 286,000 from the Departments of State and Defence. Another point of interest is that it owns the real estate on which APSA has its headquarters.

It is also reported that the three political scientists who visited South Vietnam have done work for OPR. Penniman, moreover, was on the staff of the CIA from 1948 to 1949. Like so many of the actors already mentioned, he is a graduate of the University of Minnesota where he obtained his Ph.D. in 1941. Penniman was also a former employee of the State Department where he served under and later succeeded Kirkpatrick. He was Assistant Chief of the External Research Staff 1949-52, a member of the Psychological Strategy Board 1952-53, and Chief of the External Research Staff 1953-55. Between 1955 and 1957, when he assumed the position of Professor of Government at Georgetown University, he held the post of Chief of the Publications Division of the USIA. Scammon, it should also be noted, is yet another graduate of the University of Minnesota (A.B., 1935). Before moving across to the Governmental Affairs Institute he was Chief of the Division of Research for Western Europe at the State Department 1948-55.

After four days in South Vietnam, the three political scientists, flanked by the American Ambassador, held a press conference in Saigon. The "election" was pronounced by Scammon to be "reasonably efficient, reasonably free and reasonably honest." He added: "I would use exactly the same words to describe elections in the US." The press subjected them to some sharp questioning, inquiring how they had reached such a firm conclusion after visits to only a handful of polling places in a strange land. Scammon replied: "You can, I think, develop a certain appreciation of competence."

The Wall Street Journal (6/9/1966) interviewed a senior South Vietnamese "government" General who called the despatch of the US observer team "ridiculous". He noted that the observers never got far from their Vietnamese "government" guides. "If the election were not fair", the General asked, "how would they find out?" An interesting question for Professors Scammon, Penniman and Herzberg. In fact, the "election" itself was originally conceived as a public relations gimmick to counteract the Buddhist demonstrations which, at their peak, threatened to topple the "government". The plan was to give an appearance of legitimacy to the "government" and to convince the American public that "freedom-loving people" were being defended against "Communist aggression." The observer team, with its appendage of three political scientists, was a part of this massive public relations effort.

No one was fooled in South Vietnam. Nor were independent American observers in Vietnam at the time, whose special field
of research is Southeast Asia. It was clear to them that the "election" was neither free nor democratic. Official figures were seriously misleading because they left so much unsaid. Only one-third of the adults of voting age in South Vietnam were eligible to vote; the "eligible" voters by definition excluded more than 67 per cent who were classified as "neutralists", or Communists, or who were neither but lived in districts controlled by the NLF. 83 per cent of the eligible voters went to the polls and of these less than 33 per cent voted Thieu-Ky.

Professor David Wurfel, Professor of Political Science at the University of Missouri, estimated that some 300,000 to 500,000 fraudulent votes were cast. He claimed that in an election free of fraud and pressures, the winning military ticket would not have received more than 10 per cent of the vote. Wurfel reported numerous cases of fraudulent voting techniques. The issue of multiple voting cards to the military was widespread. "Every family I talked to in Vietnam who had a relation in the military reported that he had more than one voting card," he said. Ballot-box stuffing and the alteration of returns was also mentioned by Wurfel whose conclusions were backed up by Professor Michael Novak, the brilliant young Catholic writer and philosopher at Stanford University, who reported the "election" for the National Catholic Reporter. In a random sampling of Saigon students, for example, he found that three out of eight families had been refused registration as voters.

Professor Jonathan Mirsky, Co-Director of the East Asia Centre at Dartmouth College, summed up the Vietnamese reaction:

The recent election, they feel, was an American ceremony which the Vietnamese performed because President Johnson wanted to improve his image in America. No one doubted that the results were prearranged.

One interesting sidelight to the official visit of the US observers and election experts was the fact that no sooner had they stepped back on American soil than Governor George Romney confessed that when he had visited South Vietnam in late 1965, he had been brainwashed "by the generals [and] by the diplomatic corps over there, and they do a very thorough job." The observers present during the September 1967 "election" were briefed by US Ambassador Ellsworth Bunker, General Westmoreland and other high-ranking civilians and army officers.

The Big Whitewash

The fact that Kirkpatrick and Kampelman held positions in both APSA and OPR prompted Professor Robert A. Dahl of Yale, President of APSA, to appoint a special committee in February 1967 to determine whether the independence and integrity of the organisation had been compromised. Four past Presidents of APSA served
on the committee which was also asked to inquire into the broader and complex problem of standards of behaviour for all political scientists in their relationship with government agencies. The ad hoc committee issued its report towards the end of March. It was found that: 1 APSA had received no funds directly from any intelligence agency of the government, nor had it carried on any activities for any intelligence agency; 2 APSA had received no funds indirectly from any intelligence agency of government, with one exception — the Asia Foundation; and 3 OPR is completely separate from APSA both organizationally and in physical location. The grants to OPR from CIA "conduit" foundations supported "unclassified research completely under OPR control". The ad hoc committee summed up its findings in these words:

Nothing that has come to our attention lends the slightest credence to concern that any use might have been made of the APSA for intelligence purposes. There was at no time any connection between OPR and the Association. Kirkpatrick and Kampelman's work with OPR was conducted on their own time, required a minor part of their attention, violated no policy of the Association with respect to outside activities of its staff, and involved no conflict of interest with their responsibilities to the APSA . . . In conclusion, we think it appropriate to acknowledge, on behalf of the membership of the organization, the great services which both Kirkpatrick and Kampelman have rendered to the American Political Science Association.

This typical piece of "Establishment" whitewashing did not satisfy all the members of APSA. At its annual convention in Chicago in early September 1967, an outspoken minority of the 2,500 political scientists present expressed clear dissent. During the usually routine business session, a motion was put forward to prohibit Kirkpatrick and Kampelman from continuing to hold office in OPR. The challenging motion, submitted by Professor Robert H. Clarke of Cornell College did not succeed, but a vote on the voices indicated that he had plenty of friends.

Despite the failure of the motion, it is clear that APSA is definitely not finished with the repercussions of the CIA affair and the broader questions it raised. The special committee set up by Dahl in February submitted a preliminary report to the convention on more general problems of professional standards and responsibilities. To begin with, they argued that further discussion of APSA-OPR should be deferred for another year until they had made their final recommendations. The committee emphasized the "complexity" of ethical issues and the abundance of "dilemmas and paradoxes" in establishing professional standards. The radical critics of the APSA "Establishment" argued that the issue of CIA involvement with OPR and the Kirkpatrick-Kampelman ties with OPR could be divorced from the grander ethical questions raised by the committee.

The day after the business meeting, 50 members met informally to discuss the possibilities of a "radical political science". Although
the notice announcing the discussion was posted some time before the business section, the defeats of the previous day undoubtedly helped to stimulate interest. The first meeting led to two others, and by the time the convention closed on 9 September there was an independent "Caucus for a New Political Science" in existence with a 13-member steering committee and a membership of about 250. Chairman of the steering committee was H. Mark Roeloff, Associate Professor of Political Science at New York University, whose new book *The Language of Modern Politics: An Introduction to the Study of Government* had been published by the Dorsey Press several weeks beforehand. Of interest to Australians is the fact that a member of the four-member executive committee and the 13-member steering committee is Charles A. McCoy, Professor of Political Science at Temple University, who was Fulbright Professor of American Politics at Monash University during 1966.

The "Caucus" has decided to stay within APSA as a radical "ginger group" rather than try to become a separate, rival organisation. So far, a majority of its members are graduate students, mainly from such prestige institutions as Harvard, Yale, and Berkeley. Roeloff told one of the "Caucus" meetings that American political scientists are too preoccupied with "teaching the values and virtues of American democracy." Their failure to look critically at the American political system has led to "indifference or ignorance of fundamental or organic weaknesses . . . Vietnam is no mistake." The 1967 APSA convention had no formal discussion on Vietnam. However, the "Caucus" passed a resolution not only calling for discussion of fundamental social issues in America but also urging that a full day of panels and a plenary session be devoted to the war at the next convention.

Yet another dissatisfaction which led to the formation of the "Caucus" was the sterility of the APSA journal, the *American Political Science Review*, regarding social issues. It has, in the words of a "Caucus" resolution, "consistently failed to study, in a radically critical spirit, either the great crises of the day or the inherent weaknesses of the American political science." Two recent letters to the editor of the journal make the same point. C. W. Harrington complained that the September 1966 issue contained only one article

that does not read as though written with the aid of a computer, or in some cases, actually written by a computer itself. Moreover, that computer was programmed to turn out lower-case Greek letters, mathematical symbols, and such recurrent cant words and phrases as 'stochastic', 'cognitive dissonance', 'decision-making processes', 'stimulation', 'variance', and more.

He went on to suggest that future issues of the journal come out in two editions:

One of these would continue to be called the *American Political Science Review*. It would carry articles dealing with political science. For the other edition I
offer the title *American Computer Fondlers’ Review*. It would carry articles of the type represented by most of those in the September issue.22

Professor Frederick L. Schuman of Williams College was equally candid about the failure to communicate, the irrelevance of evidence to conclusions — and computers. Referring to a recent article on “Transaction Flows in the International System”, containing 18 pages of neologisms, nonsense terms such as “decomposition of coincidentally salient linkages”, and impressive equations, graphs, and charts, he pointed out that its author finally reached a startling conclusion. In English translation: States have closer relations with some States than with other States.23

The narrow perspectives of political science is reflected in the absence of discussion of socio-economic issues in politics in most of the literature. The Great Issues are avoided and instead we find the accumulation of trivia and the ponderous elaboration of platitudes. A major reason why triviality and irrelevancy plagues the work of most political scientists is their commitment to value-free “scientism” which has led to pseudopolitics rather than real politics being the major focus of research. As William J. Newman has written: “Scientism — the OK word for neutrality in the academic profession — leads straight into the waiting arms of the conservative.”24 The great majority of political scientists would describe themselves as liberals but the lack of value commitment in their writing over the past couple of decades has given aid and comfort to conservative assumptions. The Cold War and the rise of repressive institutions in the United States did the rest and the number of radical political scientists rapidly fell away. Most political scientists became affluent members of a self-satisfied society, very much in demand by business and government. The result, as Jay A. Sigler of Rutgers University pointed out, was that they “frequently abdicated their role as social critics”. Consequently they failed to predict the outbreak of the battle for racial justice. They have failed to explain poverty in America, international tension or power politics. They have succeeded in making minor uses of mathematical models. They have succeeded in obtaining the sanctity implied by the word ‘science’.25

If political science is to make a contribution to the attainment of a just society, there will have to be a considerable shift away from the current satisfaction with the status quo, under which apathy is praised and thinly disguised hymns are sung to “stability” and “legitimacy”. Fortunately, radicalism has recently reappeared among the graduate students and the younger faculty members.

It is pleasing to report that the new spirit and the new enthusiasm which the “Caucus” has begun to bring into American political science is also emerging in closely related disciplines. At the annual convention of the American Sociological Association
(ASA) in San Francisco in September 1967, 200 delegates staged a Peace Vigil outside the convention hotel. Spearheaded by Professor David Colfax of the University of Connecticut, it was designed to effect an official statement by ASA in opposition to the war in Vietnam. After 300 members signed the petition circulated by the group, ASA agreed to put it to a vote of members in mid-November. Subsequently, an open letter was sent to President Johnson, signed by 1,300 members of ASA, which strongly condemned the war and its effects on American society, since resources were being diverted from the attempt to deal with the most serious social problems — poverty, racial discrimination, urban development — "which will not yield to fragmentary token efforts but must be the focus of massive concerted action." The spirit of the new radicals among the sociologists was captured in the following piece of committed verse placed on the bulletin board during the San Francisco convention:

The ghost of C. Wright Mills
Hondas down the halls
At night
By day it sleeps
Beneath a 30-ton monument
Donated by colleagues
To keep him there

What do we know about poverty?
Let's do a survey!
In Miami Beach
Fill out the forms
Quickly, get me a travel agent!

Is Harlem erupting?
Well, as long as they don't come up here
Or out to Westchester
We won't worry

At night
A ghostly rumble down the halls
Do we
see right
Mills?

These promising developments in the United States highlight the absence of intellectual Robin Hoods in Australia. The Australasian Political Studies Association is a rather bland organisation with few committed activists of any kind — whether Marxist or Behavioralist. There is a general lack of attack and controversy, and little in the nature of conflict within the profession except personal bitching. Perhaps, one day,
we may witness the emergence of the Free Radical Australasian Political Studies Association (FRAPSA), a title which should satisfy the radical’s desire for “hammering” or “striking”.


An outspoken opponent of US intervention in Vietnam, Professor Hans Morgenthau of the University of Chicago, has pointed out that political science at its best, when true to its moral commitment, cannot help being a subversive and revolutionary force with regard to intellectual, political, economic and social vested interests. Unfortunately, many political scientists have sacrificed their commitment to the truth, whatever it may be, to ephemeral social advantage. Morgenthau highlights the pervasive and subtle influence which the government exerts upon political science in the process of corruption, the end result of which can be seen in the public silence of many prominent political scientists on administration policy in Vietnam despite their private criticisms and doubts. The government dispenses of a whole gamut of professional and social rewards from appointments and consultantships to foreign travel and to invitations to social functions at the White House. The political scientist, by accepting one or other of these rewards, enters into a subtle and insidious relationship with the government, which imperceptibly transforms his position of independent observer to that of client. In consequence, his intellectual function is also transformed and he becomes “a political ideologue, justifying morally and rationalizing intellectually what the government is doing.” However, he performs this ideological function while drawing upon his prestige as a scholar. “Thus, his reputation as an independent searcher after the truth is put at the service of the government, and what is nothing more than the ideological defense of a partisan position is made to appear as the objective truth.” (Hans J. Morgenthau, “The Purpose of Political Science”, in James C. Charlesworth ed.), A Design for Political Science: Scope, Objective, and Methods (Philadelphia: American Academy of Political and Social Science, 1966), pp.71-72.


4 The following four articles in US journals provided information upon which some of this article is based: Robert A. Sherrill, “The Professor and the CIA” (editorial), The Nation, 27 Feb. 1967, pp.258-60; “Report of the Executive Committee”, American Political Science Review, June 1967, pp.565-68; “The Experts” (editorial), The Nation, 18 Sept. 1967, pp.226-7; Robert J. Samuelson, “Political Science: CIA, Ethics Stir Otherwise Placid Convention,” Science, 22 Sept. 1967, pp.1414-17. Additional information was gained from Professor Charles A. McCoy of Temple University, Philadelphia, various biographical directories, and the references cited below.


8 Stern, loc. cit.


29 In a letter to the Editor of the *American Political Science Review* (Dec. 1967, p.1096), Professor Christian Bay argued that the concern of the political scientist should not be “apologia or technical servicing of monstrous government policies, but to clarify political alternatives and promote a more enlightened Polity”. The conduct of the Chicago convention, he added, “bordered on the grotesque”, with APSA officers solemnly telling delegates that any attempt on the part of the organisation to express political principles would jeopardise its tax exempt status. Bay concluded “If the APSA cannot be moved to place concern for politics above a more convenient concern with public and governmental relations, then surely we need a new Society for the Study of Political Problems, for those of us who want to get out from under the wings of our own establishment.”
DISCUSSION:

Metal Trades Struggle

THE "FLOW ON"

THE METAL TRADES Award Judgements of December 11 and February 21 pose many serious problems for the trade union movement, not the least of which is the problem of 'flow-on.'

Both during the course of this award hearing and in its decisions the Court set out to break up and completely change the pattern of trade union wages activity.

In the post-war period the pattern had developed of the trade unions combining nationally and making a wage demand on behalf of all workers by way of a test case in the Metal Trades Award.

Previous margins decisions have not only won improvements for metal workers but have ‘flowed-on’ to all other industrial workers.

In addition the professional and white collar workers have been able to utilise these victories to extend gains to their members.

