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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 1965. 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 policy-makers 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,
Jonathon 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 regress”.

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 pre-occupation 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 uneasiness” 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 persistance 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
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