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CZECHOSLOVAKIA has a special place in world conscience. More than any of the other countries, it still symbolises the betrayal of small nations by the Western imperialist powers; 1938 was the fateful year that made war inevitable. Munich, Chamberlain, appeasement are words that still evoke shame, anger and sorrow. Analysis of the causes for these events goes deep into present as well as past history, with the lesson that imperialism is the cause of war, in Vietnam today as in World War II.

Munich and the Western capitalist betrayal, even more than the decisive role played by the Soviet in liberating Czechoslovakia, influenced the postwar course of that nation’s history. The Czechoslovak Communist Party, always a powerful political force in the country, won national leadership through its heroic organisation of the popular struggle against nazi occupation. This position and its mass support, enabled it to defeat the 1948 attempt to push Czechoslovakia back to the capitalist path.

CZECHOSLOVAK SOCIALISM, and the Communist Party which leads it, have great achievements to their credit and yet serious problems arose: economic, social, political. These problems finally reached a crisis stage, at which point a decisive change was necessary, not only in leadership but also in the structure of socialist society. Unless these changes could be made, socialism itself was in danger. It is a considerable achievement of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia that it found within itself the moral and political strengths to change its course, as well as the old leadership, to set out on the path of socialist regeneration. The Party’s Action Program, discussed in an article in this issue, envisages sweeping development of socialist democratisation, workers’ management, an economic and cultural advance based on mass participation, decision and enthusiasm.

This program is still under vigorous nationwide debate, with most citizens taking part, as the Communist Party prepares its extraordinary Fourteenth Congress; 1,400,000 Communists are electing their delegates and debating out the issues of policy and leadership. Because of past errors and deformations, this debate is taking place both within the Party and in a wider national political struggle.
that still centres on the Communist Party's program, policies and leadership.

This national debate is vigorous and even fierce; other political viewpoints are advanced, including non- and anti-socialist ideas as well as some which support socialism but are still critical of the Communist Party. The Communist Party has committed itself irrevocably to frankly debating out issues, to earning its leadership instead of basing itself on a monopoly of power. All available evidence seems to show that the Communist Party is winning out, increasing its popular support and overcoming mistrust and political apathy.

It would be of no service to the Czechoslovakian Communist Party to minimise its difficulties, or the strenuous efforts by Western capitalism to intervene in the political struggle. This is not confined to ideological and political intervention; there is no doubt that the Central Intelligence Agency and other imperialist agencies, particularly in West Germany, are also trying to recruit and even arm hostile elements in the hope of a capitalist restoration. Some say that communists always raise the CIA bogey when they are in difficulties. However, discovery of arms caches in Czechoslovakia is consistent with the record of CIA interventions in so many events— from the attempted invasion of Cuba right through to intrigue in student organisations in the United States.

However, these efforts cannot succeed without some mass basis. So far, emergence of any mass support for reaction has been thwarted by the Czechoslovak Communist Party's policies of free national discussion of all the vital issues, that has increased its public support and brought a new vitality to the socialist forces in the country.

A CRUCIAL QUESTION in these differences is whether there is in fact a real and serious danger of counter-revolution. In all the exchanges so far, few hard facts have appeared to justify the sweeping generalisations that assert its imminence. Rather, it appears that the Czechoslovakian Communist Party has dramatically widened and strengthened its mass support. For example, take the much-publicised "Statement of 2000 Words" (said by the western press to be the manifesto of freedom and by Pravda to be a manifesto for counter-revolution). Some of the signatories to this statement met Communist Party leader Dubcek on July 19th to give him a new statement titled "Only a few words". They explained why they had written the first article and admitted some of the weaknesses in it. The new article expresses full support for the Party's Presidium.
Indeed, most of the western press and political commentators, however reluctantly, are forced to admit that there is no sizable support for a return to capitalism. Thus they are reduced to finding satisfaction in differences of opinion and even a division between Czechoslovakia and some other socialist countries. Perhaps they cherish the hope that this division may itself create conditions to give the west a chance of intervening more actively and effectively than it has yet been able to do.

Communist Party leaders from the Soviet Union, Poland, Bulgaria, Hungary and the German Democratic Republic met in Warsaw on July 15th to discuss their views on Czechoslovakia. They sent a letter to the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia, fully published in Australia only by Tribune, which set out their concern at the danger of counter-revolution and their views on how to meet this threat.

THE CONCERN felt by these parties is understandable. If there were a danger of imperialist intervention and counter-revolution, very serious threats to their national security and to peace in Europe and the world would arise. The revival of militarism, revanchism and neo-nazism is a far more serious threat than the Australian mass media is ever prepared to admit, because the West German military revival is equally important a foundation of United States strategy as is its aggressive war in Vietnam. Rudi Dutschke, the West German student leader, shot down in West Berlin, expressed something of the reactionary nature of West German society when he was in Prague just before the attempt on his life. He made the point that West German fascism is not confined to the National Democratic Party but is generalised in the whole political structure of that country.

Understanding the concern of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries, and the reasons for it, there still remain questions of principle and method of maintaining socialist unity, cooperation and alliance. The fundamental marxist-leninist principles involved are national self-determination and the independence of parties, that must be respected. The best methods for implementing these principles are fraternal support for the policies of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia, thus helping its struggle against anti-socialist forces, internal and foreign.

It is impossible to believe that Czechoslovakia, with its past history, present realities and needs, would want to turn back from its alliance with the Soviet Union and other socialist countries.
Indeed, these alliances (and particularly with the USSR) are as indispensable for its present and future security as Soviet help was decisive in its liberation. This is clearly recognised, the alliances are unequivocally supported, not only by Party and Government leaders but also by virtually every section of public opinion.

If differences of opinion are held by some Communist Parties in socialist countries, as indeed they are, these should be expressed in a comradely way and discussed calmly, but always with the recognition that the Czechoslovak communists alone can decide their policy, as the Czechoslovak people alone can decide the type of socialist society they want. In particular, there should be no appearance of external pressure — still less actual pressure — from anywhere. Certainly not from Western capitalism, nor from other socialist countries nor Communist Parties.

Whatever differences on estimation of the Czechoslovakian situation and methods of action may exist, it is both wrong in principle and dangerous in practice to try to exert pressure, direct or indirect. Keeping Warsaw Treaty forces in Czechoslovakia beyond the scheduled date of departure was both wrong and unwise, and similar views could be held about reported Soviet Army manoeuvres along the Czechoslovak border and the rumored request to station Soviet forces on Czechoslovakia’s border with West Germany.

The mantle of champions of non-interference and holier-than-thou criticism of manoeuvres can scarcely be worn by Western capitalism, particularly the Australian and US establishments. It is hard to reconcile the pharisaical condemnation of mote-in-eye Soviet manoeuvres with the monstrous beam-in-eye real US war of intervention in Vietnam.

This effectively removes any moral basis for the US or Australian poseurs of freedom. However this does not cancel out the need for communists and all socialists to assert the principle of national self-determination and to ask that socialist countries should not only refrain from any external pressures, but also not even act in any way that may give the appearance of pressure. This is vital as Czechoslovak and Soviet leaders meet for talks that may well be historic.

THE WENTWORTH BUBBLE BURST very quickly with Federal Cabinet’s complete rejection of the Gurindji claim for some of their tribal lands now part of the Vestey meat empire. The Gurindji
had asked for 500 square miles. Wentworth visited Wave Hill and went on record as being impressed by the Gurindji’s plans and favoring return of some land, even if a much smaller area of eight square miles.

This was heralded as a sign of government policy following the Aboriginal Referendum and the new Gorton Cabinet. Wentworth was one of Gorton’s favorite sons, who had organised N.S.W. support for him after Holt’s demise. Wentworth was duly made a minister, and himself projected a new image. No longer was he just Wentworth the fanatical anti-communist, but a small “l” liberal, with a crusader’s zeal to improve the lot of the Aborigines, pensioners and other submerged minorities.

Whatever Mr. Wentworth’s subjective indentures, outcome of Cabinet deliberations on the Gurindji claim was entirely predictable. Even token return of Vestey land to its original owners would have been too dangerous a precedent. It was not the land itself — even 500 square miles is less than 10 per cent of the Wave Hill holding, the world’s biggest cattle station, while eight square miles was a mere speck. Return of this land would jeopardise all the cattle holdings, mostly controlled by absentee landlords. It would revive the issues of the recent robbery and alienation of land from the Aboriginal reserves, not in the distant past but within the last 20 years. This robbery directly benefits B.H.P. and international mining combines.

In these conditions, with monopoly interests threatened both directly and indirectly, a big business cabinet would obviously make only one decision. Even a token gesture was too dangerous. The sacred right of “private property” must be upheld. The Beef Baron lobby, powerful enough, was joined by the all-powerful Minerals lobby and that was that. Perhaps Vestey’s men saw no reason why they should return land to the Gurindjis, who have managed to survive the white man’s invasion, while Mr. Wentworth’s multi-million estates are beyond any claim, since the Illawarra tribes were wiped out long ago.

This is not the end of the issue of land rights, but only the beginning. The Gurindji claim lifted the Aboriginal struggle to a new level. There are several important new features in their struggle. First, it began as a class struggle, of doubly exploited workers against a monopoly boss. Second, it developed from a class to a national struggle, in which an oppressed national minority claimed not only their land but their right to an independent entity.
and culture (implicit in the demand for retention of their tribal areas and relics). Third the Gurindji action accelerated the growing national consciousness among Aborigines across the nation, seeing the identity of interests of all Aborigines, irrespective of tribe, of where they live or what work they do. Fourth, this struggle developed new Aboriginal leaders, new capable fighters from the Gurindjis, even if unable to read or write, and brought new activists forward elsewhere in the Territory and other parts of Australia. It is already true that the movement for Aboriginal rights is no longer a movement mainly of whites who want to help the Aborigines, but an Aboriginal-led movement that is drawing ever-wider white support for this very reason. These leaders and their independent action makes ever more ludicrous the stereotyped government and pastoral companies' accusations of political manipulation and communist plots.

The Aboriginal movement will inevitably develop and gain new mass and momentum. The Federal Government has been exposed by its decision. Its New Deal promises are suspect. Only a mighty mass movement, spearheaded by the Aborigines themselves, can force the deep social changes necessary to redress the inhuman wrongs done to an ancient people, give them their land, equal rights and opportunities in employment, education and political action. Above all, the Aboriginal people must be free to decide their own destiny, free to choose the path of national identity and culture, integrated into the Australian community without losing their identity, not assimilated, submerged and dispersed.