The latest decisions strike a very serious blow at this tactic. The Court has declared that the increases are to be restricted to the Metal Trades Award and in its latest judgement made a very definite statement that the Metal Trades Award was not to set a pattern for wages in other awards. It declared again its intention to insist upon work value cases in all other awards without the judges or conciliation commissioners being bound in any way to follow what has happened in the Metal Trades Award.

The A.C.T.U. Executive has decided to rally the trade unions in opposition to this policy declaration of the Court and has advised its affiliated unions to make application for a ‘flow-on.’

The question arises what tactics should now be adopted by the trade union movement to counter this long planned and very definite policy of the Court which is supported by the Government and employers.

The Court’s aim seems to be clear. It is to prevent the workers from developing huge mass national actions, it is to divide the workers up into small groupings and to confine wage cases to work value investigations which can take many months and in some cases years to complete.

The situation calls for much more combined activity and indeed massive actions if the policy which has in fact been implemented by the Court is to be reversed. The A.C.T.U. Executive action in advising affiliated unions to make demands is a good first step, its request that the campaign be conducted through the State Labor Councils allows for the development of united action in each State.

But the fact must be faced that the Court’s judgement has had some success in breaking up the long standing method of union campaigning.

". The metal trades workers are the best organised, most numerous and
best placed to deliver economic blows to the employing class.

To a certain extent they have been removed from the general wages struggle even though there are still areas of struggle within the metal industry that will occupy the unions.

These developments do present problems but also present the trade unions with the opportunity of strengthening their organisation on an industry to industry basis. The metal trades struggle has shown that it is possible for unions of differing leaderships to join in united action and very militant united action.

Union leaderships which have been sheltering behind the more advanced activity of the better organised forces will be required to pay greater attention to improving their union organisation and fighting more vigorously for general union policy.

Whatever form the trade union struggles assume in the future this metal trades decision has underlined one thing very clearly. That is, that the level of wage rates the workers receive will be determined primarily by the degree of activity and organisation of the working class themselves.

PAT CLANCY

DISCRIMINATION

THE RECENT work value case conducted with the metal unions received a thoughtful analysis by Jack Hutson in the February-March issue of Australian Left Review. The article calls this one of the most bizarre cases in the history of the Arbitration Commission. For two years the Commission conducted an "Inspection of Trends" in metal industry skills.

This long-drawn-out process proved to be a veneer as employers and the Commission sought to consolidate a new wage-fixing method which has the effect of dividing the metal worker from other sections of industry by denying the long established principle of the flow-on of the Metal Trades decision to other awards and by insisting that other unions have no alternative but to proceed through a "Work Value Case".

The granting in full of the Metal Trades Unions' claim for $7.40 for tradesmen contrasts sharply with granting from nothing to $1.60 to a majority of non-tradesmen in the Metal Trades Award. It is this latter group that is mainly engaged in mass production and produces the greatest profits. The Commission's decision widened the wages gap between tradesmen and non-tradesmen.

When employers and the Commission sought to have the wage increases absorbed in the over-award payments, they were faced with powerful, united and sustained struggles of metal workers and were forced to retreat. This was a victory for militant united action and signifies that job action is the best way to improve living standards.

Although in its judgment on February 22, 1968, the Industrial Commission abandoned the decision for general absorption of the metal trades wage increases, it stated: "We recognise the possibility of the odd case where some absorption is inescapable." Already a number of employers have taken full advantage of this, but only in factories where union and job organisation is weak.

The complete inadequacy of the amounts to non-tradesmen, however, constitutes a challenge to the whole trade union movement. Awards for skill must always be maintained, but these can only be safeguarded if they are based on a policy of a family living wage.

This problem of a living wage is the common property of tradesmen
and non-tradesmen, men and women, migrants and Australian born. Recent struggles have displayed the pattern for the future. For example, in one metal industry with approximately 500 workers comprised of Greeks, Italians, Jugoslavs and a minority of Australian born, mainly process workers with a minority of tradesmen, the workers in a splendid display of solidarity, were on strike for three weeks for a small amount of $1.60 for male process workers and $1.20 for women.

The current attack on the Australian wage structure by the imposition of the total wage with the abortive “work value” appendage for all industries, and the attention given to the liquidation of over-award payments, can only be defeated by broad, national trade union unity and struggle. The unions must take account of changes in the work force. In various industries technical changes have greatly increased the proportion of non-tradesmen to tradesmen. Such monopolies as Broken Hill Proprietary, Australian Consolidated Industries, Imperial Chemical Industries, have an army of production workers, mainly process workers, with a relatively small group of tradesmen occupying key positions often related to general maintenance. Both are indispensable to production, equally so to working class unity. Industrial unionism must replace the old craft unions.

Since the war we have seen the inclusion of thousands of migrants in industry. These are now a decisive section in many industries and belong mainly to the lower paid group. Can we seriously consider the problem of any successful campaigns if we ignore this reality? And yet there is still very little attention given to special publications for these workers, particularly in the Italian and Greek languages. Only a few union journals include material in foreign languages.

The growth of trade unionism still falls below the growth of population. A source of new strength is to be found amongst migrants. This has been shown in the many strike struggles of the past. Surely this deserves greater attention.

In these years of mass production, the work-force is expanded by increasing numbers of women. The “Work Value Case” emphasises the continued discrimination against women workers who give a boost to profit by supplying, in some industries, the bulk of process workers, at 75 per cent of the male rate These, in the main, receive no over-award payments. The case for equal pay must receive greater prominence.

I wish to express agreement with the conclusions reached by Jack Hutton—that these recent events have somewhat exposed the aims of arbitration. We must direct our attention to building and strengthening the unity of industrial workers. We cannot afford the concept of a sectional campaign.

Tradesmen and non-tradesmen, Australian men and women workers, whether born here or in some other country, can be built into an active force that will defeat the employers’ aims and advance the general standard of living— if the trade unions take into account the present composition of the industrial work force and direct their propaganda and activity accordingly.

HARRY HATFIELD

THE PUBLIC SERVICE

AT FIRST SIGHT, the formal abolition of the basic wage does not appear to have had an effect on wages in the Commonwealth Public Service. Commonwealth Service rates did not contain the traditional division between a basic wage and a margin.

For purposes of computing the flow of metal trades decisions in the past, a basic wage component was deducted
equal to the annual equivalent of the six capital cities basic wage. The remainder of the annual rate was multiplied by an appropriate percentage for each increase in metal trades margins.

Metal trades basic wage increases were passed on in the form of a regulation which provided that all existing rates were increased by a flat rate equal to the annual equivalent of the basic wage increase.

However, the combined effect of the Commission's total wage and metal trades work value decisions is having a radical effect on the wage levels in the Public Service, particularly in the lower grades.

1 *The abolition of flat-rate basic wage increases* has seriously disadvantaged the lowest paid worker, in the Public Service as well as outside.

Jack Hutson's table in the last issue of ALR shows clearly the effect which basic wage increases have had in raising the relative position of lower paid workers. He shows how each post-war basic wage decision has resulted in an upswing in the ratio of the assistant's wage to that of the litter.

2 *The setting of very wide differentials* in the December 1967 Metal Trades decision, while they will not flow directly to other industries if the Commission has its way, will undoubtedly form a pattern in future decisions in other industries.

The composition of lower paid workers has changed rapidly with the departure of the Australian born worker and the introduction of many migrant workers. It is also a section in many areas under right wing trade union leadership, which must become subject to great pressures from workers seeking improved wage standards.

In the Public Service, particular pressure will be on the largest union, the Postal Workers' Union, which covers 45,000 members embracing most of the lower paid designations.

Already the Government has implemented the same policies as the Commission, in its fierce resistance to increases for its lowest paid workers, and in its excuse to break off major segments of work, such as the sorting of letters, and transfer them to a newly created designation at lower rates of pay.

3 *The cancellation of all relativities* and flow of wage increases within the Public Service has already been used by the Government for example to prevent the full level of increases flowing from postal clerks, to mail officers, postmen and other similar groups. It has been used to block completely any increase to PMG motor drivers leaving them for the first time in history at a wage rate below that of postmen.

In the latter case, the Gorton Government was prepared to provoke the wholesale dislocation of industry and commerce, and to defy Australian tradition by the importation of massed numbers of scab labor in order to resist an intra-service flow of wage increases to the relatively badly paid drivers.

In refusing the drivers a wage increase, the Public Service Board Chairman, Sir Frederick Wheeler, specifically argued that drivers' wage rates should be considered on their own merit, and not in relation to other groups covered by the same Award.

4 *The abolition of the flow on from Metal Trades decisions*, together with the last point oblige unions to present separate, complex, expensive and long-winded work value cases to obtain wage increases. For many small unions and for many Public Service unions in particular, this is not possible. They cannot hope to operate
under the new system without amalgamations and the pooling of resources.

In the past many of these unions have been able to obtain frequent wage rises on the basis of flow on decisions either from the Metal Trades or from other Public Service designations without entering a protracted wage hearing, and without any form of mass struggle or agitation.

Unions which have never thought of industrial action in the past, will be faced with the problem: either industrial action or no wage increases for their members.

While this is a feature of the problem all small unions are now placed in it is particularly acute in the Public Service and among non-industrial unions who have never had to face naked class relationships in such a way before.

Before the recent PMG drivers' strike, drivers had not previously stopped work in five of the six states, nor had postmen or telegram boys, and in NSW it was only the second time that they had stopped. In five of the states mail officers had previously stopped only for short periods and linesmen who joined the strike in South Australia had never previously taken stop-work action.

In addition, telegraphists and technicians joined with stoppages and the Postal Overseers' Union for the first time in history, came out on strike alongside the Postal Workers' Union.

On top of this many unions imposed great numbers of black bans on handling of mails, on all PMG supplies and against the transgressions of work boundaries of those people who were on strike.

There were expressions of solidarity and support on the part of the public and of student organisations which took various forms.

The tremendous participation of forces new to industrial action and the firm solidarity within the service and with industrial workers, which was marked in this stoppage, no doubt foreshadows changes in the industrial outlook of Public Service workers as they are forced to come to grips with the consequences of the new drive by the Government, the employers and the Commission to freeze wages and lower standards of living.

BRIAN T. CAREI

A CATHOLIC VIEW

THE "MARXIST CHRISTIAN Dialogue" project in the Left Review, presented a very welcome picture of sincere efforts on both sides to explore for better mutual understanding. Each of the articles on the subject was concerned either wholly or mainly with ideological or theological considerations; it is patently necessary that this intellectual understanding must be sought and cultivated, but as I see it, the crucial problem is not really one of mutual tolerance of respective eruditions, rather as a titanic problem of human relationship. The tragic fact we face is, that the conforming multitude of followers of both philosophies have almost total adverse reaction to each other, and that these people will not be reading the works of Garaudy, De Chardin and others. Therefore, a strong, sustained period of re-education and re-alignment is before us, and the sooner the process begins, the sooner some results will be apparent.

In my view, Christianity (as it has been interwoven with Western and European attitudes to communism), is much more culpable for the present deplorable state of affairs than is communism. Therefore, it is up to responsible Christians always to take the initiative. Also we must recognise that Australian Christianity is, typically, lagging well behind our overseas fellows in recognising the position, and
in attempting to work for improvement. Thus, an extra effort is required here, to make up the lee-way, and to assume the advance position which we should be occupying.

I have little trust in the prospect of success through official planning by Christian Church leaders, and the thrust and planning must come from the ordinary people, both lay and religious. In particular, Catholicism, by virtue of its more organised structure, is the most likely to show speedy results. Catholics have the precepts of the Vatican-Council, and Pope Paul VI and John XXIII to inspire and guide them, and thus should be in the vanguard.

In Australia, the political aspect of communism has abetted in confusing understanding, but our attitude in this respect must be placed in the same perspective as that relating to other forms of political activity in our country. It is simply not relevant in the context we are discussing. My hope therefore is, that we ordinary Christians will positively seek every way of joining communists in service to man. We must join them in movements for alleviation of suffering, for elimination of war, for relief of poverty, and correction of under privilege. We must be as outgoing to communists as we are to Christians and ever ready to become intimates of those with whom we are personally compatible.

In other words we must love our neighbours.

COLIN MCDONALD

LAND RIGHTS FOR ABORIGINES

THE RIGHT of Australian Aborigines to collective ownership of inalienable lands is becoming a major issue. Aboriginal leaders intend to press for it at this year's Easter Conference of the Federal Council for Aboriginal Advancement (FCAA) in Canberra and, as the newly-appointed Federal Minister for Aboriginal Affairs (Mr. W. C. Wentworth) is expected to be there, he will probably have to face demands for a radical change in Commonwealth policy, flowing from the new powers acquired by the Federal Government at last year's Referendum. Such demands come from many quarters, not only from Aborigines or the political left.

The Australian Council of Churches points out, in an excellent policy statement prepared by the Rev. Frank Engel, that "the Aborigines, unlike any other Aboriginal people in modern times, were completely dispossessed of their land, without compensation or treaty arrangements." Kim Beazley, M.H.R. for Fremantle, has long been outspoken on this matter. In August 1952, he made the penetrating observation in the Federal House that "the destruction of every native people that has been destroyed on the earth has begun with the destruction of its rights in land."

Throughout Australian history the refusal of Federal and State Governments to grant Aborigines land rights has undoubtedly been a basic part of policies to get rid of the Aborigines as a people, first by open violence and more recently by "assimilation" which, in the present Australian context, means enforced absorption in the general white community.

Before the Second World War, few Australians were greatly concerned about Aboriginal lands. Those who were interested tended by and large to regard Government and Church reserves and missions as more or less stable areas. The main concern of friends of the Aborigines was to try to get some improvement in the shockingly squalid way of life forced on the inhabitants of these areas. But the enormous post-war growth of mining, military bases, etc., shattered the old situation, bad as it was. Since 1959 more than two
Million acres of reserve lands have been confiscated, and more excisions are threatened. The main beneficiaries from this have been the foreign mineral monopolies exploiting the resources of Queensland, the Northern Territory and West Australia.

Only in South Australia, under the Dunstan Labor Government, has any real attempt been made to preserve Aboriginal lands and even there the Act adopted in 1966 was a considerable watering-down of the original Bill. In the Northern Territory last year the Federal Government introduced a particularly dishonest Lands Act, allowing individual Aborigines, companies or co-operatives to lease land in the Reserves for seven years. This was strongly attacked by the FCAA as being a method of breaking up the reserves in a short time. Most lessees would be doomed to failure for lack of capital and experience and the leases would be transferable to non-Aborigines at the end of seven years.

The attitude of the Federal Government to genuine Aboriginal land-holding was demonstrated last year by its curt rejection of the Gurindji people’s request for ownership of a tiny portion of Wave Hill cattle station. This was in line with the Government’s evasion of a similar request by the Yirrkala people on Gove Peninsula in 1963.

The growing pressure on Mr. Wentworth and the Federal Government, as well as the State governments (which still control the land within their State boundaries) arises from the increasing awareness of the truth expressed by E. D. Morel in “Black Man’s Burden”: “The preservation of the land for its peoples is . . . the acid test of trusteeship”. On this test, all Australian governments have criminally neglected their trustee duties towards the Aborigines. Australia’s violations of the U.N. Declaration of Human Rights and the Commonwealth Government’s failure to ratify Convention 107 of the ILO, in which the whole of Part 2 (articles 11-14) deals with the land rights of minorities, are now widely condemned.

In a thoughtful roneoed pamphlet of 2 foolscap pages *Land Rights for Aborigines*, an Advancement Group in Armidale, N.S.W., has recently reviewed the land scandal and made nine proposals for action to halt the continuing process of dispossessioning Aborigines of their lands and to place control of viable areas in the hands of Aborigines. The pamphlet contrasts the scandalous treatment of Aborigines with the recognition—however grudging and however often violated—of the land rights of US “Indians” and New Zealand Maoris.

The programme proposed in the Armidale publication is, in my opinion, well worthy of discussion, though limited in its estimate of the real possibilities of self-development of the growing Aboriginal population and in its assessment of the kind of help Aborigines have a right to demand of governments.

The Communist Party’s programme for full human rights for Aborigines, adopted by its National Congress last year, proposes for Aborigines and Islanders inalienable possession of their remaining tribal areas, Government and Mission settlements or cattle lands, ownership of mineral and other natural wealth on these lands and economic aid on a large scale, to enable rapid self-development of modern communities. This needs elaboration into a detailed, systematic set of demands for every area.

Anyone who may doubt whether Aborigines are capable of managing and developing their own areas would be well advised to take a look at almost any Government settlement or Church mission. None could make a greater mess of the problem than the self-appointed white “leaders” have.
made of most of these places. Freed of Government and local dictatorships, and given their just entitlements in land, economic aid, modern health and education facilities, the Aborigines are perfectly capable of transforming these places of national shame in a few years.

Ted Bacon

CAPITALISM'S CURRENCY CRISIS

THE DEVALUATION of sterling and other currencies and the threat to the US dollar is a serious crisis for the whole capitalist monetary system. It has developed out of long term problems. There are many indications too that Australia will be more seriously affected in the future.

An editorial in the Australian Financial Review 2/2/68 said 'certain continental bankers gloomily forecast a series of further currency devaluations for the next 18 months—culminating in an American devaluation disguised as 'demonetisation of gold'. The period of distrust in currencies that began last year, says continental bankers, has many months to run yet."

Another comment in the London Financial Times said "last year's devaluation of sterling constitutes a threat to a continuing expansion of world trade and may in fact lead to the beginning of restrictions and world wide economic nationalism which made the thirties such a miserable decade for us all".

It appears that there are three main factors causing the currency crisis.

Firstly, the United States and Britain, the countries hardest hit, have been living beyond their means, incurring big balance of payment and budget deficits by spending vast sums on militarism, foreign investment and take-overs in pursuit of their imperialist objectives.

Secondly, both dollars and sterling acting as the reserve currencies of capitalist countries, have been freely circulated without the necessary gold backing. Britain and the US have used a privileged position to inflate the international currency.

Thirdly, there have been indications, both before and since devaluation, of growing economic problems in various countries, increased competition, balance of payments and budget deficits, growth of unemployment and slower growth of production.

The extent of arms spending and its effect is well known. Britain has now been forced to cut its military costs by withdrawing from 'East of Suez'. The Vietnam war is the biggest drain on the US balance of payments and Australia's subservience to US policies is costing us a heavy burden in the 'guns before butter' policy which is a serious handicap to development and welfare.

After the Second World War the US held at least two-thirds of the world stock of monetary gold and the dollar with this backing became the main reserve currency. Sterling was directly related to the dollar and the two countries' currencies regarded as 'good as gold'.

So powerful was the dollar that it appeared to be independent of its gold backing. This view was strengthened by the US in artificially maintaining the price of gold at $35 an ounce—the price set in 1934. It adamantly refused to increase the price, although prices of all other commodities have been increased by inflation two or three times and it used its vast gold reserves in world markets to keep the gold price down.

Gold output has not kept pace with rising prices, the purchasing power of the world's gold has been drastically reduced and there is in addition a growing demand for gold for industry, scientific and social purposes.
By keeping the price of gold pegged, the US has given the dollar an artificial, inflated value. If the price of gold was increased in conformity with other commodities, the gold content of each dollar would fall and the dollar would be devalued.

The United States continued to pour out paper dollars in pursuit of its aims and to cover its balance of payments deficit.

By the end of the 1950's claims for gold against the dollar began to grow and a heavy outflow of gold from the United States took place. All steps by the US to improve its balance of payments and reverse this trend have been nullified in recent times by the vast expenditure on the Vietnam war.

The foreign claims on US gold, estimated at $39,000m, exceed the dwindling reserves which in January this year were down to a mere $10,800m, equal to the 1937 level.

Devaluation of sterling has increased distrust of the dollar and the speculators, convinced that the US will be forced to raise the price, are buying and hoarding gold thus adding to the shortage.

A number of countries, including France, have demanded an increase in the price of gold and restoration of the gold standard for international settlements. The US however is advocating an artificial international currency or 'paper gold' or 'demonetisation' of gold. But such a measure divorcing the currency from real values, such as are embodied in gold, would only perpetuate the problems.

Even before sterling devaluation, other western countries such as West Germany, besides Britain and the US, were experiencing mounting economic problems.

The underdeveloped countries are worse off with a declining share of the exports of the capitalist world, falling prices and unequal exchange for their raw material exports and a burden of foreign debts estimated now to total SU44,000m.

Australia has been experiencing periods of falling export prices and trade deficits, slowing capital expenditure and industrial growth and more unemployment.

It is estimated that devaluation will cost $100m in compensation to the export industries alone, and this will contribute to substantial tax increases tipped for the Budget in August. It has also been suggested that measures such as credit and import restriction may be necessary to correct the balance of payments deficit and Federal Government expenditure which is exceeding the Budget provisions.

In order to sustain development it is estimated that exports must increase by 66% in the next nine years — from $3,000m annually to $5,000m — and this target may have to be increased if capital inflow is restricted.

While the spectacular mineral exports will help, these are expected to cover only half the increase needed. This means that manufactures and primary production must earn an extra $1,000m at a time when competitive conditions are sharpening.

It is quite clear that there are tougher times ahead which Australia as the 14th trading nation in the world will find inescapable.

Our position however could be improved by cutting the waste of war spending, improving relations with Asia and diverting resources for Australian development and improved economic efficiency.

JIM MOSS

Since the above was written the gold crisis has intensified. The newly introduced "two tier system" for the price
of gold is aimed to "hold the line" in the hope that the US can solve its balance of payments crisis and restore confidence in the dollar. Doubts are widespread that this will be possible without a fundamental change in US policies, particularly in Vietnam.—Ed.]

KEYNESIAN CAPITALISM

"COMMENT" in the February-March issue of the Left Review makes these points:—

1. The new "sophisticated economies" based on Keynesian theories have had "certain successes" — the techniques operate in credit, finance and deficit budgeting, precisely where the crisis breaks out — though in different forms.

2. The American economy "boasts" an 8 year boom and has "apparently" taken the huge expenditure on the Vietnam war in its stride.

3. Imperialist rivalries for world domination have created "a most explosive situation".

Parts of this argument fail to bring out the realities of the American economy—or Keynes' own thinking.

Writing in 1936, and surrounded by vast unused productive capacity, Keynes believed that the problem for capitalism is to find a market for the increased output arising from full employment and advancing techniques. Low levels of consumption by "the poor" (Keynes' term) and high levels of saving by the wealthy depress the level of spending and therefore the level of output and employment.

"Moreover the richer the community, the wider will tend to be the gap between its actual and potential production, and therefore the more obvious and outrageous the defects of the economic system".1

The Keynesian thesis rests on the proposition that full employment can be maintained if the high level of savings of the wealthy is offset by a high level of investment.

"A wealthy community will have to discover much ampler opportunities for investment if the saving propensities of its wealthier members are to be compatible with the employment of its poorer members."2

And here is the contradiction. A wealthy community has a low propensity to consume, and therefore a low incentive for increased investment as new investment requires an expanding market.

This contradiction cannot be solved within the framework of laissez-faire private enterprise. This led Keynes to the conclusion that the State must intervene to increase investment.

He suggested monetary and fiscal controls but realised these would be inadequate."

"I conceive, therefore, that a somewhat comprehensive socialisation of investment will prove the only means of securing an approximation to full employment; though this need not exclude all manner of compromises and of devices by which the public authority will co-operate with private enterprise".4 (My underlining.—C.S.)

With regard to the American economy the evidence suggests that this is exactly what has happened. The "socialization of investment" has meant primarily armaments expenditure with full co-operation between the State and private enterprise. "Controls" play an important but secondary role.

For the capitalist system to survive what is required is an additional source of demand to normal consumption and investment. This additional demand must be vast in quantity and it must grow from year to year. Ideally this demand should be for goods that do not come onto the market. To the
great American corporations arms expenditure is the answer. It can be made to fulfil every one of the required conditions. And it is intimately linked with the nerve centres of US capitalism—the Steel industry, Oil, GMH, Boeing Aircraft and General Dynamics, Chemicals, etc.

The escalation of US military spending since 1955 explains the continued US boom—as well as inflation and possibilities of devaluation. Direct military expenditure rose from $50,000 million in 1965 to $57,000 million (1966), and $70,000 million in 1967.6 One instance illustrates the links between the US government and the giant corporations and the role of military expenditure. In the current US budget General Dynamics get an order for 286 additional F111 fighter bombers at a cost of $2,000 million. (Age, Jan. 30th.)

The position is clearly stated by the following:

Joan Robinson: "Keynes' own purpose was to illustrate the paradoxes of capitalism and to plead for a rational control over investment, but the effect of his argument is to explain why it is that modern capitalism flourishess when governments are making investment in armaments. —The cure, most of us would agree, is worse than the disease". 7

General Eisenhower: in his farewell remarks to the nation, pointed out that the growingly effective coalition of military officials, defence contractors and their allies threatened to "involve the very structure of our society". 8

Galbraith: Without military expenditures it is most unlikely that government expenditure "would exercise the requisite leverage on the private economy". 9

Thus in the United States, Keynesian theories have been applied primarily in the creation of a militarised state.

It is not argued that military expenditure and the war in Vietnam are carried out to give a boost to the economy. As "Comment" points out the aim of a great imperialist state is world domination. A growing war machine — and "colonial" wars — are necessary for this political aim. They also "stimulate" the home economy and provide billions in contracts for the giant corporations.

Is there an alternative under capitalism?

Expenditure on education, health, slum clearance, an end to poverty, would raise aggregate demand as much as weaponry, so long as it was on a vast and increasing scale. Diver­sion of military expenditure into useful ends will meet formidable obstacles under capitalism because in this case the primary gain goes to the ordinary people.

The struggle developing in the United States against the war in Vietnam, for Negro rights, against poverty, is a demand that resources shall be used to meet human needs — and not diverted into monopoly profit, death and destruction.

1 Keynes — General Theory of Employment, Interest and Money. p. 31
2 Keynes — General Theory. p. 31
3 The propensity to consume is the proportion of income spent on consumption.
4 Keynes — General Theory. p. 378
5 Galbraith — The New Industrial State. p. 229
7 Joan Robinson, Collected Economic Papers. p. 11-12.
8 Quoted in Robert Lekachman, Key­nes and the Classics; p. 111.
9 Galbraith — The New Industrial State. p. 231.

C. Silver
THE RECENT PUBLICATION of this two-volume anthology of Australian short stories provides a welcome opportunity to consider the development of the Australian short story and the problems which it now faces. Certainly it now has a different status to what it had in earlier years. For instance, Nettie Palmer could say in 1924: “Most of the best work that Australia has done in prose so far has been shown in the short story.” Probably no one would say this now, less than half a century later. And yet, is this because a large number of great novels have been written in the intervening period, or because the short story is now looked upon in a different light?

Certainly when we think of what might be called the “golden age” of the Australian short story, the 1890’s and the first years of this century, it seems clear that there has been some sort of decline in the medium, even if only in terms of the number of stories being published. To a large extent, of course, the situation is tied up with the decline of the Bulletin as a literary force. During the 1890’s decade the Bulletin published 1,400 stories, an amazing figure and one which no present-day Australian journal could even approach. No doubt a lot of these stories were hardly worth publishing, but the fact remains that the Bulletin was a vehicle in which young writers could see their work in print, and were paid for it.

The difficulties writers now experience in even getting their stories printed are too well-known to need iteration here. Apart from the literary quarterlies such as Meanjin, Overland and Southerly (none of which has a very large circulation anyway) there is almost no outlet for short story writers. And this situation is especially true for young writers, trying to establish their reputations—the very sort of writers that the Bulletin bent over
backwards to attract. When we realize too that the stories of many of the best *Bulletin* writers (e.g., Price Warung) are now virtually unobtainable, it seems clear that the short story no longer occupies the same place in literary esteem that it so obviously did for Nettie Palmer.


Short Stories of Australia: The Moderns, edited by Beatrice Davis, Angus and Robertson, $4.00.

This is not just an Australian phenomenon either. A recent symposium in *The London Magazine* (September 1966) on the decline, if not the fall, of the short story painted a depressing picture. V. S. Pritchett there referred to the short story as "one of the inextinguishable lost causes", and spoke of the "economics of short-story writing" as "grim but eccentric." And Francis King lamented: "No one reads short stories, much less buys them; no one makes money from them."

Part of the blame for this state of affairs no doubt lies with the economics of publishing. Volumes of short stories are notoriously difficult to sell, and no magazine editor or book publisher wants to produce a volume that will only be sold at remaindered prices, if then. Equally, with so many writers aspiring to novels and historical studies, the Commonwealth Literary Fund, with its limited finances, seems averse to provide money to assist the writing of mere short stories. One of the more unfortunate results of this state of affairs is that too many writers, with material or imagination suitable for success in the short story medium, are producing instead over-long and patchy novels.

What is clearly needed, as much as anything, is a full recognition of the proper status of the short story. It's neither an under-sized novel nor a piece by someone of necessarily minor talent. (It's odd, isn't it, the way the reverse prejudice has dominated thinking about poetry: it is the long poem that nobody reads or writes, and the short pieces that everyone can quote). It is, in fact, an art form on its own, inferior to the novel only in the matter of length. In many ways too the demands short story writing makes are greater than those faced by the average novelist. A novel, because of its length, can afford to be patchy in some parts, flawed in others. Nobody really minds, if in fact they remember by the time they finish. But short stories, like films, have to be consumed at a sitting; they have an immediacy and directness of impression more akin to poetry than to the novel. And it's this unity of the experience which a short story offers that makes its creation such a demanding job. A single flaw or awkward sentence in a short story is painfully obvious, and bulks far larger in our
over-all opinion of the work than it would if it had occurred in a novel. The short story generally crystallises a single character or incident, and like the similar work of the miniaturist, it must be finished to perfection.

But trying to establish just what a short story is, is only part of the question. The stories themselves are clearly the most important thing. And we have only to compare, in a general sort of way, the stories in the two volumes of this anthology to find at least a partial explanation as to why the Australian short story has lost a good deal of its popular appeal. The stories in the first volume, *The Lawson Tradition*, tend to be primarily tales, with the essential aim of telling a story. Several are classics of this nature: Lawson's "The Drover's Wife", Steele Rudd's "Starting the Selection" and Edward Dyson's "A Golden Shanty". Each of the three stories originally appeared in the *Bulletin* and each of the three authors was represented in the first major anthology of Australian short stories, *The Bulletin Story Book* (1901) edited by A. G. Stephens.

Indeed, it's interesting to recall what Stephens wrote in his introduction to that anthology:

The stories and sketches which follow are usually the literary dreams of men of action, or the literary realisation of things seen by wanderers. Usually they are objective, episodic, detached — branches torn from the Tree of Life, trimmed and dressed with whatever skill the writers possess (which often is not inconsiderable). In most of them still throbs the keen vitality of the parent stem: many are absolute transcripts of the Fact, copied as faithfully as the resources of language will permit.

This then is the key to the success of the *Bulletin* style of story, "the Lawson tradition": "objective, episodic, detached", emanating from "men of action" and "wanderers", "absolute transcripts" of actual events. This was the style that contributed to the tremendous popularity of the *Bulletin*, that made Henry Lawson a national hero, and which sold over a quarter of a million copies of *On Our Selection* in forty years.

But when we turn to the second volume of this recent anthology, *The Moderns*, it is clear that none of these terms used by Stephens will do. The emphasis has switched from the objective, detached story to a much more subjective picture, one in which the personality of the author and what he feels and believes are an integral part of the story. Incident for its own sake has given way to character portrayal and study, or social or moral satire. There are exceptions of course. Cecil Mann's "The Pelican", for instance, is modern in point of time only; stylistically it easily fits into "the Lawson tradition". But generally the point is true.
One of the most regrettable results of this change in the nature of the short story has been, as already hinted, a decline in its popularity—from the point of view of both writers and readers. The modern story, with its emphasis more on people than events, seems more akin to the traditional forms of poetry than it does to the yarn or the tale. Indeed, as V. S. Pritchett implied, it seems to be hovering at the mouth of some cultural backwater, threatened with the same stagnant pools and solitary adventures as claimed modern verse long ago. As Thomas Keneally has remarked, the recent publication of Hal Porter’s collection of short stories, *The Cats of Venice*, caused hardly a stir. Had it been a novel of comparable stature, it would have created a furore.