This national struggle is also a class struggle. The Government decision on the Gurindji claim proved this. There are certainly many obstacles to forcing the deep changes needed — racialism, paternalism, apathy, indifference — but the single great obstacle is vested interests built into monopoly capitalist society. It is this deep social cause that creates, sustains and sharpens racialism, inculcates paternalism and encourages apathy by its ethics and its mass media.

Apotheosis of this racialism, the Vietnam war, has brought violence into national politics. Australia is not a partner but an accomplice of American criminal violence against Vietnam. The mass media reports the war's brutality, immorality and violence — the napalm, mass bombing, poisoning of crops, destruction of homes, rape, torture and massacre. This produces two reactions,
broadly reflecting the basic division of Australian politics. The official, government, ruling class, Establishment reaction is: This violence and brutality is justified, necessary and moral, because it is defending freedom (in South Vietnam and even the Free World) and because it is defending Australia (fight them over there, not here). Anyone who opposes the war endangers Australian security, lets down Australian troops, is a communist, a fellow-traveller, a dupe, naive idealist or woolly headed intellectual or cleric. In short, those who oppose the war are either traitors or objectively helping the traitors, even if well-meaning. And traitors should be dealt with, of course.

The other reaction comes from opponents of the war, or of conscription for the war. Some regard the Vietnam war as an immoral, criminal, imperialist war, others think it against Australia's real interests, still others only oppose conscription for the war. In different ways, they campaign against the war, demonstrating their opposition. Deeply-felt, this opposition finds a whole range of expression—marches, picketing, sit-downs and other civil disobedience, burning of flags or draft cards, as well as meetings, debates, teach-ins, discussions, publication of anti-war leaflets, pamphlets and posters. The authorities, who really regard this opposition as traitorous, have a dual policy to meet it. They have virtually abandoned the public debate — in parliament or outside, few government spokesmen are prepared to argue the issues. They are running the government, the war goes on, they are committed, this is enough.

As for the war's opponents, all possible obstacles are put in their way. By now many hundreds have been arrested, attacked, gaoled, fined. At first, efforts were made to intimidate demonstrators and even forbid demonstrations. When this failed—and it had first failed in the USA—the authorities tried to make a virtue out of necessity; "We allow the right of dissent", hoping that this pretence of toleration would contain and even discourage the demonstrators. When this also failed, and when non-violent civil disobedience was developed to express opposition to the war, the authorities decided to crack down. They introduced new draconic legislation—to stop aid to the NLF, to introduce harsher penalties for defiance of conscription. And they decided to get tough with demonstrators. As a beginning they acted against a student demonstration protesting the new National Service Act held outside the Commonwealth building in Sydney where Federal Cabinet was meeting. In a pre-planned move and at a given signal, the police removed their badges and waded into the demonstrators and press cameramen. The get tough methods were extended to Melbourne a few days later. Government hypocrisy over violence continues.
A member of the Editorial Board of ALR makes an analysis of the program of political action introduced by the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia in April. This document has evoked considerable response in that country and a multitude of reactions throughout the world.

THE ACTION PROGRAM of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia, adopted in April this year, is a most important document. This is so despite modifications that may be made following further deliberations, or as a result of a shifting balance of political forces within the country. The Program is notable first of all for its tone, for the way it faces questions as they actually present themselves. There is nothing irrelevant, false or diversionary, nothing which could in effect or by design seek to shift the ground by raising other questions which, however important in themselves, are not really at issue. The Program, in its English translation, is a 90 page booklet of about 25,000 words. Since it is, unfortunately, not yet readily available in Australia, I have quoted extensively from the document so that readers will have some opportunity to check their interpretation with my own.

Major questions dealt with include the functions of the Communist Party in a more or less developed socialist society, the diversity in the social composition of that society, the need for prevention of a monopoly or over-concentration of power, and how to actually advance democracy in such a society. By confronting such issues, the Program, if successfully carried out, as now* seems well within the realm of possibility, may prove to be of world significance, however much it is a specifically Czechoslovak document laying no claim to universality.

The Program, is of course, the result of the accumulation of twenty years' experience of socialism. But it is above all a response to an acute crisis, which is no doubt one of the reasons that the issues were confronted "head on". They had to be; procrastination would perhaps have rendered the crisis unresolvable by political

* This article was written in June—Ed.
processes within the framework of socialism. It is not the main purpose of this article to contest critics from within socialist ranks of the measures taken by the new leadership. But surely, if these critics are realistic they must ask themselves what produced the crisis, and what would have been the results of the only other alternative — “more of the same”. The Program states that the society was making headway with great difficulty, with fateful delay and with moral political defects in human relations. Quite naturally, apprehensions arose about socialism, about its human mission, about its human features. Some people became demoralised, others lost perspective. (p.11).

It goes on to speak of the inability of the Party to eliminate in practice what it had previously verbally condemned, and that this undermines the people’s confidence in the Party being, in fact, able to change this situation, and old tensions and political nervous strain are again raised and revived. (p.28)

The crisis was both economic and political, with a natural mutual reinforcement of these two sides. But the Program holds that the key to solution lies in changes in the political superstructure, changes to accord with the needs of economic development of a modern industrial state, with the need for advance of democracy, with a resurrection and enhancement of socialist humanism and concern with the individual. Within this again, the role of the Communist Party, how it is to be conceived and discharged in present conditions is seen as fundamental.

Of course the previous conception of the role of the Party resulted in large measure from the pressing needs of the times — the fight against the bourgeoisie and struggle for consolidation of power, the heightening of international tensions of the cold war, etc. The particular influences of Stalinism are left aside here for reasons of space, although it is to be remarked that the Program declares:

The leading bodies and institutes of the Party and the State of that time are fully responsible for that acceptance (of Stalinist practices and conceptions) (p.6).

The resultant was that political relations were more or less designedly built up as instruments for carrying out decisions of the centre, and when times changed this was continued. The crucial point is not so much whether decisions were passed down (decisions of central governments once arrived at necessarily are “passed down”), but rather that the system and conceptions which had been built up “hardly ever made it at all possible for the decision itself to be the outcome of a democratic procedure.” (p. 27).

Seeing itself as the instrument of rule of the working class, the Party concentrated a monopoly of actual power in its hands.
Certain forms and procedures were retained, but served more to conceal the actual state of affairs. For example, in the parliament (as elsewhere) there was an "unconvincing unanimity concealing factual differences in opinions and attitudes of the deputies." (p. 41).

The Party became a sort of universal caretaker or stern parent, to which everything controversial had to be referred for final decision. There was an unofficial "cadre ceiling", a limit to the positions to which non-members could rise. Within the Party a comparable atmosphere prevailed.

Now, the role of the Party is conceived in the following terms: As a representative of the interests of the most progressive part of all the State — and thus also representative of the perspective aims of the society — the Party cannot represent the entire scale of social interests. The political expression of the many-sided interests of the society is the whole National Front, as an expression of the unity of the social strata, groups of interests and of the nations and nationalities of this society. The Party does not want to, and will not take the place of social organisations, but, on the contrary, it must take care that their initiative and political responsibility for the unity of the society is revived and flourishes. The role of the Party is to seek such a way of satisfying the various interests which would not jeopardise the perspective interests of the society as a whole, but which would promote them and create new progressive interests. The Party policy must not lead to non-communists getting the impression that their rights and freedom are limited by the role of the Party. On the contrary, they must see in the activity of the Party a guarantee of their rights, freedom and interests. We want, and shall achieve, a state of affairs when the Party right at basic organisation level, will have informal, natural authority based upon its working and managing ability and the moral qualities of communist functionaries. Within the framework of democratic rules of a socialist state, communists must over and over again strive for the voluntary support of the majority of the people for the Party line. It is necessary to alter Party resolutions and directives if they fail to express correctly the needs and possibilities of the whole society. (p. 23, emphasis added)

Performing such a role requires a corresponding inner Party life: Only down-to-earth discussion and exchange of views can be the pre-condition for responsible deciding of collective bodies. Confrontation of views is an essential expression of a multilateral responsible attempt to find the best solution, to advance the new against the obsolete. Each member of the Party and Party bodies has not only the right, but the duty to act according to his conscience, with initiative, criticism, with different views on the matter in question, to oppose any functionary. This practice must become deeply rooted if the Party is to avoid subjectivism in its activity.

It is impermissible to restrict communists in these rights, to create an atmosphere of distrust and suspicion of those around who voice different opinions, to persecute the minority under any pretext — as has happened in the past. The Party, however, cannot abandon the principle of requiring the fulfilling of resolutions once they are approved. (pp. 24-25)

Social diversity and social unity

The Program points to the diversity of socialist society, to its various social and political segments and the relations between
them. It recognises that socialist society does not become more and more homogeneous (which at least some of us had thought before), and that social unity, although possible in a way quite impossible in capitalist society with its basic class divisions and exploitation, is by no means a smooth and automatic process.

This recognition has a decisive bearing on the conception of the political system and the nature of the economic plan:

The different interests and needs of people not foreseen by the system of directive decision-making were taken as an undesirable obstacle and not as new needs of the life of people which have to be respected by politics. That was why the often well-meant words of "an increase in the people's participation in management" could not help, as in time this "participation of the people" came to mean chiefly help in carrying out orders and not in settling the correctness of the decisions. (p.27)

Decision-making about the plan and the economic policy of the State must be both a process of mutual confrontation and harmonisation of different interests — i.e. the interests of enterprises, consumers, employees; different social groups of the population, nations, etc. — and a process of a suitable combination of view of the long-term development of the economy and its immediate prosperity. (p.57)

Socialism can only flourish if scope is given for the assertion of the various interests of the people, and on this basis the unity of all workers will be brought about democratically. This is the main source of free social activity and development of the socialist system. (p.14)

It is not necessary to go into detail here concerning the various social groupings within socialist society, but the approach to youth is worth mentioning. The concentration is not on what the previous generation (of revolutionaries, and people generally) has given them — significant as that is — but on what they have been denying them:

Shortcomings and mistakes in political, economic and cultural life, just as in human relations, affect the young person especially strongly; contradictions between words and deeds, lack of frankness, phrasemongering, bureaucracy, attempts to settle everything from a position of power — these deformations of socialist life most painfully affect students, young workers and agricultural workers, arousing in them the feeling that it is not their work, their efforts which are decisive for their own future life. (pp.17-18)

The diversity is recognised as reflected in the National Front, a coalition of parties with their own independent rights. But it does not end there:

Socialist state power cannot be monopolised either by a single party, or by a coalition of parties. It must be open to all political organisations of the people. (p.3)

And besides political organisations, all forms of voluntary organisations, special interest associations, societies, etc., are to be fully protected in their rights, and pursuit of their objectives in the interests of their members.
Moral and material incentives

In its economic measures the Program raises most important questions, much discussed of late in the socialist world, concerning moral and material factors. It should be noted that this discussion of the relative merits and respective weights of material and moral incentives is confined to socialism. Under capitalism the latter arise either not at all or only marginally in the main areas of economic activity, and usually in a distorted way in other fields. This is yet another expression of the crisis of capitalism, for the demand or yearning for a moral incentive, for a human interest in the work in which one is engaged, for an end to alienation, is a central issue in the ideology and politics of today.

It by no means follows from this that virtually sole reliance on moral incentives as advocated in China in particular, and rejection of the use of economic measures as a "return to capitalism" is well-founded, or signifies a "more socialist" orientation. What is ignored in this approach is the intimate relation which exists between the two. This relation exists at various levels. It is indeed difficult for the human being to develop fully under conditions of deprivation. Poor housing, precarious transport, poor quality goods and services, lack of cultural standard in living environment and so on affect precisely the human, moral factor. True, the human spirit can soar above these things to great achievements, and is enormously admired when it does so. But it is quite different when the "moral factor" is called on as an excuse for bad leadership and management which inflicts deprivation which is unnecessary, could be avoided, and has been promised to be overcome.

It should also be realised that economic categories are an expression of relations between human beings. For example, exchange value under simple commodity production reflects the equality and mutual inter-dependence of producers of different commodities needed for life. With suitable modifications this applies also in relations between associated producers under socialism. In the absence of objective criteria, backwardness and deformations remain concealed, at the expense of all. But "it is not possible to blunt economic policy forever by taking from those who work well and giving to those who work badly." (p. 49).

Furthermore, the problem of material and moral incentives changes with the development of the economy. With a primitive level of production forces the consequence of good or bad, enthusiastic or apathetic work is often clearly apparent. The result is fairly directly linked with the effort put into achieving it. However, with growing sophistication, complex integration of an economy, and modification in a thousand ways by price policy, taxes, sub-
sidies, etc., it is less and less possible to define directly the relationship between input and output. And when good and bad work, whether at the work bench or in management, is not differentiated, it becomes increasingly difficult to point to positive results flowing from moral incentive, and still more to maintain that incentive.

Use of both national and international markets are involved in this, as they are able to provide the most objective available measure of the effectiveness of work performed. The market serves another purpose in that, with the relations of exploitation and private monopoly domination absent the market, because it is not subject to arbitrary direction from on top, can become a means to "ensure a marked superiority of the interests of citizens as consumers and sovereign bearers of the economic movement." (p. 57). As to the economic plan, it will "cease to be an instrument for issuing orders", and become instead an instrument enabling society to find the most suitable long-range trends of its development by scientific methods; a change from an instrument designed to enforce subjectively determined material proportions into a program of economic policy. (p.48)

*Development of democracy*

The whole document breathes the spirit of democracy, and indeed may be summed up in the words used (p.5) "... our present aim of democratising the socialist order." This is to be seen at one level in the correction of more obvious defects (to say they are more obvious is no way to minimise their importance). Some issues have already been touched on concerning the role of the Party, the rights of other parties and voluntary organisations. Division and limitation of power is taken as a basic principle, including, for example, that in disputes including the rights of government and its bodies the basic guarantee of legality is proceedings in court which are independent of political factors and are bound only by law, (and) to guarantee the full independence of barristers and solicitors from state bodies. (p.45)

The State Security Service is to be purely for the purpose of defending the state from the activities of enemy centres abroad, and every citizen who has not been culpable in this respect must know with certainty that his political convictions and opinions, his personal beliefs and activities cannot be the object of attention of the bodies of the State Security Service. (p.44) ASIO please note.

In particular the main responsibility for investigation is to be passed on to courts of law, prison administration is to be entirely separated, and administration of the press law, state archives, etc., are to be handed over to other state bodies (the Security Service had gradually taken over such powers).
There will be a press law which will guarantee a virtually unfettered flow of information, comment and discussion in all the mass media (already apparently operating in practice), and any restrictions are to be clearly specified in law and not left to arbitrary interpretation. The same principle to apply in dealings between state bodies and individual citizens and organisations. Freedom of speech and association, freedom of religion, freedom to travel, and to stay abroad for any period, and various other kinds of individual rights are to be guaranteed in a new Constitution to be drawn up.

At all levels of decision the principle will be that not just proposals will be up for decision, but alternatives, expertly substantiated will be offered for appraisal. This, together with the other measures and a free flow of information will help to ensure that decision making comes to life, and gets away from anonymity and formalism.

Fears have been expressed by communists in many places that these freedoms will be seized upon by class enemies and turned against socialism. The Program replies:

The Party realises that ideological antagonists of socialism may try to abuse the process of democratisation. At the present stage of development and under the conditions of our country, we insist on the principle that bourgeois ideology can be challenged only in open ideological struggle before all of the people. It is possible to win over people for the ideas and policy of the Party only by struggle based on the practical activity of communists for the benefit of the people, on truthful and complete information, and on scientific analysis. We trust that in such a struggle, all sections of our society will contribute actively towards the victory of truth, which is on the side of socialism (p. 33).

All the above and other democratic rights mentioned in the Program will ensure a great development of democracy, and in a far more meaningful way than under capitalism where such rights may exist to varying degrees, but even then are often severely limited or sometimes entirely negated by the concentration of economic power in private hands, and the class amalgam based on this of leading figures in government, administration, military and judiciary and in the mass media.

In elaborating these democratic rights and freedom of political opinion and expression, the Program does not accept a Government-Opposition division of political life as either appropriate, having in mind Czech history and present conditions, or as the be all and end all of democracy, as it is presented by supporters of capitalism. Such a set-up is one way in which hypocrisy in public life and struggle for power for its own sake is encouraged and promoted.

The Program probes deeper questions of democracy, confronting issues of further economic development and humanisation of life
in a modern industrial society. Freed from the incubus of private ownership, they have a base from which to go forward, now they have made up their mind to it, in a way that is impossible under capitalism. To do so has been demonstrated as entirely necessary and eminently desirable.

This is shown in all spheres. If "directive" planning and administration has proved impossible to continue, then a broad scope for social initiative, frank exchange of views, and democratisation of the whole social and political system becomes virtually the condition of the dynamics of socialist society. (p.8)

"Subservience, obedience and even kowtowing to higher ups" were appreciated under the directive system rather than "independence, diligence, expertise and the initiative of the people" (p. 10), but these latter qualities are precisely what is essential under the alternative, for that alternative can only be proper development of autonomy and self-management in enterprises, as elsewhere.

This necessity for enhancing the autonomy of socialist enterprises is common to and has been recognised by most of the socialist countries, though not in all have the consequences for the political and ideological superstructure been fully faced up to. But it would be strange marxism which held that the "necessary conformity" of the economic base and the superstructure (a main tenet of "historical materialism") ceased to operate when capitalism was overthrown.

Under advanced capitalism, the nature of the modern productive forces also demands "autonomy" of enterprises and J. K. Galbraith in his book The New Industrial State repeatedly reverts to this question. But of course such "autonomy" is basically different because of private ownership, different both in relation to other enterprises and to the state, and within the enterprise itself, being possible of application only at management level and not with the work-force generally because the basic relation is one of exploitation. Here socialism has the opportunity — it also has the need, for its own development, as we have seen — to really show its superiority at a higher level than hitherto.

The economic reform will increasingly push whole working teams of socialist enterprises into positions in which they will feel directly the consequence of both the good and bad management of enterprises. . . therefore . . . the whole working team which bears the consequences should also be able to influence the management of the enterprise . . . managers and head executives . . . would be accountable to these bodies for the overall results of their work . . . These bodies would be formed by elected representatives of the working team and by representatives of certain components outside the enterprise (scientific and professional bodies seem to be included here) ensuring the influence of the interests of the entire society and an expert and qualified level of decision-making . . . (p.51)
A Statute dealing with the many complicated problems which will arise concerning the democratic control and responsibilities of the various components of these management bodies is to be drawn up.

It is interesting to note that the trade unions are not proposed to directly participate in these bodies, but are urged to enhance and concentrate on their role of protecting the interests of the workers which not infrequently, in the previous set-up, conflicted with their support for directives under the plan and their performance of some state functions (control of some labor legislation e.g.). But even socialist economy places working people into a position in which it is necessary to defend human, social and other interests in an organised way. (p.52)

The central feature of what is called the scientific and industrial revolution can perhaps be reasonably well summed up as meaning a new level of science and its application in industry and other fields.

Just now, at the beginning of the scientific-technological revolution in the world, the social position of science is changing considerably. Its application in the entire life of society is becoming the basic condition for the intensive development of the economy, care for man and his living environment, culture of the society and growth of the personality, modern methods of management and administration, the development of relations between people . . . (pp.71-72)

This has many implications, including the need for professional autonomy to assist in achieving the application of scientific, objective standards, and in ensuring freedom of science and scientific personnel, including in the social sciences.

If the social sciences are really to become an official instrument of scientific self-cognition of socialist society, it is necessary to respect the principles of their internal life. (While assisting their development the Party) does not interfere with the process of creative scientific work and in this respect relies on the initiative and social responsibility of scientists themselves. (p.73)

Other implications are for education, which receives considerable attention in the Program, especially as regards quality and the role of school and university administration on a democratic basis with adequate autonomy and student participation.

The importance of culture in the modern industrial state is seen, as is the freedom necessary for its flowering.

The arts and culture are not a mere decoration of economic and political life, . . . if culture lags behind, it retards the progress of policy and economy, democracy and freedom, development of man and human relations. (p.79)

It is necessary to overcome a narrowed understanding of the social and human function of culture and art, over-estimation of their ideological and political role and underestimation of their basic general cultural and aesthetic tasks in the transformation of man and his world. The Party will guard and safeguard both the freedom of artistic work and the right to make works of art accessible. (p.80)
While in the Program the emphasis is by far on the side of democracy, autonomy and individual freedom, the problem of getting a fusion of these with the overall social needs and more long range development is raised repeatedly. There is not the airy dismissal of this problem to be found frequently today, an understandable over-reaction though it may be to the problems of the "mass society."