Of course there are those who would argue that all that has happened is that the Australian short story has reached a point of excellence where it can appeal now only to an educated minority; that the fact that short stories are no longer widely read is only to be expected, if not applauded. Much the same argument, centred on modern poetry, has given rise to the many elitist cliques and attitudes which abound in the literary and academic worlds. Its basic weakness is that it acquiesces in a situation which can only be regarded as self-defeating, and that, arguing from the privilege of education, it refuses to extend that privilege to all.

What then is to be done? Need it, in fact, be a matter of great concern if the short story is relegated to our collection of literary fossils—along with the epic, the anatomy and the melodrama?

It would be a matter of great concern if this were to happen, and what is needed at the present time are more urgent and more decisive steps to prevent it from happening. It's good to see, for instance, that collections of short stories are being increasingly used as texts for senior students in our High schools. How much better than those dreary collections of “essays” which served effectively to discourage reading. But this is not enough. What is also needed is a far greater range of publishing outlets for the short story writer than is now available, as well as grants and allowances to enable writers to devote the necessary time and effort to their work. All too often the short story has been looked upon as a sort of literary bubble-and-squeak—something you ran up in a hurry, when time and inspiration were short. A recognition of its proper status, as well as a practical boost to its flagging fortunes, would be for some public-minded person or institution to re-institute competitions among authors along the lines of the writers’ competitions the *Bulletin* used to run. And instead of awarding a great sum of money to what is obviously the best work, and leaving all the others unacknowledged (which is the unfortunate policy of the trustees of the Miles Franklin Award,
who seem to be addicted to short-priced favorites), surely a more encouraging and fruitful method would be also to give some sort of reward to those whose work may not yet be of top-class quality. Unless something like this is done, no doubt more and more potential short story writers will drift into the field of television script-writing—and make a good deal more money by doing so.

Having, it is trusted, established a case for concern over the future of the short story, let us look at our past achievement in this field as reflected in the two volumes of *Short Stories of Australia*.

Any anthology of short stories is bound to reveal omissions and inclusions which strike the reader as otiose or idiosyncratic. Certainly this anthology is no exception, and if Douglas Stewart's volume, *The Lawson Tradition*, strikes one as a more balanced selection than does Beatrice Davis' *The Moderns*, this is no doubt because Stewart, with a safety margin of some thirty-odd years, had the easier task. To look around with an anthologist's eye among stories written over the past few decades, largely by writers who are still living and producing work, as Miss Davis was asked to do, is no easy task. She herself speaks of the "injustice" which must be done, and the "false impressions" which must be given as part of "the occupational hazards and anxieties of any conscientious anthologist."

Mr. Stewart, with less cause but equal modesty, speaks also of "injustice" and "unkindness" in making his limited selection, and says that "it was simply not possible to include every writer who was worth considering." But he certainly seems to have included most of them. The stories of Lawson, Dyson and Steele Rudd have already been mentioned as among the best in the collection. In addition, it is as good to see the much neglected Price Warung in print again as it is to meet Henry Handel Richardson outside the pages of a lengthy novel. The inclusion of an extract from Norman Lindsay's novel *Saturdee* though seems a little odd—and Stewart's explanation for its inclusion is not entirely convincing. Many other novels also saw the light of day in the form of serial publication, but this seems little reason for regarding chapters from the finished product as short stories.

Towards the end of the volume *The Lawson Tradition* starts to pall a little too. One almost feels a sense of relief that "the moderns" stepped in when they did. What had been a new and exciting vein for Steele Rudd became very much an over-worked mine by the time James Hackston got around to it—and the inevitable result was a lot of hard work for little reward.
Perhaps too, in years to come, similar objections will be raised to some of the stories in *The Moderns*, but in the meantime the impression is one of diverse and manifold talent, even if, as several other reviewers have pointed out, the youngest contributor thought worthy of inclusion is now approaching forty. Should the book be called: *The Early Moderns*?

Quibbles like this though should not dim our appreciation of Miss Davis' achievement in assembling such a fine collection of stories. Within the limits she has set herself her selection leaves little to be desired. It's good to see too that she has interpreted "Australian" in a sufficiently broad sense to enable her to include the work of several expatriates—notably James Aldridge and Shirley Hazzard. Both of these are fine stories, and Aldridge's, for all its indebtedness to Hemingway, one of the most memorable in the book.

One main criticism of this second volume is that Miss Davis, unlike Douglas Stewart, has not seen fit (or perhaps has not had the space) to double up on the stories of major or important writers. As Stewart remarks in his introduction, "an anthology in which each contributor is represented by only a single story tends to be too levelling or muddling. To display a writer's range and variety... it is often desirable to put in at least two of his stories." In *The Moderns* one would quite willingly have traded the few second-rate stories for an extra one or two by any one of half a dozen major writers: James Aldridge, John Morrison, Hal Porter, Judah Waten or Patrick White.

To the superficial observer the publication of this handsome two volume anthology is likely to signal that all's well, and far from quiet, on the Australian short story front. If this is the impression given, then it is certainly a misleading one. Angus and Robertson deserve to be congratulated on producing an anthology from which they are no doubt counting on making as little profit as from their biennial *Coast to Coast*—that admirable collection of the best stories from each two-year period, which is due to appear again at the end of this year. But if *Short Stories Of Australia: The Lawson Tradition* and *The Moderns* has the success it deserves to have, then perhaps the diagnosis has been wildly wrong. One certainly hopes so.
April 1968 marks the 25th anniversary of the heroic uprising of the Warsaw Ghetto. The author pays tribute to the agony and struggle of the Jews in Poland against the Nazis.

THE FATE OF THE WARSAW GHETTO has become the symbol of the fate of European Jewry. For twelve savage years (1933-1945) Hitler and his National Socialist Party brought destruction, slavery, pillage and death wherever the Hitler army set foot. Anti-Semitism was used by the Nazi ideologists as "the psychological spark which would fire the mob" and in the wake of the fighting in Poland the construction of ghettos, concentration camps and atrocities began as the first step towards "the final solution of the Jewish Question." During the Third Reich's drive towards "a thousand years' rule over the world" (one of Hitler's sayings), the Jewish problem was destined to constitute a wicked diversion. According to the principles of Nazi racial discrimination, highest in the racial hierarchy ranked the Germans, on a lower level the Scandinavian nations, then the British; still lower ranked the French, followed by the Slav nations, and on the lowest level but one were the Jews. Below them there were the Gypsies.

The Nazis' criminal aim was: THE TOTAL EXTERMINATION OF THE JEWISH POPULATION. The monstrous crimes perpetrated against the Jewish population: their confinement behind Ghetto walls away from the rest of the world, the trampling down of their human dignity, complete expropriation and finally total extermination — according to the Nazi plan these crimes were intended to terrify the whole non-Jewish population. Within two and a half years, from the beginning of 1940 until the middle of 1942, more than 100,000 people died in the Warsaw Ghetto from hunger, exhaustion, diseases, terror and slave labor. This, however, was insufficient for the Nazis. Realising that the process of extermination was proceeding too slowly, it was decided to speed up its pace. Assistance in this endeavour was gained from corrupt, degenerate, scientists of the Third Reich.
Some fanatical German chemists produced a formidable gas, Cyklon B, by means of which millions of people were put to death in special gas chambers.

Then, however, the Nazis faced a difficult problem: how to coerce the remaining 400,000 inhabitants of the Warsaw Ghetto to depart, without excessive resistance from their native town in order to be “re-settled” in death camps. The answer was found in the use of deceitful, tricky, hypocritical propaganda. This propaganda claimed that a regular settlement at new working places in the East was being organised. By special announcements three kilograms of bread and one of marmalade were promised to each voluntarily applying for re-settlement. Many, by constant hunger brought to deepest exhaustion, relied on these terrible promises, not aware that they were but pretences, concealing the route towards the grave. Such perfidious and cruel tactics in tricking the intended victims were used throughout the process of mass annihilation. Even in the death camps of Treblinka, Sobibor, Brzezinki and Belzec it was the custom to supply the exhausted and wretched people, naked on the way to gas chambers, with a cake of soap each. This was to make them believe they were on the way to the bath-house and would remain in the camp. In their effort to avoid acts of resistance the murderers tricked their victims to the very end.

The Nazi hangmen were confident they
would succeed in turning the Jews of the Warsaw Ghetto into slaves marching to their death. Something altogether different happened: in the starving and dying Ghetto a powerful resistance movement came into being. "Everything calls for unity now, our common fate calls for unity." This rallying cry was accepted with intense fervor by all those who were determined to fight the bloody enemy, to uphold the honor of the ill-treated Ghetto. There was formed within the Ghetto an anti-fascist organisation which constituted a united national front to fight the oppressor. In the autumn of the same year, after 300,000 inhabitants of the Ghetto had been exterminated by the Nazis, the famous Jewish Fighting Organisation had sprung into being. Its leaders were: Mordechai Anielewicz, Edward Fondaminski, Michal Klepfisz, Michal Rozenfeld, Hersch Berlinski, Marek Edelman and others. The heroic uprising of the Warsaw Ghetto in April, 1943, was the achievement of the Jewish Fighting Organisation and of its loyal fearless leaders.

When on April 19, 1943, detachments of SS troops, Wehrmacht and police, armed to the teeth with automatic arms and supported by tanks, armoured cars, artillery and air forces, invaded the Ghetto in order to deport the remaining Jews to extermination camps, they met with powerful resistance. The Nazi forces were compelled to withdraw from the Ghetto and their leader SS Colonel von Sammern-Frankennegg, saved himself only by ignominious flight. At the headquarters of his superior officer SS General Jurgen Stroop, an experienced organiser of mass murder, had to report: "In the Ghetto everything is lost. The Jews are resisting. We had to withdraw from the Ghetto. We no longer hold the Ghetto."

Thus the first battle of the Ghetto brought defeat to the aggressors. Boys and girls of eighteen hurled bottles with explosive liquid at tanks, they planted mines manufactured by themselves, they shielded the retreat of the civilian population, they fought—as testified by General Stroop in his report to Himmler—to the last bullet, to the last drop of blood, filling with awe the arrogant SS men and Wehrmacht soldiers. It was most important to banish fear of the Nazi "superman." April 19, 1943, the very first day of the uprising, had shown that the Nazis were "heroes" only when facing defenceless victims, and that they ignominiously retreated when met by the bullet and the grenade of a determined adversary.

The heroic example presented by the struggle of the Jewish Fighting Organisation in the Warsaw Ghetto, encouraged to armed resistance the united anti-fascists of the Bialystok Ghetto (August, 1943), the captives of the death camp of Treblinka
On the site of the former extermination camp of Treblinka where the Nazis killed some 800,000 Jews, a Monument to the memory of the victims was unveiled on May 10th, 1964. The Polish Government, the public, and Jewish organisations abroad contributed to the costs.

(August, 1943), and the deported Jews facing death at the extermination camp of Sobibor (October, 1943). Jews from Poland, from the Soviet Union, from Czechoslovakia, Germany, Holland, stood shoulder to shoulder in this fight. In all these camps, as well as in Maidanek, Auschwitz, and Plaszow, the heroic fight of the Warsaw Ghetto resounded in powerful echo. The armed resistance of the Ghetto fighters alarmed not only the local Nazi authorities, but even Himmler and the SS staff in Berlin. Unable to suppress the uprising in open combat, General Stroop obtained authority from Himmler to overwhelm the Ghetto with fire and dynamite. His men were ordered to blast the entire district, block by block, house after house. They burned the Jews alive, they drowned them in flooded sewers, they smashed the children against the walls, they bayoneted hospital patients, they foully murdered pregnant women. Nazi documents reported the satisfaction derived by Stroop and his bloody gangsters from this massacre. The SS General Jurgen Stroop was chief of the large-scale action carried out by the Nazis in order to quell the uprising in the Ghetto. Stroop was proud of his bloodthirsty deeds. This he reveals in his daily reports to his superior, SS General Kruger, on the bestiality committed and military action taken by the Nazis in the Ghetto. At the same time Stroop admits in his reports the great heroism of the Ghetto fighters.

Moreover, the Jews had succeeded in organising bases of resistance in these factories. Such a centre of resistance in a factory of the Army Accommodation Office had to be attacked as early as the second day by an Engineers' Unit, by flame throwers and by artillery.

The Engineers, belonging to the Wehrmacht, were assigned to Stroop by the Commander of the military garrison in Warsaw,
Lieutenant-General Rossum. Rossum participated afterwards in the attempted liquidation of the resistance movement in France and carried out terrorist actions against French peasants. After the war he was caught, but released. Now he lives in the German Federal Republic. Stroop goes on:

Just after the first days it became apparent that the Jews no longer had any intention to resettle voluntarily, but were determined to defend themselves by all means and by using all weapons at their disposal. So-called battle groups had been formed under Polish bolshevistic leadership; they were armed and paid any price asked for available arms.

Stroop identified the whole Jewish resistance movement as bolshevik.

Battle groups, consisting of 20 to 30 or more Jewish fellows, 18 to 25 years of age, accompanied by a corresponding number of women, kindled new resistance. These battle groups were under orders to put up armed resistance to the last and if necessary to escape arrest by committing suicide.

The resistance put up by the Jews and bandits could be broken only by energetically and relentlessly using our raiding parties by day and night. On 23rd April, 1943, the Reichsfuhrer SS Himmler issued through the higher SS and Police Fuhrer East at Cracow his order to complete the combing out of the Warsaw Ghetto with the greatest severity and relentless tenacity. I therefore decided to destroy completely the Jewish residential area by setting every block on fire, including the blocks of residential buildings belonging to the armament works. Only during the large-scale operation was the aryan population informed by posters that it was strictly forbidden to enter the former Jewish residential area and that anybody met within the former Jewish residential area without a valid pass would be shot. At the same time these posters informed the aryan population again that the death penalty would be imposed on anybody who intentionally gave refuge to a Jew, especially if they lodged, supported or concealed a Jew outside the Jewish residential area.

Permission was granted to the Polish police to pay to any Polish policeman who arrested a Jew within the aryan part of Warsaw one-third of the cash of the Jew concerned. This measure has already produced results.

That memorable spring of 1943, the Easter holidays occurred at the end of April. During the whole of Passion Week uncasing processions made their way to the walls. They did not cease even during the feast itself. The words: Go now, the mass is over, Allelujah, Allelujah, were no sooner heard than the crowds from the overflowing churches, with fresh flowers in their hands, streamed towards the walls, towards the spectacle — towards the Warsaw Passover spectacle. It was indeed a spectacle out of the ordinary. The people from the neighboring houses could hear the cracking of bones, the hissing of human bodies at the stake. The Ghetto was aflame. People were dying in the conviction that bestiality had reached its lowest depths. How tiny, how frail was human conscience. Detonations shook the earth, the streets, but not the people, not the people's conscience. The people of Warsaw did not fight for their lives, for their fate was known; doomed in advance, they fought for their dignity. This is a record of defiance, of active resistance, of psychological and armed opposition.
In view of all this it is amazing that after the war theories were developed by some historians (Ralph Hilberg, Professor Hugh Trevor-Roper) and commentators (Hannah Arendt) that the reaction pattern of the Jews to the Nazi slaughter "was characterised by almost complete lack of resistance." Furthermore it was "compliance and co-operation with the persecutor." Their concept is based on the Jewish religious historical belief of Kidush Hashem (the glorification of God) where physical sacrifice meant less than to give up Jewish religious beliefs. They failed to realise the existence of a militant Jewish labor movement, Jewish communist Bund, Jewish trade unions. All these movements created a new Jew, who conscious of his dignity, was ready to fight and defend his right and place in the general community. This attitude of mind found ready expression before the war wherever Jewish communities were obliged to struggle for their rights. The same forces furnished the organisations of resistance to the Nazis in time of the war. It was not true to say that the Jews went meekly to their deaths. Wherever and whenever it was feasible, they evaded deportation, went into hiding, jumped out of the death trains, collected arms, mustered in the forests, joined the partisans, and made preparation to do battle in the ghettos and camps. In the autumn of 1942 — both the reports of the German authorities and Jewish accounts agree on this — in the course of deportations in the regions of Lublin, Kielce, Bialystok, Volhynia and Byelorussia, there were mass flights by Jews to the forests, though the forests did not always prove a refuge. . . .