This often takes the form of struggle against institutions as such, or the establishment of "counter-institutions" which may have a certain role to play as leavening, but is peripheral to the main problem which is how to humanise and democratise the institutions themselves, which are an inevitable concomitant of our present stage of scientific, technical and cultural development. Says the Program:

simplified ideas as if (our goals) could be attained by underrating and decrying the administrative machinery in general, were rather detrimental in the past. (p.43)

Such problems as ensuring both the necessary safeguards to officials in their functions and the necessary replacement of officials is also posed (p. 43). What the Program in fact is setting out to do is to attack the problem right at its heart. Whatever degree of success is achieved will act as an enormously powerful world influence.

As the name Action Program conveys, this is not primarily or even mainly a theoretical document. But this is at present no defect. What is required is to do, to break with the old, to introduce the practice of democracy, to bridge the gap between words and deeds, aspirations and results. To the extent that this is done it will stimulate creativity in all directions, not least in the theoretical field. The Action Program is based on principle, on a theory, on an ideology, which will be further greatly elaborated and developed. One awaits the opening of the 14th Congress of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia on September 9 with great interest.
while Malcolm Salmon was still in France, as a special correspondent for Tribune, he answered several questions for ALR. His answers provide further information on the events of May and June and indicate some of the perspectives of the French left following the elections.

**QUESTION:** Various estimations have been made of the political situation in France before and after the elections; some claimed a revolutionary situation existed, others stated that the demonstrations were for urgent demands within the system. What were the various estimations before the elections and how much have these elections confirmed or denied these estimations?

**SALMON:** Estimating just what the political situation in France was in May and June, whether or not it was “revolutionary,” is the number one preoccupation in the political world here just now. Millions of words are being written about it, not to mention the other millions uttered in the course of the oral debate which is going on everywhere in this post-crisis atmosphere.

The Gaullists, of course, are not on record as to just how they really saw the situation. But actions speak louder than words. And their military gestures in the last week of May, the ring of armour which they then threw around Paris, indicate that they were perfectly prepared to put down an insurrection.

Incidentally, information I have gathered from reliable sources here indicates that these army units had orders to fire on the students if they should go into the streets to demonstrate on the night of May 30-31, immediately after de Gaulle’s hardline, comeback speech. It appears that the CGT intercepted this army order and immediately contacted the student leaders to inform them of it and to advise them against demonstrating that night. The advice was accepted. This was at least one case where student-worker co-operation worked in the May-June crisis, and it's just as well it did. The unions could not have stood by and seen the students massacred. The general bloodbath which many believe the Gaullists were prepared to stage at this point could not have been avoided. The episode illustrates graphically the interdependence of the student and worker worlds and ought to serve
as a stone — and a big one — in the wall of French worker-student co-operation in the future.

As to the left, the question of whether or not the situation was revolutionary represented the great divide. By and large, the French Communist Party and the Federation of the Left led by Mitterand reckoned it was not. It is fairly clear that there was some hesitation on the part of the Federation at a given moment (Tuesday, May 28) when Mitterand gave his press conference at which he asserted that "the state has ceased to exist since May 3," and expressed his readiness to assume the presidency of the Republic. It is also true that the Communist Party called for a change of government, for a "people's government of democratic union," at the same time as it exerted the utmost pressure on the Federation to agree to a common program of government offering a clear alternative political perspective. The fact that this pressure was unsuccessful is one of the great tragedies of the May-June crisis.

Communist Party calls for a change of government were also always most closely linked with the workers' and students' economic and social demands, which it saw as representing the true character of the movement.

The trotskyist, maoist and anarchist groupings, which formed a sort of amalgam in the crisis, certainly saw the situation as revolutionary. The slogan of "workers' power" was one of the main elements of their agitation. They were joined more and more closely in this estimation by the United Socialist Party (Parti Socialiste Unifié, or PSU) as the crisis unfolded. This fact was particularly clearly expressed by the presence of Mendes-France — a sort of father figure of the PSU — at a big rally (not supported by the FCP) at Charlety Stadium on May 27.

On June 25 between the two rounds of the elections, I heard a PSU orator tell a meeting in the occupied Law Faculty here that France in May "had witnessed the most favourable situation for socialism in any country ever." He went on to excoriate the FCP for being like a general who withdraws his troops from an impending battle and then says, "You see, we had no chance of winning."

From what I have been able to discover in a month of inquiries here, it seems that while there were nine million workers on strike and workplaces were occupied all over the country, the strikers in their majority were acting for the demands they were making and were not determined to carry on and overthrow the existing social order, as were a minority.
If this was true of the strikers, the country at large was certainly not in a revolutionary state. As far as the students were concerned, it is one of the most poignant illustrations of the negative effects of the violent tactics favored by some student leaders that, according to an opinion poll, public sympathy with the student movement plummeted by 20 p.c. in the fortnight after May 13, with the continuation of the tactics of the barricade and the burning motor car.

A secretary of the CGT, M. Marcel Caille, told me that in his organisation's efforts to secure gifts of food in the countryside for striking workers they encountered the same phenomenon. He said peasant opinion swung violently against both students and workers in the first week of June. Sixteen hundred tons of potatoes were thrown on to the roads in Brittany at about this time, because farmers couldn't get a decent price for them. They destroyed their crop, without for a moment thinking of giving it to the strikers.

Of course, in the countryside the anti-communist demagogy of the Gaullists had great effect. In rural France, little distinction was made between the actions of students' and workers' organisations, however eager in fact these were at certain moments to distinguish themselves from one another. It was all a matter of a new wave of madness in Paris, and, of course, the Communist Party, the country's only big revolutionary organisation, "must be behind it." There is unmistakable evidence that opinion in the army underwent a similar evolution.

In an interesting article in *Le Monde* (July 12), Professor Maurice Duverger points out that accumulated social discontents cannot be confused with a will to revolution. He adds: "The absence of a will to revolution in the great majority of the workers last May . . . was not the consequence of the reformism of the CGT and the CP. On the contrary, the reformism of the CGT and the CP was the reflection of this absence."

Far from confirming a revolutionary situation, the elections showed a sizeable proportion of the French population could be scared by the bogey of revolution, skilfully manipulated by the Gaullists. Of course, no political force in the country was fully prepared for the magnitude and sweep of the May-June crisis. Everyone was more or less taken by surprise.

Expressed politically, it seems to me not unlikely that the May-June crisis in France was the first great adventure into the field of the "structural reform" of capitalism in the direction of democracy and socialism, about which marxists in many countries have been talking for some time now. However adroitly the Gaullists
manoeuvre, the educational and industrial structures of French society will never be the same again, after May-June, 1968.

For the Communist Party and the whole French Left, the crisis has posed the problem of just what is the correct appraisal of the modern student movement. The debate on this question is already opened up, and can be expected to continue for a good time to come.

Q: Peter Smark in The Australian (July 3) stated: "The experts believe the main reason for the shift of a large segment of working-class votes to the Gaullists was a protest against the needless prolongation of the mass strikes after handsome concessions had been won." What conclusions do you draw from voting patterns?

S: Certainly the prolongation of the strikes in some places had a negative effect. But I wouldn't care to say this was the main factor. The overwhelming element in the rightward shift in the elections appears to have been the visceral one of fear, fear in particular of bloody revolution and civil war. This affected working-class voters too.

It is possibly true that the CP (whose vote fell from 22.46 p.c. in March, 1967 to 20.3) lost some votes to its left, in particular to the PSU. But if the PSU lifted its percentage of the vote from 2.26 p.c. in 1967 to 3.94 in the last election, it is also true that it stood 325 candidates this time as against only 110 in 1967.

An examination of the June 1968 vote in 92 of the 110 constituencies it contested in 1967 shows that, like the other leftwing parties, it lost votes — more than 26,000 in fact. In a Latin Quarter constituency its vote fell from 6,678 in 1967 to 3,861. The Federation of the Left (18.79 p.c. in '67 to 16.50 p.c.) also lost votes, presumably mainly to the right.

One of the curious phenomena of the '68 election was the failure of the centre, expected by many to do very well. Representing the most pro-American elements in French politics, the centre saw its vote fall from 12.79 p.c. in '67 to 10.34. The centre's lavishly mounted attempt to present itself as the third force can only be said to have been an abject — and, in fundamental political terms, highly significant — failure. The winning swing to the Gaullists took them from 37.75 p.c. in 1967 to 43.65 p.c. this time. Under their doctored electoral system 43.65 p.c. of the vote gave them 350 seats. Under proportional representation they would have got 205.

Abstentions play a big part in French elections. And of course they hit particularly at the side against whom the tide appears
to be running. The cry of "Tous aux urnes" ("Everyone to the polls") was much heard in the land in the week between the two rounds, especially from the Left. But this did not prevent left abstentionism from being a quite significant element. On the other hand, reports from the booths indicate that a significant proportion of Gaullist voters hadn't voted in any election since 1958, evidenced by their election registration cards being void of date stamps for all elections in the last ten years until this one.

Q: What were the reactions to De Gaulle's threats to use the army, to the release from jail of right-wing forces and to the banning of some political groups? And what actions were taken in response?

S: Of course democratic opinion in France, including the FCP, denounced de Gaulle's release of Salan and other OAS conspirators for the barefaced pre-election manoeuvre that it was. He just appeared to have so much trouble on his left he couldn't afford any opposition on his right. So the deed was done.

When the regime proscribed the ultra-left groupings there were limited protests. But it is profoundly characteristic of the time in France that the FCP made no protest. The stakes in the crisis were so great and political tempers at such a pitch that the CP's audience probably would not have understood a protest at the banning of groups who were acting as "objective allies" of the Gaullist power. Some people feel that a CP statement pointing out that while ultra-lefts had been banned, the ultra-right Occident organisation was left free to do its dirty work, and that this was an example of Gaullist bias, would have been appropriate. But not even this was done.

On the other hand, I have heard of no protests from the ultra-left against the murder in Arras of a young communist by Gaullist thugs on June 29. Though I suppose it should be said in fairness that since they are banned it is probably hard for them to raise their voice.

On this whole matter of the OAS and the "gauchiste" groupings, the remarkable thing to me has been how little comment and attention the pardons and the bannings have aroused. I expected there would be much more. I suppose it's an illustration of how really hard the game is played here. When the decisive issue was the possibility of a bloody confrontation between the big battalions of the working class and the repressive machinery of the state, a confrontation to which the OAS and the "gauchistes" alike are fundamentally irrelevant, it's probably not surprising that their different fates have aroused relatively little public attention.
Q: Various reports suggest that students and young workers are critical of the CP, that some student leaders are former CP members and that mercenaries joined in, and even took over some student protests (e.g. the stay-in at the Sorbonne and the Odeon Theatre). Could you comment?

S: When we speak of the students in France today, I think we should have firmly in mind three different things.

Firstly, that the majority of France's 600,000 students are not left at all, but conservative. The biggest student participation in any demonstration in Paris in the course of the crisis was a rightwing one — the Champs Elysees parade after de Gaulle's speech on May 30.

Secondly, that there is a strong left trend among the students, a profoundly healthy and positive trend, born of the rejection by a significant proportion of the student body of the French bourgeois university and bourgeois society in general. This is a trend which is really viable, and will, one hopes, determine the complexion of French university life in the future and for a long time to come.

Thirdly, that there are ultra-left political groupings of long standing, not necessarily connected with the student world at all — the PSU, the trotskyists, the maoists (not so old and not so influential) and the anarchists (not so influential as the world publicity given to their black flags in the May-June student demonstrations would make them out to be) — which had a determining influence on the left student movement during the crisis. This influence is being contested now, and no doubt will continue to be contested in the future.

Certainly in these circumstances a number of students are critical of the CP. It is also true that a number of former members of the Communist Students' Union, who left after a split in that organisation culminating in 1965, were active in one of the most important of the ultra-left bodies, the Jeunesse Communiste Revolutionnaire (trotskyist in orientation) in the course of the crisis. There is no doubt that the split in the communist student body had its effect, short and long term, on the whole student scene in France.

The so-called 'Katangais' — an armed group led by a former mercenary in the Congo — did get into the Sorbonne, and a lot of jailbirds and other undesirable elements got in with them too. But one of the really encouraging things about the end of the Sorbonne occupation — it was not a glorious end — was that it was students themselves who booted the Katangais and the other riffraff out.
France's communist youth organisations, especially the students, had a difficult row to hoe in the recent crisis. Fundamentally opposed to barricade tactics, they nevertheless showed great moral — and physical — courage by going into the Latin Quarter day and night selling *l'Humanité* and explaining their point of view to other students in the heat of the battle. There was a Communist Students' Union stand in the Sorbonne throughout the occupation. In fact the Union gained 2,000 new members in the course of May-June, and now has about 7,000 members throughout the country.

One fact not sufficiently known abroad is that in other University centres in France — Lille, Nancy, Besancon, Lyon are examples — where the Communist Students' Union plays a prominent role in student leadership, there were none of the student-worker contradictions to be seen in Paris, and not much barricade tactics either. Occupations of faculties were carried out, but generally in a way that mobilised public opinion towards the students and did not drive it away.

There is every reason to believe that when the new academic year opens and the student left has had time to digest something of the recent experiences, the Communist Students' Union will find new favor — although no one expects miracles here.

The measure of opposition of young workers to the CP (and the CGT more particularly) was not nearly as significant as in the student world and had nothing like the weight it was given in some press reports. The March 22 Movement of Daniel Cohn-Bendit and the trotskyist groupings put in a lot of work in late May and early June trying to mobilise young workers against the CGT. But I haven't been able to come across more than a few isolated cases where they enjoyed any success. The Renault plant at Flins outside Paris, where many of the young workers are fresh off the farm and still go back to it at night, was one such place.

Q: It is well known that Jean Paul Sartre, the journal *Les Temps Modernes*, Claude Bordet and the journal *Nouvel Observateur* have considerable influence amongst sections of the left in France and abroad. It is now stated that anarchists (and presumably their publications) and trotskyists, including *Drapeau Rouge*, have a growing influence. What positions did these men and the various publications take to the recent events? Has Sartre, for example, joined in the view that the CP has abandoned revolution for parliamentarism?

S: Jean-Paul Sartre's *Les Temps Modernes* and the *Nouvel Observateur* both in slightly different ways are influential among sections
of the left. By and large they take the position that the CP is spent as a revolutionary force. Not only they take this position by the way — it’s very much a la mode here to say this. It’s an idea which runs right across the political spectrum to the Catholic l’Esprit.

In the elections, after slamming the CP and the Federation of the Left for all they were worth, they nevertheless joined in advocating a vote for the single left candidate in the second round. Sartre’s name was on a poster much seen around Paris in which a number of prominent intellectuals made this appeal on the eve of the second round on June 30. The PSU also advocated a vote for the single candidate. The CP and the Federation had an ad hoc agreement with the PSU in the second round.

The trotskyist, maoist and anarchist groupings, with differences between them, largely limited their campaigning to the slogan “Elections Treason.” As far as I know they didn’t advocate a vote for anyone. It could be that some elements among them did. But their publications are hard to come by and I may be wrong here.

Of course, the ultra-left especially the trotskyists, are part of the scene here, and have been for a long time. But apart from the situation mentioned above in the student world, and some tendencies in the leadership of the PSU and (associated with the PSU) in the second trade union centre of France, the CFDT, there is no great rise in their influence.

One of the things the FCP says — and it says it with great firmness and confidence — is that “leftism” is not just a passing phase, but a “permanent temptation” for the working class movement. This is based on experience with trotskyists, for example, going back to 1925.

The FCP also says that its strategy of long and patient work to build the unity of the left and democratic forces in the nation, to create a mass political situation of the isolation of the forces of the right, inevitably carries with it the danger of opening a flank to attack from the ultra-left. This is something they feel they just have to live with — although “living with it” does not mean that the FCP will not, in the light of May-June, launch a full-scale onslaught on “gauchisme.” Waldeck Rochet already foreshadowed it in his report to the FCP Central Committee on July 8-9.

One of the new facts they have to contend with, of course, is that “gauchisme,” in at least some of its elements, is now
actively supported by the Paris Embassy of at least one socialist country. Certainly the trotskyists, maoists and anarchists are not going to disappear overnight. Nor are they going to take Paris by storm.

Q: Reports here say the CGT has grown considerably, as has the CP. Have other left forces grown too and to what do you attribute the growth in each case?

S: The CGT gained 400,000 new members in the course of the strike movement and founded 6,000 new trade union organisations. Unquestionably it emerged, on a national scale, with greatly enhanced prestige from the crisis. M. Marcel Caille, secretary of the CGT, gave me these figures.

The Communist Party gained 23,000 new members in the two-month period, 17,000 of them young people. It has won 48,000 new members since the beginning of the year. These figures are published in *Humanite*.

The PSU grew from 12,000 to 25,000, according to Jean-Pierre Masson, a PSU member and a vice-president of l'UNEF, the student body, whom I interviewed.

In an upsurge of this character, which represents a coming to political consciousness of literally millions of people, it is, I suppose, natural that the Left should grow.

My personal opinion is that in the recent crisis one joined the CP or the PSU (to counterpose these two) on the basis of whether one preferred the calm and sober attitude of the FCP, with all its occasional infelicities of expression, or what one writer called the "revolutionary mysticism" of the PSU. But that, as I say, is only a personal opinion.

Q: Mendes France has been presented as the man most identified with the revolutionary students' and workers' demands, yet was himself defeated in the elections. Could you comment on this?

S: One of the things which has fascinated me most on this visit to France has been the extraordinary mobility of political life. Take the names of parties. The Gaullists up to the beginning of June were the UNR, then for the purposes of the elections they became the UDR (Union for the Defence of the Republic) and then after the elections, when they were safely home and the Republic was no longer "in danger," overnight they became last week, still UDR, but "Union Democratique de la Republique."

Well, of all the mobile elements in French political life, Mendes-France is about the most mobile. He is praised by Cohn-Bendit
("Mendes is the least bad of the stars"), and he received a handwritten letter (a rare honour) from de Gaulle condoling with him on the death of his wife.

Typical is the fact that while he is a member of the PSU, he is not a leader of this party, although he is one of the half-dozen best known political figures in the country.

But despite all the ambiguity, Mendes has a role. This role, it seems to me, is as left reserve man for the big French bourgeoisie. He lost in Grenoble because his role requires that one constant of his career should be that he holds a position to the left of centre — and the left lost everywhere in these elections, even the big bourgeois left. Mendes demonstrated his position in 1954 when the French bourgeoisie decided it had to liquidate the Indo-China war. No other politician could be found with the necessary qualities to do this. He thought his hour had struck again in the closing days of May, 1968. But he miscalculated. Not that the last has been heard of Mendes-France by any means.

Q: Since some criticism of the CP suggests its "revisionism" is of long duration and one example, often quoted, is the CP's support for financial credits to the then government during the early stages of the Algerian war, could you comment and provide information of any critical appraisal by the non-CP left of the past record of Mendes-France, who was the head of that Government?

S: No, the non-CP left has a curious blind spot here. Not only did Mendes-France launch the war of repression in Algeria, but when he was piloting the Indo-China peace through the National Assembly a few months before he made it a point of honor that he would not consider he had a majority unless it was a majority excluding the votes of the communist deputies.

Q: If, as it appears, many workers made gains within the system what now is the concept of the various sections of the left to win a majority for revolutionary change?

S: As far as the FCP is concerned, the immediate task of workers is to struggle to consolidate and expand the gains won in the strike movement. The situation in the factories, after the massive upheaval of May-June, should favor this.

The Nanterre meeting of the Central Committee of the FCP made it quite plain that there will be no change in the strategy of left unity pursued with considerable success over recent years. There will be — already are — strains within the Federation
of the Left over continued association with the communists, but, at least at this stage, the prognostications are not unduly pessimistic as far as the preservation of the alliance is concerned. What will undoubtedly count heavily here is the attitude of the Socialist Party, the big party in the Federation (more than 40 of its 57 deputies). It appears that Guy Mollet, Socialist Party leader, is likely to play a positive role here. The choice before the Federation is whether to seek openings to the centre, aiming at “third force” governments like those of the period 1947-58, or whether to cleave to the left orientation of alliance with the communists.