Wherever the hand of friendship was extended to the fugitives they fought courageously against the invader. In this connection it is worth recalling the People's Army Commander in Lublin, Jan Holoda ("Kirpiczny") and the partisan leader in Volhynia, Jozef Sobiesak ("Maks") who represented — in the words of Emanuel Ringelblum, the ghetto chronicler — "the good spirits of the forest." But there were "evil spirits" as well: units of the right-wing National Armed Forces and the Confederation of the People, also common hooligans and extortionists, "Navy-blue" policemen, and gangs of Ukrainian nationalists; for Jews running off to the forests to fall into such hands meant as tragic an end to their hopes of fighting as if they had been caught by the German gendarmes or SS.

In the course of the battle the Jewish Fighters' Organisation sent the following message to the Poles: "From amidst the smoke of raging fires and the blood-drenched dust of the murdered Warsaw Ghetto, we, prisoners of the Ghetto send fraternal, hearty greetings to you . . . the fight for your freedom and ours is going on."
THERE WAS A TIME not so long ago when the vast majority of children of working people left school at 14 or 15. With rare exceptions only the wealthy stayed on at school and experienced tertiary education. Divisions between young people were largely confined to the type of work they took up and these divisions tended to be the same as those that existed generally in the working class — between the skilled tradesman on the one hand and the unskilled and semi-skilled on the other.

Bright young lads aspired to an apprenticeship. The early years of low wages and night time study were compensated for in greater job security and in the future rewards and status that came from being a tradesman. Yet the divisions were not clear-cut since the non-apprenticed lad and the apprentice worked together throughout the working day. In the high peak year of apprenticeship the number recorded represented 30.1% of all 15-year-old males in Australia. That was 1956. Ten years later the number of recorded apprenticeships remained fairly constant, but the high school scene had changed dramatically.

Of the 98,951 boys who entered secondary school in 1960 more than 31,000 were still at school in 1965. Thus 31.3% had taken the full secondary course. While the majority still leave school by the age of 16, the minority in the high schools continues to expand. By the end of this decade about 40% of boys and 30% of girls will complete the full secondary course. Of those leaving school earlier a high proportion take up apprenticeship or work in the service industries. Given the changing needs of production none of this is surprising. In a narrow sense production increasingly requires technically trained experts as it once needed tradesmen. The fact that increasing numbers stay on at school while the number of apprenticeships on offer does not decline suggests that relatively few young people take
up unskilled or semi-skilled work. This does not mean that unskilled and semi-skilled work has been wiped out. Even a cursory investigation will show that these fields of work, also expanding, are mainly taken up by immigrant workers and married women.

Although the high school population has increased dramatically the number of young Australians attaining higher levels of education is still far below that attained in most comparable countries. Yet the change is big enough to have brought new influences, problems and challenges.

The differences between young people leaving school early, even those taking up apprenticeships, and those remaining at school, is far greater than any division between the skilled and the unskilled workers of the past.

While systems of education vary from State to State within the Commonwealth in all cases the main high school education is geared to the top grouping who will complete the full high school course.

Whatever the problems in those schools catering for the full high school course, and they are not without problems, they have better staff and facilities than the junior secondary schools. Yet by the end of primary school most children are passed to schools where only a miracle would project them towards a full high school course.

The minority streamed off into selective high schools begin to take on the appearance that once characterised the children who went to private, sometimes quaintly called, public, schools. Even in the comprehensive high schools the children in the higher streams are soon removed in most important ways from those who will opt for early school leaving.

Those who stay on at school see widening horizons for employment; work that will bring security, good pay, status, even a measure of fulfilment. In practice some will find that the widening horizons are more myth than reality, but they do have a sufficiently practical basis to meet many expectations.

And so lines of communication begin to break down. Children who stay at school do develop a cultural basis, no matter in how rudimentary a form, but this, far from helping them communicate with those who are working, cuts them off further. Culture becomes a part of the status symbol. Those who work pity those at school for their lack of income, and the freedom that comes with it, but there is envy too and the accusation of snobs.
The new needs of production do not require that every child should have a complete secondary education. But one very good reason for socialists to insist on universal secondary education is that this would expand the level of communication between human beings no matter what type of work they then undertake. This is not to ignore the human right of all children to attain high cultural levels or to dismiss the current wastage of talent at all levels of the education system.

If the present educational divisions are perpetuated it well may be that the divisions between the more highly educated workers and the majority will run far deeper than any division now existing between tradesmen and unskilled workers.

Prior to World War II the percentage of young people able to take up a trade was far less than the percentage after the war. Industrial expansion fostered in the war years made it necessary for more skilled workers to be trained. Given the continued development and application of technology more young people will be encouraged to complete secondary school and undertake tertiary education. Significant numbers of children from the industrial working class will be in this group. Parents who place a high value on job security will make sacrifices to keep their children at school in the same way that parents in the past were prepared to subsidise the low rates of apprenticeship pay to enable their children to have a trade.

But there is overwhelming evidence to show that the educational level of parents, home environment and other social influences outside the school weigh the scales for or against higher education*. It is not simply money, or the lack of it, but perceived levels of attainment and the stimulation to study. Generally speaking a home where parents left school early is more likely to be without the facilities to encourage basic study skills. Some young people will move up the scale but many more who could attain higher education will be deprived of it or diverted from it. Even when considerable changes are taking place in the structure of the work force the majority in each group tend to repeat themselves in the next generation. It will not be surprising if the needs of production prevail in moulding the education system, that the children of the unskilled immigrant workers will become the

The Australian Council for Educational Research has studied the representation of children entering tertiary education with different parental occupational backgrounds. In this study thirty-three per cent of fathers of male school-leavers were in the category “unskilled or semi-skilled” but only 1.5 per cent of these school-leavers entered university. In contrast only 2% of the fathers of male school-leavers were classified as “university professional” but 35.9 per cent of their sons entered university.
least skilled in the work force while the children of today's skilled workforce will, in the main, be educated only to the level that will enable them to fulfil the needs of expanding technology.

Amongst those staying on at school there is a strong belief that higher education ensures a rising status and provides the intellectual basis for greater participation in the running of society. The controllers of society should not be surprised when high school pupils and the products of the high schools act upon these beliefs.

While there is partial truth in the view that educational training of young people today is only different in degree from the vocational training of apprentices, and in the view that changes in educational standards are simply a response to the needs of production, these over-simplifications ignore the powerful influences that education brings in its own right.

Young people completing the six-year high school, or with the expectation of completing it, are subjected to numerous influences.

For the earliest years they are projected into an educational rat race. They are under pressure to work long and hard. The goal may be a chance at a highly paid job. The threat may be that if they don't study they will have to become ordinary workers (perish the thought). Meantime study is real and earnest. Even when they do well they are under pressure to do better, from Mums and Dads who didn't have your chance, from teachers who need high pass rates for inspectors and from the fact that places in tertiary institutes are by no means guaranteed, even to those with quite high passes.

In such circumstances many older high school students have learnt levels of discipline that even the bundy clock fails to instill into workers. They show some sympathy and appreciation for the status of teachers. In several recent instances high school students have taken strike action to support teacher demands for higher salaries and improved conditions.

Although high school education is too often subjected to the pressures of university requirements so that all-sided study is replaced by specialisation, the range of studies and the world in which the student grows up assist him to be knowledgable. The age at which he is assimilating so many ideas helps him to be relatively free of prejudice.

When once the high school boy read Champion or Triumph with their stories of individual, mostly clever, romantic heroes, today he is more likely to read Mad. Parents may find Mad
destructive and cynical, but its targets include most low brow TV, President Johnson, the Vietnam war and all the main forms of hypocrisy practised in society.

The study of contemporary history has moved well past World War I to take in events as late as 1965. Some curriculums now include the study of Australian trade unions, the political parties and current events. While much of this is superficial and not always objective, it opens doors previously nailed down in cold war prejudice. Since stress is placed on self study and researching for facts, indispensable attributes of successful researchers and flexible workers at a later stage, some self study and researching leads in interesting directions even when the basic curriculum leaves something to be desired. High school students have been in the last few years, the biggest single grouping seeking information about the Communist Party. Some want material for assignments, some say they are seeking the facts to help them understand communism. In several cases a few young people have read themselves through more of the writings of Marx than many active socialists would be familiar with.

None of this is to suggest that the ideas of socialism are main topics of conversations in the high schools or that socialist ideas are winning a major adherence. It does suggest that socialists and, indeed, all in the labor movement committed to a humanist set of values should concern themselves with the content of courses undertaken in the high schools.

Till now the concentration of effort by those who value education has been on the obvious essentials — on the school building program, teacher training, teacher qualifications, size of classes and the provision of equipment. Efforts need to be undertaken more widely to counter the growing tendencies to distort education. When the distortion arises from the pressure of universities, an all-sided education for the majority is sacrificed for the minority who will eventually attend university. The syllabus becomes a preparation for university entrance. To the extent that this is successful the need to provide a full secondary education for all children is obscured.

Even when the pressure of universities is only partially successful, the effect on those who are only remaining in school until the age of 16 is apparent. They become indifferent when taught subjects which are of no use to them, which they cannot understand or see the point of.

When the distortion arises from the pressure of industry's needs there tends to be an overweighting on the side of science at the expense of the humanities. This pressure begins in the schools.
and extends into the tertiary institutions so that it becomes possible in theory to train people to point missiles in the direction required without concerning them with the political, social, economic and moral issues involved in pointing missiles anywhere.

At the same time trade unions, political parties and the leaders of social movements should not be content to leave the presentation of their position entirely in the hands of the education authorities.

Trade unions are in an excellent position to concern themselves with the content of studies undertaken about the unions. They could offer material and speakers.

The 'white collar' unions, notably the Australian Council of Salaried and Professional Associations, could share with high school students the studies they have made on the effects of technological change. This would be a far-sighted approach since most high school students will eventually work in fields covered by ACSPA.

In a small way the Communist Party has provided materials on request, but until now no material has been especially prepared for high school students. When communists have accepted invitations to speak in schools the questions have been as one might expect — about Hungary, the Berlin Wall, the Peking-Moscow dispute, Vietnam, about democratic practice and the rights of individuals in socialist societies and whether communists organise strikes and industrial unrest. The open mindedness and the response to honest attempts to answer such complex, even difficult, questions would do credit to older audiences.

Factual, documented material on Vietnam, including Malcolm Salmon's eyewitness account of North Vietnam, are sought. It was no accident that a major target for the distribution of government pamphlets on Vietnam has been the high schools. No reliable survey exists to show the extent of opposition to the Vietnam war in the high schools, but evidence of anti-war values extends from the widespread popularity of the badge which proclaims: 'Make Love Not War' to teach-ins, student participation in demonstrations, evidence of resistance to cadet training, a student strike at one Victorian school and considerable support for the NSW teacher, Bill White, when he refused to be conscripted. As yet those who oppose the Australian commitment in Vietnam have not made more than sporadic efforts to develop into an effective movement the disquiet amongst students towards the Vietnam war and conscription.
For many years the trade unions and other sections of the labor movement have sought to protect apprentices from excessive exploitation, from poor training and outdated study courses. When so many young people now prepare for life and work in the high schools it is imperative that they too be protected from excessive exploitation arising out of the needs of industry or the tertiary institutions, from poor training arising out of the lack of money for education and the consequent shortage of school buildings and qualified teachers and from outdated study courses which allow facts to be presented one-sidedly or ignored altogether.

Since high school students are not apprentices, helping them towards the best conditions of study and towards self-expression on issues that concern them cannot be developed in the same way as are the needs of apprentices. Parents working with each other and in co-operation with teachers have already done much and will do more, but the needs of education require greater community involvement if secondary education is to become the right of every child. Student self-expression will develop as the community recognises the value of the search for truth, no matter where it leads. Then teachers will encourage it without fear of departmental crack downs.

Young people at work as apprentices or in other occupations may be able to help bridge the gap between themselves and the high school students. While the gap is real there are common problems for all young people, notably those associated with Vietnam and conscription. If those concerned with such issues seek alliances with those in high school some of the gap may be narrowed and this will have important results when all are eventually at work regardless of the colour of the collars they will wear.
The concluding part of an article on the famous Italian marxist Antonio Gramsci, by a lecturer in politics at Monash University, in ALR No. 1 1968. Later articles will consider Gramsci’s approach to marxism, particularly his concept of hegemony, his views on the role of a socialist party in advanced capitalist countries and on the role of intellectuals and intellectual activity.

TWO FACTS MUST BE BORNE IN MIND in understanding Gramsci’s thought in the Ordine Nuovo period of 1919-1920. The first was the fact that he read as much Lenin as he could acquire after 1917 and disseminated it through the factories. The second is that even so, very little Leninism was reaching Western Europe before late 1920 and this meant a lopsided understanding of Lenin which is clear from Gramsci’s work.

In the years 1918-20 the October Revolution was often described as the revolution of the “soviets” and Lenin and Trotsky as leaders of the “soviets.” The ruling idea was that the key to an understanding of the Russian revolution was an understanding of the role of the soviets. The nature of the bolshevik party was regarded as much less significant and until the second congress of the Communist International in August, 1920, which was formed to conduct the “world revolution” the nature of a communist party outside Russia was not regarded as important, even by the Russian leaders themselves. One of the earliest facts about the October revolution which Gramsci realised was the important role the soviets had played.

Almost contemporaneously with the formation of the Communist International in March, 1919, Gramsci, Togliatti, Tasca and Umberto Terracini, another Turin student, formed the paper Ordine Nuovo (May, 1919). This paper was to become one of the most famous papers in Italian history although in its original form it only lasted two years. At first it was intended to be only a cultural journal. However, as Italy became more and more revolutionary and after the PSI became the first major socialist party of Western Europe to join the Comintern, socialists began
to ask themselves more and more how to conduct the revolution in Italy, where a revolutionary situation was rapidly developing.\footnote{36} Having decided that the soviet was a universal form and not a Russian institution Gramsci looked around for something similar in Italy and discovered the germs of the soviet system which could lead to the revolution in the commissione interna of the Turin factories.\footnote{37} The commissione interne were akin to the English shop stewards committees. Gramsci proposed in *Ordine Nuove* that they be developed into factory councils, consigli di fabbrica. These consigli could ultimately cover all factories and agricultural production in Italy and provide the basis for the socialist state after the revolution. In the meantime they would be the means whereby the worker would be made conscious of himself as part of a great productive process and taught that the managing of the socialist society was not beyond his power. Through this process the worker would attain true liberty.\footnote{38} Gramsci felt that several problems making a revolution difficult could be solved through such a system. He felt that the nature of the Italian state had had an atomising and alienating effect on its citizens; they became the “individui-cittadini.”\footnote{39} This meant that in moments of radicalisation and worsening of conditions, such as those which prevailed after the First World War, the Italians became anarchist or libertarian.\footnote{40} This in turn led to two developments in the leading circles of the socialist movement: either revolutionary adventurism or opposition to any attempts to take power at all.\footnote{41} The development of the consigli di fabbrica would combat all these tendencies, by developing in the worker a consciousness of his social importance, preventing alienation: by combating anarchism through discipline; and by enabling the working class to take power already prepared to run the country.