The PSU, and the various left groupings now in “de facto” alliance with it, are putting a big effort into local action committees, nominally consisting of workers and students. It seems they are concerned to prepare for more “grands soirs” like those of May and June.

There is considerable debate in the ultra-left over whether a new party should be formed. Consensus of opinion at present seems to be that the time is not ripe. But this is certainly on the agenda — a new party designed to supplant and outflank the FCP to the left.

In the student world, the PSU-influenced leadership is putting forward the idea of a “student party,” which would serve as a house for both “reformists” (who want a struggle conducted on student demands in the University) and “revolutionaries” (who want to “contest the capitalist system”). The vice-president of l’UNEF, PSU man Jacques Sauvageot, has off his own bat announced that the revolutionaries in l’UNEF will reoccupy the faculties when the academic year opens.

The FCP appears united in its determination to continue with its “unitary” strategy. As for the rest of the left, there is some confusion, with pressures working for moves both to left and right.

Q: One immediate result of the continuation of Gaullism is a new round of French nuclear tests in the Pacific but what attitude did each section of the left have on foreign policy and what part did this play in the elections?

S: The one aspect of foreign policy which got much attention at all in these egocentric French elections was the Gaullist nuclear striking force. As for the rest of the world, it might not have been there. Certainly there were ritual references to some foreign policy questions, but the elections were the issue of an acute domestic political crisis — and they sounded like it.
Of course, in reality, foreign policy questions are important in France. It is on foreign policy questions, for example, that the greatest obstacles exist to the common governmental programme sought by the communists with the Federation of the Left.

But the many positive aspects of the Gaullist foreign policy have taken much of the sting out of the foreign policy debate in the country over recent times.

One interesting feature of the elections is how de Gaulle's brazen anti-communist demagogy during the campaign will affect his relations with the socialist countries. It is not the smallest irony of the French crisis that the great man had to fly back from Rumania, where he had been outdoing himself in flattery of the Rumanian leadership, to start accusing other Frenchmen of planning to set up a “totalitarian dictatorship” like the one in which he had just been feted.

I cannot close without a reference to the splendid work being done by the French Communist Party in solidarity with Vietnam. I talked to Henri Martin, the sailor hero of the opposition to the French war in Vietnam in the early '50's, about it. It is really most impressive. One of the pleasantest things about being in Paris just now is to be able to observe the cordiality of the relations between the French communists and the Vietnamese delegation to the official conversations with the United States. A very big effort of solidarity with Vietnam is planned here for July 20, 14th anniversary of the signing of the Geneva Agreements.

EVERY RADICAL OPPOSITION to the existing system; which is attempting to prevent us from creating conditions under which man can lead a creative life, without war, hunger and repressive work; must necessarily be global. The globalisation of the revolutionary forces is the most important task of the whole historical period in which we are living and working for human emancipation.

THE SELF-PRESERVATION of bourgeois society and the destruction of man's human qualities coincide increasingly all the time.

POLITICAL ACTIONS which do not lead to inner changes of the participants are manipulation by elites.

— from “The Rebellion of Students” by Rudi Dutschke.
STUDENT ACTIVISM

Interviews with Kirsner, Hannan, Cahill, Aarons, Thompson, Duncan and O'Brien — July 1968.

Many attempts have been made to define the radical and revolutionary student movement both nationally and as a world wide phenomenon. All aspects of the student revolt are subject to differing assessments, even amongst student leaders there is no agreement on its extent, motivation and potential. Australian Left Review asked student leaders from Melbourne, Adelaide, Sydney and Brisbane a number of questions, which we had been asking ourselves, in an effort to understand this important new contribution to the movement for social change. Here student leaders speak for themselves.

DOUGLAS KIRSNER, aged 21, 4th year honours Arts student at Melbourne University, member of MU Labor Club, member of the Liberal-Country Party Club (a club which disclaims any connection with the party of that name) member of the Australian Labor Party, member of the University Union Council.

GRANT HANNAN, aged 30, post graduate student in History at Monash, member of Monash New Left Club, Monash Labor Club and the Australian Labor Party, past editor of National "U".

ROWAN CAHILL, aged 22, 4th year history student at Sydney University, Director of Student Publications, member of the Australian Labor Party.

BRIAN AARONS, aged 23, tutor and post graduate student in Physics at New South Wales University, active in ALF (Action for Love and Freedom), member of the Communist Party of Australia.

MITCH THOMPSON, aged 23, Arts student at Queensland University, Society for Democratic Action leader.

PETER DUNCAN, aged 23, 4th year Law at Adelaide University, Editor of "On Dit", member of the Students Representative Council, member of the Socialist Club, ALP Club and Students for Democratic Action.

PETER O'BRIEN, aged 21, 4th year Law-Arts at Adelaide University, member of Students for Democratic Action, former member of the S.R.C. and editor of "On Dit".
How extensive is the radical student movement in your city and in Australia today?

KIRSNER: It depends what you mean by 'radical'. Those to the left of somebody like Jim Cairns comprise a relatively small percentage of students. There is a greater proportion of students who support the present Government than there is among the general population. However the radicals have a far greater influence than their numbers would indicate. There is a greater proportion of radicals than there was, say in the 'thirties.

HANNAN: The radical student movement is not extensive but in most places has the capability of growing quickly given appropriate conditions. For example in the University of Queensland in 1964/65 there were no more than 10 active radicals in a university with a day population of approximately 5000. Today the numbers would certainly be over 500 fairly committed and a following on some issues which would raise the number to about 1200. In Melbourne there is a small hard core, bigger than the hard core in Brisbane even now—but lacking the ability to lead larger numbers of students on specific issues.

CAHILL: It's not very extensive at Sydney and even less at Macquarie. At New South Wales there is really only ALF (Action for Love and Freedom) which has had a measure of success in bringing the administration before the students, but most students are indifferent. If you take Clark Kerr's formula from Berkeley that you need 1 per cent of the student body to be truly radical to develop a wider movement then we haven't got that at Sydney. We have about one-third of 1 per cent. There are higher levels of radicalism in both Brisbane and Melbourne but you can't "export revolution" as Queensland student leaders have tried to do. In Queensland till recently there has been no tradition of a student-left. In Sydney there has been some student-left since 1925 which engages in in-fighting and lacks solidarity. This does not help.

AARONS: It depends on how you look at it. Radical students are a small minority of the whole student body yet the size of Sydney's three universities means that absolutely they form a substantial grouping — about 300 I'd say. When compared with the membership of other radical youth organisations this is quite a reasonable number. I would imagine that the position in Sydney would pretty well reflect the situation in the rest of Australia.
THOMPSON: The radical student movement is more intensive than extensive. It represents sporadic student action on certain issues (Vietnam the main one) relevant to a particular campus and to specific conditions. It has been clearly shown that the movement occurs on all campuses but it lacks co-ordination, long term planning and permanency of structure. I would say that it is only now that other groups are following the lead of Brisbane S.D.A. (Society for Democratic Action) in setting up their own independent infra-structure, and long term planning. I think one may be optimistic of the future.

DUNCAN: The radical student movement in Adelaide is small at present — probably no more than 50 students, but it is growing. Overall in Australia there seems to be a rapid awakening to what the left has to offer and that the only way to get this is by radical action.

O'BRIEN: There are between 40 and 50 students at Adelaide University who would describe themselves as radical in the sense that they want a fundamental change in the structure of Australian society. These students are mainly centred around Students for Democratic Action. The Socialist Students' Alliance, formed last June, represents eleven or twelve radical student groups in all States except Western Australia and Tasmania.

What main causes, issues, events, contribute to the movement's development?

KIRSNER: the most important issue has been the Vietnam war which has provided a tangible rallying point for radicals. It constitutes a symbol of all that is bad in our society — deceit, violence, coercion, interference with other people's lives. Moreover, the Vietnam war is basically a moral issue for radicals. It has swung the tone of politics a little away from sheer pragmatism in a direction where concern for fellow human beings and principles can be counted as factors influencing decisions. The rise of Dr. Cairns is an example of this. The war has exposed the government on a large number of issues by providing a yawning "credibility gap". Students are questioning government action more than ever.

Australian universities have many of the conditions for which students overseas are fighting. Thus many of the springboards for action, such as lack of freedom of organisation on and off campus,
are missing from most Australian universities. However the government and university administrations can provide important catalysts for action by being openly repressive. Discipline and police brutality are examples. Students engaged in action can see the issues that underlie the particular demonstrations more easily. Thus a matter of discipline may make students more aware of the nature of the university, its role in society and what it ought to be. Police brutality may lead students to re-think their attitude towards state power.

HANNAN: Generally the Vietnam conflict has acted as a catalyst in student radical movements. However as experience in Queensland has shown, the way to larger numbers, to growth of strength is to be found in pursuing democratic rights by means of direct action.

CAHILL: I emphasise that I speak of a minority movement but the Vietnam war is the great issue. Most oppose the war on moral grounds or they oppose conscription and only a few say that the war is caused by US imperialism sticking its nose in where it doesn’t belong. The political opponents are seen by many, even some opponents of the war, as too extreme. Motives are suspected and they are called “communist”, a label which still has power to frighten people, even though some of the politically involved are critical of communists.

Another important issue is the treatment of Aborigines but this protest is quite respectable. In this sense it is different from Vietnam. As you consider the government policies which led to Vietnam you have to consider the need to destroy the government. In the case of the Aborigine struggle you can see it as one bad spot to be remedied.

Other factors facilitate the movement, the threats of violence from the authorities, restrictions from an authoritarian government, as in Queensland; intellectual ferment on the right as well as on the left, as in Melbourne; government intervention into universities, as at Monash. If Dunstan’s Labor Party, with its electoral majority and parliamentary minority is frustrated I would predict a new wave of student radicalism in Adelaide.

In Sydney the Humphries case crystallised some student action and the Free University has had a liberalising effect.

AARONS: These vary, but generally they can be classified under two headings, (a) social issues where students see something wrong in society at large and attempt to do something about it. Usually these involve moral and civil rights questions, e.g. Aboriginal rights and civil liberties in Queensland. In particular, the last four years
has seen the ever increasing importance of the war in Vietnam. The protest movement against the war has grown from small beginnings to the most significant Australian movement of recent times and students have played a big role in the development of this movement; (b) issues which affect students directly, perhaps exclusively e.g. student rights within the university, or the recent amendments to the National Service Act designed to make the universities serve as a pimping agency on students.

Traditionally, Australian students have always done more about the first than the second, but lately there has been a change in emphasis, this year has seen radicals at several universities increase their interest in specifically student issues mainly around the student power question. I think this is a good thing. One way for the radical student movement to grow is for it to take up issues which other students can closely identify with.

THOMPSON: Students are very unhappy about the present situation, their alienation from decision making in the university at all levels of administration to staff-student communication. But it goes beyond this to the factor that students are being motivated on value issues, such as Vietnam which goes beyond their immediate environmental effects which directly influences the alienation in a student. The students are realising the 'big lies' of the government and the instituted political parties. There is no need to elaborate on an analysis of the big lies, these are known to us, but we may see why the vanguard of the radical movement in Australia lies with the students. With the Vietnam war a reservation characteristic of the academic conflicted with the horrors of a genocidal war, and we were the ones conducting such bestiality. This contradiction of all our moral values was the point at which students began questioning the whole of society.

It is because we have access to sources on the structure of governmental systems, because some of us specifically study in this area, and because of greater mobility (due to lack of family responsibilities, etc.). We realise the full contradictions of capitalist society in the lack of decision making individuals have in saying how society should develop.

DUNCAN: I believe that Vietnam and civil liberties are the flux contributing to this development. I feel that the real motivating force is a deeper and more subtle dissatisfaction with life in our society as a whole.

O'BRIEN: The Vietnam war has been the main catalyst for the radicalisation of to-day's students. If a society can go along with a war like that there is something wrong with the society.
How much does the movement derive from Australian conditions and how much from student actions in other countries?

KIRSNER: Not only the student revolts but the general upsurge in revolutionary activity throughout the world has provided a great deal of inspiration to Australian student radicals. But we must be wary of using overseas models for Australian conditions. The point is that we can learn a lot from rebellions overseas but we mustn’t blindly emulate them. It is a matter, as it is in every other country, of assessing the environment and the possibilities for action and change within it.

HANNAN: The overseas student actions have an obvious effect on the hard core but a negligible effect on the body of students as a whole. The more successful movements are those which concentrate on problems which are close to the everyday life of the student and only gradually introduce bigger political questions.

CAHILL: Student radicalism in Australia is not just the transplanting of overseas experiences. There is a long tradition of a dissenting and revolutionary spirit in the labor movement. Dissenting students carry on that tradition, even if they don’t acknowledge it. Some of the style, rhetoric and even ideas have been taken from abroad but this is not a bad thing. As ideas are transposed they undergo change and are modified to become valid. If attempts are made to copy without adaptation then the ideas don’t work. Most overseas influences have been good, for example, the British New Left Review has infused new life into marxist studies here. The fact that overseas experiences are considered leads to new international attitudes as opposed to isolation. There is a feeling of solidarity with students in other countries and in particular, with the revolutionary people of Vietnam.

AARONS: Although there is an element of “importing revolution” — that is copying some ideas from overseas, particularly America — in the student movement, by and large it has developed from Australian conditions with its own ideas and forms of organisation.

Of course, events overseas do have an impact, sometimes quite a large one, on what happens here. The prime example is Vietnam. The heroism, sacrifice and effectiveness of the Vietnamese people in their fight against U.S. imperialist intervention have evoked admiration in many students, as with others in the community. I would say that this has been an important factor in the
radicalisation which has taken place in the student movement over the last two years. An interesting phenomenon here is that radical students, many of them critical of the official communist movement and "Marxism-Leninism" can take as one of their heroes Ho Chi Minh, a leading communist and "Marxist-Leninist". "Ho Ho Ho Chi Minh" has become a common cry at student demonstrations. In fact it is significant that the Vietnam struggle, led by communists, has been a focal point for student radicals the world over.

THOMPSON: I can only speak of our movement in Queensland, which began on a local level. Many of us felt a need to protest against the Vietnam war and conscription. It is without a doubt that these were the issues which provided the necessary catalyst for a student movement which began questioning the whole structure of society. The movement originates according to the specific issue and the conditions existent in Australian society. Although there are internationally held demonstrations and co-ordinated movements, this is only due to the fact that student action is a world-wide phenomenon, just as Marx's ideology is.

DUNCAN: In the short run obviously the incidents overseas have caused a greater interest in radicalism and a realisation of the power that students can exercise.

O'BRIEN: One of the overseas influences has been C. Wright Mills and his comments about students and intellectuals being an "agency for social change" seem to me to be fairly sound.

Do you agree with the concept of student power (a) within the universities, (b) in society?

How could student power be achieved and if it is achieved what would it do?

KIRSNER: 'Student power' is a much abused expression. One gets the impression of professors being appointed and dismissed by general meetings of 17-year-old students or of society being directed and run by a small band of inexperienced, rat-bag students. I don't think the students want this at all. 'Student power' is a term coined by non-students.

What the students want is a completely different society from that existing anywhere in the world today. Most don't think this can be achieved through the conventional methods of parliamentary
democracy involving political parties. Thus they engage in different sorts of action. The students do not want to control society.

On the contrary, they want people to control their own lives. But 'student power' is a reality to the extent to which students are an influential group. People speak of 'student power' mainly because student action on a large scale is a relatively recent phenomenon. The concept of students acting as a group does not fit the traditional framework. Students cannot be accommodated to a 'class' unless, perhaps, the 'lumpen proletariat' class in which Marx placed them together with layabouts and criminals of the worst sort. But this is hardly helpful today.

As for 'student power' in the universities, it would be an entire violation of the concept of a university as a community of scholars to give one section of this community power to make decisions for the whole. In many overseas universities students have no say in university matters, and it is there that 'student power' becomes relevant. Students are putting forward demands that they should have a significant say in decisions of the university, 'Administration' or 'Government power' is a reality in many universities and it is in reaction against this that students are rebelling. Of course staff should be able to pick their own courses and should not be dictated to by students but, by the same token, they must not be dictated to by the Government, the Defence Department or 'the wider needs of society'. Lecturers should be autonomous.

HANNAN: Yes I agree with the concept of 'student power' in the universities but I am not quite clear what is means by 'student power' in society. If it means that students concern themselves with taking a political role in society — outside the university — Yes. Student power in the university would be best approached by setting up dual centres of power — run by students and staff — which would rival the existing structures of power. If, for example, a students' discipline committee was set up as a rival to an Administration one it would attempt to sit in judgment of a student charged by the Administration before the Administration discipline committee.

Imagine the situation where a student discipline committee found a student not guilty, before he went before the Administration. If student-staff power were achieved, and I would take this to mean non-academic staff as well — in other words — workers' control — it would be a better centre of struggle against the bourgeois capitalist society than it is now. I would bitterly contest the view that universities as training places for a capitalist order should be destroyed. By and large universities are centres of struggle.

CAHILL: I certainly favour student power in the universities. Students should help to run the universities, change the curricula,
for example to ensure that there are courses on all the issues which will face students later in society. I have been aware, even in first year, that the university now is a training ground for middle class society. The problem is that student power isn’t well understood and it may be fobbed off with a few crumbs or by tricks of the liberal establishment. Since the French crisis most Vice Chancellors have given lip service to the importance of student radicalism, making apparent self criticisms. The problem is that it is hard to see where power resides now but student power should mean, above all, the removal of outside pressures and real student representation.

Externally the concept of student power in society sounds elitist. Students should have no more say than anyone else but students do have a tradition of influencing society and I would argue for radical student participation in general society issues. Students should use their education and training to help break through false rhetoric, for example, to help break the ideological case for support of the Vietnam war. If students get out in public with well conceived demonstrations they help disclose the nature of society. Ordinary citizens don’t usually understand that police violence is part of the power of the establishment.

AARONS: So far there hasn’t been any adequate definition of the term ‘student power’ but I think that most people would agree that it means basically a greater participation by students in the running of universities. On this definition student power in society is definitely out if it implies that students should run society; if it means they should participate more in society I would agree. Students, along with other young people, should be given more rights to participate in society and affect the direction in which it goes. Immediate and minimal demands here are obvious — lowering of the voting age to 18 and granting of full rights for youth to take part in social decision making — e.g. the right to stand for elections to all public bodies.

Above and beyond these formal aspects, intervention by students in the social process should be encouraged as part of the student power concept. It is obvious that students have played an important, often leading role, in many social movements of our time, and can exert influence beyond their numerical strength. An instance of this was the student “freedom ride” for Aborigines in February 1965, which aroused a dulled public conscience and helped the existing Aborigine movement in a dramatic way. This role of students as a critical and active social force will, I hope, become ever more important.
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The revolution in Mexican art began with the political revolution in 1910, and many of the artists joined in the uprising of 1913 against the regime of dictator Huerta. In the decades of turmoil, intervention and political manoeuvre which have followed, the artists have been pre-eminent in keeping alive the revolutionary spirit. Though aware of the modern art forms of Europe they aimed to re-vitalise the native stream of folk art. The result has been a modern renaissance of essentially popular art. The favourite means of expressions have been the most public media—graphic arts and murals. The Mexican mural painters have adorned schools, universities and public buildings of all kinds. Their works have kept alive the revolutionary tradition, scourged political opportunists, and created visions of the future. In no country are the ordinary people more aware of the nation's leading artists and their work.
Getting back to universities, I would say that the whole crux of the student power concept is involvement and participation by people in making the decisions which affect their lives. This doesn’t necessarily mean that students should, for instance, set their own exams (although I know of at least one university department which comes close to this) but it does mean that students, along with academic staff, should have adequate representation on university bodies at all levels. Student power can only be achieved if the majority of students want it and if they can find the way to persuade society that they should have it. That is a very general statement but the whole issue is so new and complex that it is hard to be more explicit. If it is achieved, student power could play a part in revitalising the universities — a process which would benefit the community in general as well as students.

THOMPSON: Yes, in both cases (a) and (b). Student action can be achieved at the university in the beginning by forming an identifiable organisation with headquarters or a meeting place where students can congregate.

Before we can talk about achieving student power we must analyse what it means to us, and then work out a systematic means of tactics and strategy to achieve it. I define student power as direct student participation and control in the management of the university and student participation in the decision making apparatus of society. It means the rights of students to self management of their university and that students will play a role in deciding the development of society.

What is needed in a program of student power is to establish the nature of the movement and a series of concrete demands. This may be achieved by a wide student campaign of leafleting, forums, etc., on campus followed by action. Two points must be remembered: 1, a constant education campaign, extensively through campus leafleting and intensively through the media of discussion at headquarters or by means of a Free University (anti-University) non-institutional organisation; 2, an independent financial organisation, with full-time organisers.