In No. 7 of *Ordine Nuovo* in 1919 Gramsci launched an appeal to the very militant workers of Turin:

> How can we dominate the huge social forces which the war has loosed? How can we discipline them and give them a political form which has the virtue of developing normally, of continually being integrated until it becomes the skeleton of the socialist state in which the dictatorship of the proletariat will be incarnated? How can the present be wed to the future, satisfying the urgent necessities of the present and working usefully to create and “anticipate” the future?

He suggested that the socialist state already existed potentially in the organs of the working class, the commissione interna, socialist clubs and peasant communities. They should be united and hierarchically ordered. In the first instance they should be united into regional committees. They should then demand that all state power be transferred to the consigli. He invited all “the best and most aware” workers to collaborate in this activity.
Gramsci and Togliatti and Terracini, but not Tasca, who disagreed with the primacy given by Gramsci to the consigli,\(^4\) had already built up personal contact with the workers in their place of work and did not rest with the appeal alone. They went into the factories, sought out the best workers and propagandised on behalf of their scheme. It took time and hard work to win support. In August 1919, only 1,100 copies of their journal were being sold in Turin and little more throughout the rest of Italy. But six months later the paper was selling over four thousand copies in all. Forty three issues came out in the first year, after which the number of copies sold seems to have settled at about 5,000 copies, though the editors hoped for ten thousand copies by the end of 1920.\(^4\) This circulation was unheard of for a "piccola rassegna di cultura." The distribution was more diffused by this time, though mainly concentrated in Milan and Turin. Fascists, and Roman Catholics, as well as Socialists read *Ordine Nuovo*.

The workers responded to Gramsci's appeal, though he was no "tribune" and soon a network of consigli were established in the Turin factories. The object of the *Ordine Nuovo*’s editors now became the raising of the consciousness of the workers and their cultural level. They made no concessions to working class difficulty in understanding some of their advice (unlike Stalin, who popularised marxism) "Psychologically, the period of elementary propaganda, so called "evangelism" is over."\(^4\) The object of Gramsci’s intellectuals was to develop the critical faculties of the workers. The first task of the workers was to discipline themselves and organise themselves. "The Communist revolution is essentially a problem of organisation and discipline," he wrote. The organisation would have to start in the factories and then be diffused into the country.

All these policies seem very similar to the Leninist principles in *What is to be Done?*, but they were completely independent in inspiration. Before the Second Congress of the Comintern in August, 1920, Gramsci knew little about democratic centralism. Only Gramsci’s directions that the present task of the communists was to encourage the creation and development of consigli of workers and peasants and their eventual unification in a national organisation and to capture a majority in such a congress, were, perhaps, inspired by Lenin’s policies vis-a-vis the soviets. However, his assertion that the communist party could have no competitors was independent.

The directions he was making to the workers seem fairly obvious ones, but the backwardness of the Italian working class movement at this time must be remembered. Such elementary directions were
needed. His real originality (if we do not admit that arriving at Leninism without having read Lenin is original in itself) lay in his obiter dicta and use of a wide knowledge of up-to-date Western European work in political science and sociology.

In *Ordine Nuovo*, Gramsci argued that the main advantage of placing the consigli in prime position in the creation of a dictatorship of the proletariat, and maintaining that the unions and then the socialist party were passe forms, lay in the fact that only in such a hierarchy could the workers reach an awareness of their ability to administer the state without the bourgeoisie. They would learn on the job their own all-important role in the capitalist state. They would also, because they were close to their social roles, more quickly discard their mythical, utopian, religious and petty bourgeois beliefs in favour of one based on their role in production. This mental readjustment was a sine qua non for revolution. It is important to note that emphasis on the importance of ideas preluded the theories developed later by Gramsci.

Gramsci argued determinedly in 1919-20 that the existing institutions of capitalism could not be used to conduct the revolution, nor, indeed, could those which had arisen in response to the capitalist system, that is the trade unions and the Socialist Party. He used the Michels thesis to indicate the manner in which such supposed proletarian institutions became estranged from the mass. Their leaders, he asserted, were too far from the mass to appreciate what the mass was feeling.

Nor did he admit that the state ushered in by the revolution would be a parliamentary democratic state. It too would be something completely new in which the communist party would at first be dominant.

Gramsci's thought on the role of the party went through several stages. The changes in his attitudes were determined both by the developments in Italy in 1919-20 and the influence of the Comintern on his ideas. They cannot be understood separate from these two factors. In 1919 the situation in Italy grew more and more unstable. It “felt” revolutionary. The Socialist Party proved unable to lead the proletariat to a revolution. It lacked both a programme of action and the will. Then, in October it affiliated to the Communist International and announced its commitment to the methods used in Russia. Shortly after Gramsci wrote an article called “The Party and the Revolution.” This said that the PSI was the agent of a revolution being made by the complex of socio-economic conditions in which the masses were living. It was not the controller of the masses. Its job was to subtract from
bourgeois democracy the "consensus" of the governed in the system. This was the negative function for the party. Its positive function consisted of diffusing in the masses via the new institutions its Idea (Weltanschaung) which would provoke a consciousness in the workers of the manner in which they would run the new society. The task of the Socialist Party consisted of convincing the masses that Italy under the current system of production was producing only half her needs. The only way out of the dilemma was to introduce a new social system.46 Four months later he wrote another article: revolution still hung "like a spectre" over Europe. In this article he drew a distinction between the Socialist party and the Communist Party. The first had a multiclass base, the second a proletarian. The various classes supporting the first could have divergent interests. The second's followers saw their only salvation in revolution. The job of the PSI, while not neglecting the other classes, was to build a ruling class psychology in the proletariat proper.

How to carry out the revolution was the all important question. He called on the PSI to proceed with its task of educating the working class through the consigli and to call a national congress of consigli. Perhaps his more critical attitude towards the PSI was due to the admonition of the Comintern to the PSI to beware of the "reformists" in its midst.47 In the same number he loosed a determined attack on the "reformists." In mid-1920 the revolutionary wave was ebbing and already the Comintern was seeking to explain why the world revolution it had foretold for 1920 had not occurred. One of the reasons it advanced was that there was an absence of real revolutionary parties throughout the workers' movement. Before it announced its intention to have all Communist Parties conform to the bolshevik model, Gramsci wrote a further article calling for a renewal of the Socialist Party. This was delivered to the Milan congress held in April, 1920 just after a general strike had broken out in Turin. The PSI leaders and the congress did not support the strikers. This made the Ordinovisti and the Turin workers very bitter. Gramsci wrote (Togliatti delivered the report, which was ignored by the leadership led by G. M. Serrati): "The present phase of the class struggle in Italy is the phase which precedes: either the conquest of political power by the proletariat in order to pass on to new modes of production and distribution which allow a renewal of productivity; or a tremendous reactionary triumph by the propertied class and the governing caste."48 In this situation, because the socialist party was doing nothing to organise the masses, they were incapable of taking power. The PSI, despite its affirmations at the Bologna congress had remained a parliamentary party and done nothing about the
"reformists" in its midst. He warned that the working class would form a new party, which was cohesive and strongly disciplined. He gave warning that a faction would be created to convert the PSI.

After this date, his attacks in the PSI, a traditional socialist party came thick and fast. He accused the PSI of being primarily governed by the values of the bourgeoisie. In August, the Second Comintern congress occurred. This instructed the PSI to adopt democratic centralism and to expel the reformists led by Turati. The Italian delegation resisted these directions, and Lenin announced that he thought that the line of the Ordinovisti was correct. Soon after the Turin workers occupied the factories of Turin. The PSI refused to extend the movement and the "reformists" attacked the protagonists of the occupation. Gramsci now turned on the PSI. It was no longer revolutionary he said; it was like the British Labour Party, a conglomerate of parties. He announced that at the next congress the communists would turn it into a communist party. At Leghorn in January, 1921 the communists seceded to form the PCI. By that time the occupation of the factories had collapsed and the revolutionary wave was over in Italy.

One of the main reasons for the impotence of Gramsci's group was its refusal to conduct factional activity in the PSI or to build an opposition until it was too late. He himself admitted this later. Whether there could have been a revolution in Italy, had his schemes been developed by the party will never be known. He felt so, and I am inclined to agree.

Anticipating the content of later articles on his theory, I will point out here that the policies advised for socialists in Gramsci's Ordine Nuovo period nearly all contradict his later theories. The charge of inconsistency can be avoided if we recognise that conditions changed—the theories he was to evolve later were for advanced industrial or capitalist societies in a state of comparative social stability. In 1919-20 he was advancing theories to cope with a revolutionary situation. He himself recognised that they were methods for peculiar or particular circumstances. On the other hand it should also be remembered that he was still groping towards a clarification of his ideas at this time and greatly influenced by the Leninism he read. Even so, at this time there were already in embryo some of his future thoughts, and I shall refer back to these in other articles.

The next phase of Gramsci's life lasted from early 1921 until 1926 when he was arrested by the Fascist regime and jailed. He remained in jail until a short time before his death in 1937.
phase, too was characterised by “leftism,” although there can also be discerned a retreat from the values of Leninism as imposed by the Comintern.

In January, 1921 the Communist Party was formed at Leghorn after the maximalist majority, led by G. Serrati, had refused to implement the Twenty One conditions of membership in the PSI. The communist party was rather heterogeneously composed at first. Apart from Gramsci’s group there was the “abstentionist” group led by Amadeo Bordiga and an extreme-left socialist group. Gramsci’s Ordinovisti group was recognised by all as the leading intellectual group but Gramsci allowed the leading positions in the party to fall into the hands of Bordiga and his followers. Only Terracini was on the first executive committee of the PCI and he had been the least “Gramscian” of Gramsci’s followers in 1919-20.53 Gramsci thus allowed control of the party to slip into the hands of a group with which he had never really seen eye to eye and which had opposed him on various occasions.54

Though the first communist leadership did not realise it, there were two main problems to be faced in 1921-22; the menace of fascism and reconciliation with the socialists. The leadership was strongly “leftist” kept hoping for a revolution and regarded the “maximalists” as worse than the “reformists.”55 Their attitude thus preluded the disastrous policies of the German Communist Party in 1928-33.

This leadership, perhaps drunk with the revolutionary fervour of the past, continued to call for revolution, and presented it as just around the corner. It neglected to unite to fight against fascism. Squadristismo was growing worse throughout the year 1921, however, and the Socialist Party entered what Nenni calls its period of defeat. They concluded a Pact of Pacification with the fascists, which while it temporarily resulted in a discontinuation of the brawling, looked like a capitulation to the class enemy. The Communists immediately dissociated themselves from this Pact and Gramsci pointed out its shortsightedness.56 Both the PCI and the PSI lost members.57

Late in 1921 the Comintern, recognising that the communist movement was on the defensive and that the revolutionary wave had subsided, announced the introduction of the united front. This instructed the communists to reunite with the socialists to fight reaction and to play down revolution until the time was more appropriate. Coming so soon after the split, these directions seemed the rankest of opportunism to the Bordiga leadership. At the Rome congress of March 1922 they drew up theses which were primarily an attack on the united front. These denied the
possibility of winning the masses by toning down the theory. They argued that only “objective conditions” would allow this mass support to be won. What the party said or did would make no difference and it should stick to its guns.

Gramsci’s attitude at this time is obscure. According to Bordiga he supported the Rome theses. According to himself he opposed them. According to Tasca he supported them for tactical reasons. Its seems probable, given his past, that he supported the theses in principle but was troubled by the party’s indiscipline vis-a-vis the Comintern.

In 1922, and much of 1923, he was in the Soviet Union, working in the Comintern and recovering from illness in various Soviet hospitals. He married Giulia Schucht after meeting her while in the hospital. They had two children (b 1924 and 1926). It was during this period that Gramsci was able to see the way the Soviet Union and the Communist International functioned. He was also far removed from the Italy where the fascists came to power in October 1922.

In the struggle against fascism the Communist Party had been “absent”, because of its refusal to unite with the PSI. Consequently throughout the year 1922, while he was in Moscow, the Comintern and the PCI had been more and more at loggerheads. In July 1922, despite the communist opposition to the united front, the Comintern invited the PSI to rejoin it:

... if Serrati has really recognised his mistakes he will have no choice but to reconsider everything he has said and written against the Communist International. ... He feared to prepare for the revolutionary struggle and now he can see that to renounce it was a preparation for the victory of the fascists. If it were merely a question of Serrati we might mock him tu l’as voulu Georges Dandin. But behind Serrati there are still tens of thousands of workers and so we say every Party can make mistakes, honest workers’ leaders can also make mistakes but they must prove their honesty by recognising their mistakes, learning from them and finding the way back to the correct road of struggle marked out for proletarians of the entire world by the Communist International.

The leadership opposed this readmission of the prodigal son. However, since the PCI had first been formed because the PSI had refused to expel the “reformists”, the leadership found itself on shaky ground after the PSI did finally expel the “reformists” at its Milan congress. The much weakened revolutionary socialists were ready to reconsider fusion with the PCI, which the Comintern now advised too. Gramsci vacillated at first between support for the Comintern and support for Bordiga but slowly moved over to the Comintern position. Given his constant insistence on the need for discipline in 1919-1920, his attitudes towards Bordiga are understandable. However, his support of the Comintern was contingent on its not misusing the other communist parties in
Soviet interests. He was present at the Fourth Comintern Congress at which Bordiga was also present. There he supported the fusion while Bordiga opposed it, accepting the decisions of the congress only for disciplinary reasons.60

On his return to Italy, Bordiga showed that he was not prepared to carry out the directions of the Comintern to unite with the Socialists. Besides the rump of the socialists raised technical problems to unifications. Quite clearly, at this stage and throughout 1923, the former Ordinovisti group, with the exception of Gramsci, supported Bordiga’s position. Togliatti, Terracini and others spoke out against the mode of fusion.61 Only the rightwing of the party, led by Tasca, was firmly in favour of the united front. Gramsci’s position can be gauged from his fear of the Right. He was still erring to the left emotionally but he attempted to reform the Ordinovisti group to pressure Bordiga into carrying out the Comintern line and failed. The hostility of communists towards the socialists was too great.62

In November 1923 Gramsci moved to Vienna, perhaps in order to be closer to the party, which since the fascists had come to power the previous year had been operating in conditions of de facto illegality. He had now given up hope of recreating the Ordine Nuovo group but he continued his activity of organising a new leadership for the PCI, which, now that Bordiga was in jail, was shared by the rightwing and the followers of Bordiga in the party. Gramsci’s former colleagues were still supporting Bordiga, who from prison was circulating material opposing the united front. The near collapse of the socialist movement, including the communists, in early 1924, may have been one reason why Gramsci managed to create an opposition in the party in that year. First one, and then the other, of the leading men of the party: Togliatti, Terracini and Scoccmarro, came over to his position in favour of working with the rump of the Socialist Party. Gramsci tolerated no compromise with Bordiga. The triumph of his line in the party leadership came at a meeting of the Central Committee held on 18th April 1924. The Comintern announced that it had no further complaint about the activities of the PCI. A month later the communists and the rump of the socialists ran on a joint list in the elections, winning fifteen seats. Gramsci was elected for the Veneto electorate and returned to Italy after an absence of two years. He now had parliamentary immunity from fascist persecution.

On his return he immediately set about preparing the PCI for clandestine activity. He found that many of the PCI members still supported Bordiga. This made his task more difficult. Meanwhile fascist repression grew worse and worse. Within the PCI,
opposition to the Fifth Comintern Congress demand that it “bolshevise” itself grew more acute.

Up to 1925 Gramsci had proved a loyal follower of the Comintern, leading the opposition to Bordiga in support of the Comintern policy and supporting the bolshevisation of the PCI. In 1925 and 1926 his attitudes began to undergo a change. Had he remained free he might well have joined Bordiga, who was expelled as a Trotskyite in 1927, in the limbo of communist non-persons. The change in attitude was the result of a number of developments. First, Gramsci had had time to meditate on the nature of the Comintern and began to have second thoughts about its usefulness and its function. For it was now in 1924 that the Comintern started to come under the aegis of Stalin and the transfer of faction fights from the CPSU (B) to the Comintern began. Gramsci was not averse to the introduction of bolshevik discipline to the PCI provided this did not mean that the PCI would be misused through Russian carelessness or in Russian interests. The Comintern had the moral obligation of duty towards its sections. However, the process of bolshevisation coincided with directions for more aggressive activity by the PCI. While in 1922-4 discipline had coincided with the imposition of what Gramsci regarded as a correct line of working with socialists this new line did not. He himself accused the Comintern of applying irrelevant Russian methods to Italy. Interestingly, this had been the position of the PSI before Livorno and Bordiga after 1921. Gramsci wrote in 1926 a letter cleared by the PCI and addressed to the Russian leaders:

Comrades, in these nine years . . . you have been the organising and motivating element for the revolutionary forces of all countries. . . . But today you are destroying your work. You are degrading, and running the risk of nullifying, the ruling function that the Communist Party of the USSR conquered through Lenin’s efforts; to us, it seems that the violent passion of Russian questions is making you lose sight of the international aspects of the Russian question itself, makes you forget that your duty as Russian militants can and must be fulfilled only within the framework of the interests of the proletarian International.

He added with reference to bolshevisation

unity and discipline in this case cannot be mechanical and compulsory; they must stem from loyalty and conviction and not like those of an imprisoned or besieged enemy division from thoughts of escape or surprise sorties.63

This letter reputedly never reached the leaders of the CPSU being “put in the wastepaper basket” by Togliatti.

However, although Gramsci was already showing doubts about Russian developments and certainly did not agree with the communist premise which ruled thereafter that the first duty of the communist was to secure the Soviet Union, I do not feel that we can distinguish the lines of his future thought in the 1926 Lyons
theses of the PCI, which were the last official documents he drew up. On the whole these documents were “leftist” in tenor and have been admitted by Togliatti to be partly “leftist” in tenor. Most of them were concerned with the bolshevisation of the PCI which was secured to some extent at this congress. It is true that there was considerable attention paid in Gramsci’s speech to the tactics called for by the conditions of Italy, which he classified as semi-industrialised. However, at this time it was Comintern policy for parties to take into account the national conditions of the country. Furthermore, Gramsci’s analysis of Italy was fairly similar to that given by the Comintern. It is too easy now to read into early communist documents traces of national communism. A case can only be made out if they are in conflict with the ruling Comintern directions. In this case they were not. So with Gramsci, we can only say that he was reformulating his thought and his attitudes at this time.

It was after he was sent to prison under the Exceptional Laws which were passed by Mussolini in late 1926 that his thought really started to develop in new directions. Had he been outside the prison where what he was doing could have been observed he would almost certainly have been expelled from the PCI. So, another factor in the understanding of Gramsci’s thought is the fact that he was able to write as a communist without being subjected to the moral and political pressures placed on communists by their own leaders in the years which followed 1926. Of course, he was subjected to other pressures. The object of the court in sending him to jail for more than twenty years was to “prevent this brain from working for twenty years.” The fascist regime did its best to make things difficult for him. Only his perseverance enabled him to receive the enormous amount of reading material which provided the source of his Prison Notebooks. At first he was imprisoned on the island of Ustica off the South of Italy, but he spent most of his term in Turi di Bari in miserable conditions, designed to kill him. Eventually the regime succeeded, releasing him just before his death. Always in poor health, he suffered agonies from various ailments, including tuberculosis. He complained very little, and to the last maintained a clear mind of great brilliance.

Unlike his earlier work which was written on the spur of the moment for political purposes, his work in prison was “fur ewig”, for history, and indeed it seems to be of lasting value.

In it there came to fruition his knowledge of Italian conditions, of Marxism and of Croceian idealism, synthesised into a marxist theory for advanced industrial countries. This is the theory I will discuss in future articles.

34 See J. Hulse, The Forming of the Communist International, (Stanford, 1964). Australian readers must not assume that it took as long for Leninism to reach Italy as it did to reach Australia where What is to be Done? was only read in 1925. Togliatti has indicated that Italian translations of the contemporary works, i.e. non theoretical works of Lenin were reaching Italy in late 1918.


36 A. B. Davidson, op.cit.

37 M. Guarnieri, I consigli di Fabbrica, (Il Solco, n.d.)


39 Ibid., pp. 4, 14 and passim.

40 Ibid, pp.23, 72, 311, 379.

41 Ibid, pp.403.

42 A Tasca, Il Mondo, 25 August 1953.


44 Ibid., p.446.


46 Ibid., p.67.

47 Ibid., pp.91ff.

48 Ordine Nuovo, p.117.

49 Ibid., p.161.

50 Some writers maintain that the peak was reached in April 1920, Cammett, op.cit., p.101.

51 P. Togliatti, Antonio Gramsci etc, pp.43ff.

52 Ordine Nuovo, p.98.

53 For an assessment of Terracini see P. Gobetti in Rivoluzione Liberale, 2. IV, 1922 in Valeri, op.cit., pp.595-6.

54 E.g. Bordiga had opposed Gramsci at the Second Comintern Congress.


56 Original letter of Ex-Comm. PCI dated 6 July 1921.

57 About 100,000 socialists did not renew membership in either party.


61 P. Togliatti, Formazione etc, pp.55, 142, passim.

62 Ibid., pp.66-7.

63 Tasca, op.cit., Il Mondo, 15 September 1953.

64 See J. Cammett, op.cit., p.170ff.


66 Lettere dal Carcere, p.58.
IN FEAR OF CHINA, 
by Gregory Clark. 
Lansdowne Press, Paperback 
$3, Hard cover $4.95.

GREGORY CLARK bears a golden name among Australians concerned at the present course of Australian government policy towards Asia. A former officer of the Department of External Affairs, specialising in China and speaking both Chinese and Russian, he resigned from the Department in 1961. Ever since, he has been an outspoken critic of the assumptions of present Australian foreign policy — a critic especially worrisome to the Government because of his intimate knowledge of just how Australian foreign policies get to be the way they are.

I well remember the occasion in early 1966 when Mr. Clark's former boss, Sir Alan Watt, had a weekend's leisure interrupted by an urgent summons from on high to go and address a Canberra seminar on Asia at which Mr. Clark had been badly denting the reputation for wisdom of the makers of Australian foreign policy. It must be said Sir Alan could do little to retrieve the position.

But Gregory Clark's motivation is far from being to knock his former associates. As the present work, In Fear of China, shows, his resignation was the result of a profound political, psychological and moral break with the ethos of the Department of External Affairs. His treatment of the Department in the remarkable chapter, “Australia Versus China”, is completely lacking in rancor. But after reading it it is perfectly plain why a man like Gregory Clark had to get out of it.

Put briefly, it appears that through the study and practice of diplomacy, Gregory Clark found himself increasingly interested in political science — in the best sense of those words. The yawning gap between these two fields of activity in Australia in the 'sixties became too great—and he chose political science. This of course is not to say that there are not people remaining in the Department's service who are seriously interested in political questions. Perhaps it is that in Gregory Clark's case he saw the problem whole.

Two extremely interesting points made by Clark in his study of the Department ought to be referred to briefly here.

He says that due to a number of factors—including its relative newness—the Department of External Affairs in Australia does not enjoy the status and prestige of Foreign Ministries in other countries.

He also says—and this is perhaps a corollary of the first point—that the military-intelligence complex exerts a relatively greater influence in the Australian Department than in other countries. These two observations certainly provide much food for thought, in view of the crucial importance for us of foreign policy matters.

Clark discusses China's international behavior, and the behavior of other powers in relation to China, in terms of two categories — national interest and ideological interest.

He examines the general problem of hostility between States, dividing hostility for this purpose into two forms which he calls “active” hostility and “reactive” hostility.

With these tools he sets to the study of China and the Korea war, the question of Tibet, the Sino-Indian dispute, the problem of Taiwan, the Sino-US
impasse and the dispute between China and the Soviet Union.

He also examines the question of China's relations with the rest of Asia and, of course, the question of Sino-Australian relations.

On this whole range of questions, Clark's argument in general is that China's behavior since 1949 has been rational in terms of its believed national and ideological interests, and rather better than worse than that of others in the sense that the hostility displayed by China to other States has tended more often than not to be reactive rather than active.

At the same time—and this is a factor which gives the book a quite special value—he concedes the possibility of serious elements of reactive hostility in the behavior of other powers in their relations with China, and this without abandoning his central theme.

Clark's attitude to China is lambent with sympathetic imagination. This quality is perhaps most vividly expressed in the following passage (pp. 188-189):

"All Western countries, in their attitude towards China, are influenced to a greater or lesser extent by their inability to understand the Chinese. Nor is the fault entirely that of the West. The problem is two-sided, with both China and the West contributing their share to the mutual misunderstanding. The Chinese side of this gap has to some extent been described in terms of the cultural uniqueness of the Chinese, and the tendency to see themselves as apart from the rest of the world. Less fully realised is the extent to which this tendency works in reverse..."

"...China remains for most Western countries an 'alien' nation whose people think, talk and act somehow differently from the rest of us. This attitude was well summarised by the 17th century French scientist and philosopher, Pascal, when he suggested that the test of a moral man would be to place before him a button which, when pressed, would cause the death of a nameless Chinese and would earn him £10...

"This 'alienation' extends into the making of policy. Australian policymakers urge sympathetic understanding of West German frustration over the loss of East Germany and the lands east of the Oder-Neisse line. They dismiss as anti-US propaganda Peking's anger over the loss of Taiwan. We should not, it is urged, force the South Africans out of the UN and so ostracise them from the world community, regardless of whatever dislike we may feel for apartheid. As for Peking: 'We must ask ourselves, when we see the current activities of the 'Red Guards', whether...we should be considering a change in Chinese representation (in the UN)' (Australian UN representative Plimsoll).

Having said all this, it must be remarked that Gregory Clark's account of Chinese behavior passes rather lightly over the most recent period, the period of the proletarian cultural revolution. This is a pity, because if recent developments had been dealt with at greater length the author may have been able to shed a more penetrating light on the reasons for deep changes undergone by Chinese internal and external policies over the past decade.

It seems that all these changes are not adequately accounted for in terms of the categories of national and ideological interests.

Gregory Clark's warning that the cult of Mao Tse-tung is not to be equated with the cult of Stalin but rather with the "cult of Lenin" surely begs the question. However real a factor a Lenin cult may be in the minds of some, it did not exist in his
lifetime, and any signs of it were strenuously opposed by Lenin himself.

As far as China’s relations with the other socialist countries are concerned, it is true that Gregory Clark deals at length with the Sino-Soviet dispute and leans heavily on the question of Soviet refusal to provide China with atomic weapons as a prime factor in this dispute.

But does Chinese resentment at this flouting of a believed Chinese national interest adequately account for the subsequent determined attempts by the Chinese leaders to establish hegemony over all the socialist countries and over the world communist movement? Australian communists speak from quite practical experience here—both of Chinese friendship and co-operation and their opposites.

But perhaps the distortion in the understanding of Chinese national and ideological interests on the part of the present leading group in China is most vividly expressed in their refusal to join in a common declaration of support for embattled Vietnam on the grounds that this would mean “collaboration with revisionism”.

The doctrinaire and egocentrism of this stand of the Chinese leaders are perhaps more keenly appreciated in Hanoi than in most other places.

Indeed, it is a commonplace of the contemporary socialist movement that if the Chinese, despite their dispute with the Soviet Union, and despite the undoubted mistakes that have characterised some Soviet attitudes to China, would sink their differences to the extent of a joint declaration in support of Vietnam, the Vietnamese people’s struggle would be materially assisted.

Gregory Clark’s failure to acknowledge that Chinese socialism is passing through an aberrant phase should not perhaps be held against him. He is in fact a specialist in international relations who nowhere professes socialism.

But this element in the book does detract something from its overall persuasiveness.

In Fear of China remains, however, a splendid contribution to the growing volume of Australian writing directed to the study of our international environment and to the cause of teaching us how to act better in it.

MALCOLM SALMON


Considering the current concentration by both friends and enemies of socialism on individual freedoms in socialist countries, this small collection of short stories, poems and a play, plus an excerpt from a speech by Fidel Castro, should attract attention.

The reader who expects from the title, or to find as the Editor claims “a rough picture of present-day Cuba” will be disappointed. With very few exceptions the writers represented, nearly all in their twenties and thirties, are not active in the Cuban revolution although they have said Yes to it and “are united in preference for Cuban independence under Castro to any kind of foreign dominance.”

In his introduction, Editor and translator Mr. Cohen says that he bases his selection for the Anthology “on literary merit alone.” The young writers represented, influenced by Kafka, T. S. Eliot, Apollinaire and other “moderns” continuing the line of pre-revolutionary writing, reveal to him how “a very vigorous generation of Cuban writers is responding, individually, to a very exciting phase of the country’s history.”
Worthy as the contribution of these writers may be to their national literature from the point of view of techniques and preservation of their language from deteriorating into a local patois, Mr. Cohen's claims prod again the ever-topical argument over form and content: of what is significant art.

If this anthology gives a rough picture of present-day Cuba then there has been no Cuban revolution. With rare exceptions it is a somewhat dreary collection of probings around attitudes of despair, ignorance, boredom and futility, with a little macabre fantasy on the side—reflections of the weary, decaying society of an old world in which they have their roots.

Passivity is the keynote. The lives, the episodes, obviously occur in any society, capitalist or socialist, but where are the strivings, the fervour, the mental and physical conflicts, the setbacks and victories of the great majority of a people preoccupied with building a new society?

Publication of most of the work of these writers was during or after 1962. This fact, and the "solid liberalism" of the active and flourishing Writers' Union which Mr. Cohen found in early 1966 bears witness to Castro's policy and promises made in his Words to Intellectuals in 1961.

Castro here expounded in detail what should be the attitude of revolutionaries to those intellectuals "who demonstrate a favourable attitude towards the Revolution and who wish to know what degree of freedom they have within the revolutionary conditions to express themselves in accordance with their feelings (and philosophy)."

For revolutionaries, he said, "The principal goal is the people... We struggle for the people without inner conflict; we know we can achieve what we have set out to do." But, "Whoever is more of an artist than a revolutionary cannot think exactly as we do." The Revolution is a problem for these people, said Castro, and they are a problem for the Revolution. Yet the Revolution must count on all honest citizens and "cannot renounce the goal of having all honest men and women, whether writers and artists or no, moving along with it."

For the future Castro foresaw a merging of the mounting cultural level of the mass of the people with the artists' creativeness and skills which, in the best traditions, would reflect socialist reality. "We have to struggle in all ways so that the artist creates for the people and the people in turn raise their cultural level and draw near to the artist."

In his note dated March 1967, Mr. Cohen says that some recent events "might cause me to modify some of my judgments... the liberal cultural group is finding it harder to defend itself against the rigid party men... which has made the lives of some of the younger writers increasingly difficult."

We can join with Mr. Cohen in his hope that "this tendency will soon be reversed."

J.J.

THE ARROGANCE OF POWER,
Jcnoteh Cape, $5.30.

SENATOR FULBRIGHT holds that it is possible for people and nations to reconcile their differences without the inevitability of resort to violence; that communism is not an ideology of unmitigated evil; and that even if China's actions deserve the uncompromising hostility of the United States a point which he does not concede, America's present belligerent attitude is hardly likely to improve matters. He questions too whether the countries of Asia and
South America really regard the present foreign policy of the United States as wholly beneficial and freedom-loving.

For these views and others, he is regarded as one of the West's most important and influential 'doves', and no doubt ranks high on the John Birch List of People-Whom-America-Could-Do-Without. As Chairman of the U.S. Senate Foreign Relations Committee he writes with knowledge and involvement in world affairs; although he suggests on occasions that he is not as closely involved in decision making as his particular position should warrant.

"To criticise one's country is to do it a service and pay it a compliment", writes the Senator. Judged by those lights his book certainly indicates his admiration for, and desire to serve his country. For with incisive and stimulating clear-sightedness this one time Professor reviews America's foreign policy; cutting away all cold war axioms, all comforting dogma, and all assumptions that, prima facie, America and her supporters must always be absolutely right, and her foes, real and imagined, must at all times be absolutely wrong. He suggests that the old myths should be supplanted with new realities through the process of free discussion and dissent. "Dissent", he observes, "is the highest service one can give humanity."

The author sees America's arrogance of power — a disease not unknown in the history of other nations of the past — reflected at all levels, from the national assumption of her right to remodel the world in the image of her own society, through the machinery of her foreign aid programs which are often humiliating to the recipients; down to the petty arrogance of many American tourists abroad, particularly those visiting newly developing countries.

He sees it dangerously manifest in the increasing intolerance of criticism and dissent in the present chilly and bleak air of a resurgent McCarthyism, and suggests that in such a climate the flower of true freedom and democracy could well wither and die. With its death would of course go all the values and concepts which the West is supposed to be sustaining.

He sees hope for the future only if America will, at the present height of her great powers, "re-examine all the attitudes of her ancestors", (particularly, one gathers, those of her most recent ancestors).

Senator Fulbright's book covers a wide field, from his well documented concern with the erosion of the effectiveness of the Senate and its specialised committees as instruments of democratic processes and decision making; through the Vietnam situation on which his views are widely known; to relations with Russia, China, other Communist States, and with America's North Atlantic allies. All these are aspects of foreign policy with which he has been personally and very actively closely associated.

The book also contains clear and pithy summaries of various American foreign adventures such as The Bay of Pigs invasion (of which he received advance information purely by accident); the Cuban Missile Crisis and the Dominican intervention.

The author advocates the re-establishment of the promising international climate of the early 1960's when the acceptance of the likelihood of nuclear war was receding, and when the leaders of all powerful nations were at least beginning to move away from positions of mindless dogma and prejudice to attempted reasoned discourse and co-operation in their international transactions.

Fulbright can perhaps be termed a practical idealist. His suggestions for peace in Asia; for "rebuilding bridges"; for the introduction of a system of
foreign aid which replaces the present system of resentment-generating "handouts" to poorer nations from their richer neighbours, all portray a practical, reasoning and experienced mind in action; a mind moreover which is spurred on by a very real vision of true international peace and goodwill.

Many will no doubt adjudge the Senator to be unrealistic. Yet, in his quest for peace through public understanding and enlightenment he has taken such unprecedented steps as calling, before the public hearings of his committees, not only established authorities on world affairs, but also distinguished psychiatrists and psychologists to testify on the psychological aspects of international relations and the root causes of conflict and tensions between nations.

In the belief that it is high time that man learned to guide his own destiny rather than continue to allow himself to be dragged behind the chariots of blind nationalism and dogmatic ideology, he suggests that political scientists could well spend less time playing "war games" and devote more time and energy to asking themselves whether war is necessary. He speaks scathingly of "the new breed of University professor who sneers at proposals for the relaxation of tensions and occupies himself with more 'realistic' matters such as calculating the 'acceptable' levels of 'megadeaths' in the event of nuclear war."

In 1954 Senator Fulbright was the one member of the Senate to vote against additional funds for the Special Investigating Sub-Committee headed by the now notorious late Senator McCarthy, whose name is synonymous with the worst aspects of blind hatreds and prejudices of the darkest Cold War days. Such an act, in the frosty political climate of those times, required courage, and indicates that Fulbright is indeed one who can keep his head when those about are losing theirs — a fact which gives the present book added significance.

_The Arrogance of Power_ contains only one reference to Australia to be found in the sentence — "Aside from the token forces provided by Australia and New Zealand for their own political purposes, the only other outside force in Vietnam beside the large American army is a Korean force of forty thousand men heavily subsidised by the United States."

Senator Fulbright calls a spade a spade; no more, no less; and from such a writer who is also deeply, importantly and actively involved in world affairs, we can expect a refreshing if disturbing book.

In this respect the Senator has not failed us. _The Arrogance of Power_ should be compulsory reading for present and aspiring leaders of all countries.

G. STANLEY MOORE

GARRYOWEN'S MELBOURNE, by Margaret Weidenhoffer. Nelson, 197 pp., $4.95.

THESE BOOKS deal with the development of two urban areas in Australia in the last century. They are different types of books; one is an eyewitness account of the development of Melbourne, the other a view of early Kings Cross as seen from the present. Each should be assessed as an example of its own kind.

Garryowen's Melbourne is a selection from _The Chronicles of Early Melbourne_ 1835 to 1952 written by the Irish journalist Edmund Finn. Finn, alias Garryowen, was said to have written the work after a priest appeared to him in a dream.

The original work claimed to treat on upwards of a thousand subjects. However, Margaret Weidenhoffer has
been careful to select only those topics and comments which appear to have lasting interest.

It has been noted that by about the middle of the last century the tone and style of Australian culture was set. To some extent this book shows what kind of culture developed and the moral and material forces that made it. We see the search for some kind of assurance in a country that was antipodean in more ways than one.

John Pascoe Fawkner found some of this assurance in the legalising of his sly grog operations in 1837, others found it in more respectable ways. John Batman took some concern about the souls of the natives whose land he had inveigled.

Some found strength in the just demise of others.

Garryowen gives an account of the first hanging in Melbourne. In 1841, in front of about 6,000 products of Western Civilisation, two Aborigines were clumsily dispatched. Underneath the gallows, as they passed away a protestant clergyman intoned the words “In the midst of life we are in death.” Garryowen does not let us know at whom these comments were directed.

This is in no way a history of early Melbourne. It is merely an unselective chronicle. However, despite the limitations of his background and profession, Finn gives a first-hand and sometimes vivid picture of a developing colonial society.

Freda MacDonnell’s attractively presented Before Kings Cross is a history of a locality rather than a local history. Her concern is with the people who have lived at Kings Cross.

No real attempt is made to place the development of this area in the context of the social history of Sydney.

We do get glimpses of this society when she examines some of its members, but these are limited. The author is absorbed in a Kings Cross remembered mainly in its present street names. The names Challis, Nicholson and Plunkett become persons in this book.

Despite their natural limitations these books are worthwhile reading for anyone interested in the people and institutions of Australia’s cities.

Tom Nash

CRITICS OF SOCIETY: Radical Thought in North America, by T. B. Bottomore. George Allan and Unwin, 143 pp., $4.25.

THE RADICAL and left wing movement in Australia has produced its fair share of hypercritical and frustrated pessimists on the one hand and doctrinaire bigots on the other.

Both would do well to read the works of T. B. Bottomore, Head of Political Science Sociology and Anthropology at Simon Frazer University, Vancouver. His more recent books Elites and Society (1964), Classes in Modern Society (new edition 1966), and now Critics of Society (1967) provide much penetrating analysis, food for thought and telling tilts at both wishy-washy humbug and hidebound dogma.

Critics of Society is however disappointing perhaps inasmuch as in contradiction to the aforementioned volumes it fails to answer the questions which it poses.

Bottomore asserts the need of critical social theory which not only analyses the sickness of present society but also forecasts what sort of society is emerging and identifies the social forces which will bring it into exist-
ence. He maintains that Marxism accomplished these things in the nineteenth century.

While stating that "it is still possible to regard Marxism as the social theory which makes the greatest sense out of the confused period in which we live" he considers it "more difficult to do so as the twentieth century goes on".

Jean-Paul Sartre is criticised for the following statement: "Far from being worn out, Marxism is still very young, almost in its infancy. It has barely started to develop. It is therefore still the philosophy of our time. It is unsurpassable because we have not yet passed beyond the circumstances that created it. Our thoughts, whatever they are, can take shape only upon this humus. They must be contained within the framework it provides, or be lost in a vacuum, or retrogress."

Correctly stating that modern societies have passed beyond the stage of early capitalism which Marx analysed, Bottomore makes a particularly questionable assertion that the rapid development of capitalism accounts for "the crisis of Marxist thought in the last three decades".

Any crisis of Marxist thought it would appear, however, surely arises not only from rapid development of modern societies but also in large part from more subjective reasons. The stagnation and ossification strikingly evident in Marxism since the thirties resulted in large measure from the particular turn of events which occurred in the Soviet Union under Stalin and the influence which this had on the Communist Parties (in which were to be found the great majority of the world's Marxists).

The ideological conformity demanded, and by and large achieved, in those long years had a paralysing effect upon theoretical development. Other important and relevant facts appear to be: 1 the failure of a number of revolutions in Europe following 1917 and the inevitable preoccupation of the Soviet Marxists with the practicalities of survival and growth; and 2 the failure of achieving socialist revolutions in any fully developed industrial society.

In the realm of ideas Marxists have failed to keep pace with history as Marxism requires them to do. It is hardly the fault of the theoretical foundations and methodology of Marx that such has not been accomplished to the degree required by contemporary problems.

The leeway I believe will be made up because the objective needs are there and the subjective desire, greater than for decades, is present among Marxists today. It will be achieved the quicker if boldness becomes the criterion of Marxist scholars and critical tolerance of new ideas the criterion of followers of Marxism.

Bottomore wants a comprehensive critical social theory and proffers as the reason for the "hesitancy and uncertainty" of the social movement of dissent in the U.S.A. today, the fact that it has no such theory of society to guide it.

He also deplores the "lack of a reliable and enduring social base" in those movements.

Bottomore is always sceptical in his works of the ability of the intellectuals to be the "animators of social change" because of their heterogeneous class, social and ideological position. So he is of the students and of the theory currently abroad which substitutes students for proletariat in the historical revolutionary process. No one remains a teenager for very long he observes. One may further observe along with the controversial Marxist scholar Herbert Marcuse that the
radical student movement, or at least some part of it, runs the risk “of falling victim to inoculation and thus to the system itself”, despite the invigorating persistence of its social protest of recent years.

The “reliable and enduring social basis” for social change notwithstanding the confusion and complexity of the modern industrial societies is, in this reviewer’s opinion, the working class, which includes developing modern components, together with left wing intellectuals, radical students and sections of the middle strata generally.

Australia’s radical youth movement and new left is still in its swaddling clothes. Alone it is as yet quite ineffectual but its voice is heard and is growing louder. An interesting and perhaps significant phenomenon in Australia, it seems, is that there is a greater friendship and affinity of this movement with the “old” left than is the case in the U.S.A. and that the “old” left is stronger, more cohesive and firmly based than its counterpart across the Pacific. To be dynamic each needs the other.

Many pages of Critics of Society are devoted to pungent comment on such important figures in the world of ideas as John Galbraith, C. Wright Mills, Hannah Arendt, Vance Packard and William Whyte whose writings have had wide currency among radicals and liberals.

Galbraith is taken to task for assuming that social changes will occur without changes in political power. He is further criticised for alleging that mass economic issues have largely been solved — an illusion shared, at Galbraith’s instigation probably, by many progressive intellectuals in Australia today.

Of particular interest are the comments on the American new left. Whilst sympathetic to this movement Bottomore is quietly and penetratingly critical. “The most widely held philosophical view among the new left,” he writes, “is probably some version of existentialism, precisely because this emphasises personal choice and decision, the direct human response to a situation, in a world which appears increasingly impersonal.

“Yet I doubt if such a creed is adequate to sustain effective social criticism or to bring about any radical social change. Left wing critics such as Sartre have had to supplement the individualistic and moral stance of existentialism with the historical and sociological ideas of Marxism in their effort to create a more satisfactory guide to social action. Above all, they have had to outline, in however sketchy a manner, some alternative conception of society — for which they have often turned to the revolutionary nations of the third world — in order to give point to their criticism and protest. It is very well to repulse those smelly little orthodoxies which put the mind in chains again (yet we should remember that Orwell was speaking of the doctrines of narrow and intolerant political sects in the 1930’s, not of the great liberating ideas of the Enlightenment or of early Marxism); at the other extreme, however, lies the incoherence of purely individual and emotional disenchantment with the world, or the self-righteous moralizing cant which is the preferred mode of expression of some young radicals.”

One may agree or disagree with Bottomore but the issues he raises are always real and to the point as far as the struggle for the development of ideas for social change are concerned. The task of refurbishing ideas, developing Marxist theories to a greater relevancy in the modern world, is enhanced by Bottomore’s writings.

JOHN SENDY

AUSTRALIAN LEFT REVIEW

April-May, 1968
TEACH THEM NO MORE,
by Brian K. Burton.
Australasian Book Society,
214 pp., $3.00.

In his book, Brian K. Burton confronts us with the problems incurred by our prison system and, in particular, he raises the question, what is society trying to achieve by this treatment of its criminals? Speaking with the authority of a past full-time Prison Chaplain, Burton shows, despite any existing idealistic aims that the present institutions have only created a situation which does little to rehabilitate the criminal, or even punish him. In fact, prison experience tends to produce a more maladjusted person whose previous "defects" are perfected or developed.

Burton does not try to preach nor does he offer any positive advice. He simply allows some of the issues to come out as he examines the prison life of three men.

For John Moline it starts by his taking a marble fireplace from a house that was being demolished. The sentence is only twelve months. However his distrust of all whom he meets, his isolation from his family and a few unfortunate incidents which occur with his fellow prisoners serve to increase his confusion and his depressed state. His tension comes to a climax with his murdering a guard.

To Terry Coleman, the greatest fear arising from imprisonment was the threat of homosexual attack. Obviously, the potential was always within him, but under the strain of prison life his repulsion towards such behaviour is overcome. Nevertheless it is still a problem, for Terry remains quite bewildered. Furthermore it leads to greater difficulties in his contact with others, especially the prison authorities.

Only Percy King is content with his new life. He enjoys the power which comes to him through the number of rackets which he controls. When he is released he finds the outside too dull, he is no longer "king." With little trouble Percy arranges his return to prison where he continues for a while to build an even more extensive kingdom.

Unfortunately, the impact which the book may have made through its commendable theme and its interesting subject matter, is lessened by some technical weaknesses.

Burton tries to build up the emotional atmosphere through his descriptive and reflective passages, but the words or phrases used are frequently jarring or forced. His simple and direct style used in narrating everyday activities and conversation is far more fluent and successful.

Secondly, the behaviour and the thoughts of the characters are not always convincing. This is partly connected with the failure of the style to arouse our sympathy and understanding. Then unavoidably, there is a limit to the information that can be brought forward. This weakness is most noticeable in the presentation of Moline. His personality and the prior events do not adequately account for the murder he commits.

Another feature which could be rectified is the structure. The progress of these men is told in a parallel fashion. Naturally variations occur. Thus after reading several chapters on John Moline one then has to recall where the tale of Percy King was suspended before proceeding with his latest exploits. In the final chapters, especially with John Moline, one is left wondering whether a chapter may have been omitted.

Although these detracting aspects cannot be ignored, Brian Burton's desire to make society "aware of what it is doing to men it names criminals" is made very clear. Something must be done so they are taught no more under the present system.

Janice Nash
ERRATUM
The note (1) which appears in the text on page 41 should be read at the end of page 40.
Two books which are concerned with great issues of today.

**FROM ANATHEMA TO DIALOGUE**

By Roger Garaudy.

A book which foreshadows possibilities for the future. Roger Garaudy, leading French Marxist, shows with genuine frankness and sympathetic insight new currents in Catholic thinking. There is no attempt to hide the fundamental issues that separate Catholics and Communists — but rather an emphasis on what they might have in common. An introduction by the Jesuit Karl Rahner is in itself a major contribution to the debate.

Price $3.15.
Postage 17c.

**KARL MARX:**

The Evolution of His Thought

By Roger Garaudy.

The author has achieved much more than a survey of Karl Marx’s theories in relation to history, philosophy, political economy and political action. Considered in the light of the controversial issues involved in today’s scene the book is vital to those who are concerned with ideology and with the struggles for democracy. Once more we are vividly aware that marxism is not a system of laws but the dynamics behind the dialectical art of discovering them.

Price $1.95.
Postage 17c.

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 ABORIGINALS 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.