An example must be set at University where courses and decision making dealing with any issue affecting students and staff must come from them. It is important that the movement of student power be not isolated, otherwise it loses its meaning. Student power is not just an on campus factor, it must be directed to changing society. To
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this end, university students must challenge the very basis of power in capitalist society by linking with workers, teachers, technical students and high school students. It is only a combination of the meaningful power of all these groups that can bring about change. Once this is achieved we will have passed through the transitional stage to socialism, for student power is part of the means towards which socialism may be achieved.

DUNCAN: I agree with the concept of student power in both the universities and in society generally. We, as students, are part of an aware minority and have an obligation to the rest of society to try and improve it and to show others how to improve it and this means student power.

My concept of student power is that it is not something "to be achieved". It is more a means of gaining the sort of things we desire to see. Student power is not students in control but the ability of students to act as a pressure group to exert the force of change onto people exercising power, whether this be a government, trade unions or other organisations exercising power.

O'BRIEN: I agree with student power in so much as it means a participatory democracy for students which is essential in a university. In society if students create a "counter-milieux" the overall society can perhaps be improved.

What is your attitude to traditional organisations of the radical movement — the trade unions, the Australian Labor Party, the Communist Party of Australia, etc.?

KIRSNER: I regard these as part of a general movement to change society in the direction I want, and thus view them in a friendly way. Naturally I have disagreements with many of their policies, and I realise they don't have all the answers. But neither has anyone. The point is to co-operate. The traditional radical organisations have many supporters, and a policy of spurning these would ensure that no new society could be reached, for students alone cannot achieve the fundamental changes they desire. The Left is a movement not an organisation. Within the movement there are and ought to be many strains of thought and action. In a society where the Left is a minority, an attitude of divisiveness can only lead to the continuation of minority support.

HANNAN: All organisations of the left are worthwhile and should co-operate as much as possible. This however would not include the
Whitlamite wing of the ALP and trade unions with similar leadership.

CAHILL: For too long the left has chopped itself up in battles which are both ideological and personal. Everyone on the left needs to cooperate but since the whole of the ALP is sometimes called the left I would qualify this and say that everyone but the right in the ALP should cooperate. This is the way to become an effective force. We need cooperation between all the forces that are for socialism and between all those who believe that Australia should get out of Vietnam. In general terms I support the trade unions and I see nothing wrong in cooperation with communists, in the peace movement or directly.

AARONS: It's hard to express an attitude briefly but in general I support the concept of trade unionism and many of the activities which Australian trade unions engage in. I would like to see less bureaucracy and conservatism and more involvement in social issues but these, of course, are matters for the union members themselves. The ALP I regard as important, in that it is the party which the Australian workers at present support. Its weaknesses as a vehicle for radical social change are well known, but it seems to me that there is a fundamental point here which is often overlooked. The ALP is a system of checks and balances which acts more like a mirror than a light source in that it tends to reflect political issues and ideas rather than create them. Whatever your perspectives for the ALP — and these vary from extreme right to extreme left — if you are a radical you must see the need for a political organisation which will serve as a light source and help to change people's attitudes and ideas. This brings me to the CPA. Whatever else it is or isn't (opinions here also vary widely between the extreme right and left point of view!) the CPA is the only political party in Australia today which offers a radical alternative to the status quo. Assuming that a political party is needed in order to achieve radical social change, the CP becomes an important organisation for radicals.

If a revolutionary party is needed and you don't think the CP is it, then another will have to be formed. Personally, I think the CPA is on the right track and therefore I am a member. The problem is for the CP to become the sort of party which most socialists and radicals can join, and conversely, for radicals to help this process by joining or in some way making their views known to the party.

THOMPSON: The traditional organisations are unfortunately, at the moment, very much a part of the established institution in the very best tradition of left conservatism. Of course this is not applicable to every group but it is applicable over all to the opposi-
tion institutions in Australia. What is desperately missing in these bodies is the need to organise the workers on the basis of self-management of industry. This is a potentially very powerful weapon (witness the French insurrection) which is not used because of the total concentration on simple economic issues — more wages, fewer hours. These groups have lost the foresight to continue the struggle on all levels, and this is not more evident than in the trade union weakness in accepting the harbinger of capitalism — the Arbitration system.

DUNCAN: I give general support to the Labor Party as the most acceptable of two evils within the present system so I am inclined to favour a policy of "don't rock the boat" near election times. Under the present system the Communist Party is in a political wilderness and so I think it is following the wrong course. It is likely to find itself in the rear of any radical movements in Australia — even side show revolutions over particular issues.

O'BRIEN: As far as the existing parties are concerned I think that the Communist Party is the most acceptable.

What changes, if any, would you like to see in the traditional radical organisations?

KIRSNER: This is a very general question indeed but I suppose, to answer in generalities, these organisations should adopt a more principled stand on a number of issues. The ALP would be far better under a left-wing Parliamentary leadership. There should be more participation from the membership and a rethinking of party policy along principles, as opposed to pragmatic lines. It should not become a shadow Liberal Party. The Communist Party, I think, should be in the forefront of the struggle for socialism and individual rights. It may well be doing a good deal in the trade union movement but outside this it often lags behind much of the radical movement. I don't think it should worry about being 'respectable' — a part of the established political system.

HANNAN: There are so many changes I would want to see that it would take me too long to attempt to make a list here.

CAHILL: I think the Labor Party should stop being a liberal democratic party and become a real socialist party. Too many members of the ALP have an aversion towards socialism, they tone down policy; for example Whitlam has made Vietnam policy
very vague, in an attempt to gain power. This is wrong. Given a
decent use of the mass media it would be possible to create respect
for socialism and to win a majority to support a policy of ending
Vietnam involvement. I would support Cairns rather than Whitlam.
I believe changes will come to the ALP because the intellectuals and
students who join the ALP tend to be on the left and they should
be able to work with the left trade unionists to win the rank and file.
The groundswell is of the left and what has to be defeated is
really an administrative machine.

I don't know much about the trade unions but I recognise that
they too reflect the left and the right. I see them as organisations
reflecting the whole of the working class and I urge, as Laver does,
a break down in barriers between workers and students. The work­
ers should be assisted to realise that factories and universities have
much in common. We should support each other. There are
problems of course. In Paris the government sought to, and in
some measure succeeded, in buying off the workers with a wage
rise. It seems that most workers are just concerned with wages
and conditions. They see this as one bad spot in the system and
they don't realise that to gain better conditions they really need
to replace the system. This explains why there has not been enough
strong union action on Vietnam, except in a few instances. The
unions give Vietnam only sporadic treatment because much of the
working class isn't concerned. I think unions need to do more to
develop the consciousness of workers for them to have a more
conscious role. Amongst the politically conscious students some
say that the Communist Party is too bourgeois. In France too there
seemed to be some hesitancy by the communists. I don't know
what is wrong but I think the issue in dispute is how to conduct
revolutionary struggle. For my part I don't see anything particu­
larly wrong with the way the communists work here. Of course the
idea that the communists are part of a world wide conspiracy and
manipulate movements of dissent continues. It is part of the cold
war hysteria which should have died but it continues and is a
factor in keeping people away from the CP.

My starting point with all the traditional organisations is that if
you are a socialist you must be prepared to work with other socialists.
AARONS: I outlined some changes I should like to see in trade
unions in the previous question. The ALP I would like to see more
left wing; more committed to a socialist platform and less prone
to divisive faction fights, but somehow I don't see this happening.
I would like to see the CPA become larger, more dynamic, especially
at rank and file level and more influential.

THOMPSON: This requires too long an answer to give here but
part of the answer follows from what I said before about left conser-
vatism. There has to be a greater intellectual commitment. There is a need for militancy and an understanding of socialism. The present bureaucratic structures have to be changed and re-orientated to a more functional participatory method. What we are struggling for must be reflected in our own organisational structures.

DUNCAN: The list of changes I would like to see in the ALP would be too long to consider here. Suffice to say that it should follow Cairns rather than Whitlam. The CPA should become more outspoken — its policy of appeasement, followed at present, will, I believe, be shown to be futile.

O'BRIEN: I will confine my remarks to the changes needed in the Communist Party. It would be more acceptable to the student left if it got over its paranoia about being persecuted and returned to being a militant revolutionary party.

If a Federal election were held this year, whom would you advise student radicals to work and vote for?

KIRSNER: I am a member of the ALP.

HANNAN: The ALP (because it has some electoral chance). If there were any possibility of CPA electoral success then I would work for the CPA. The point about an ALP victory would be that it would help to open up the political spectrum to the left — with varying dogmas and depending on how much control Whitlam retains in the party — to help provide some sort of protection for the work of radical movement.

CAHILL: The ALP. This may sound like a climb down but the ALP is the only viable alternative. The CPA won’t field candidates in all electorates so it would be foolhardy to pretend they are an alternative government. One would have to work with the knowledge that if Whitlam’s policy took over, Vietnam involvement, in some form, would continue, some conscription would remain and Australia would still purchase those useless F111’s, but one could create a better situation to bring the Vietnam war to an end and you certainly would ensure better treatment for conscientious objectors.

AARONS: From what I have said before it’s fairly obvious that my answer is the CPA. I know the usual view is that it is hopeless to expect the CP to attract any sizeable vote and therefore worthless
to try. I think there are fairly good arguments against this view, but briefly I think I can back my case up by stating the problem in a negative way. There isn’t going to be any radical social change in Australia until some revolutionary party has sizeable popular support. This does not exist now, hence we have to create it. Actually, I have for some time now wondered whether the CP couldn’t obtain quite large votes if an enthusiastic and intensive campaign were waged by all the non-ALP left. Certainly the pessimism and do-nothing attitude of many, including party members, doesn’t help.

THOMPSON: I would advise student radicals to vote for the ALP. It is there that we must get a mass basis for a radical movement. But I would advise them also to work towards an extra-parliamentary machine which, in the future, could build up to an alternative political party. At the same time radicals should work within the Labor Party to radicalise it in an attempt to present a real opposition in parliament and not a mock opposition as it is now.

DUNCAN: I would support and advise radical students to work and vote for ALP candidates in an election.

O’BRIEN: In the event of an election I would advise students to vote for the CPA.

What do you think will happen to present-day student radicals after they graduate?

KIRSNER: A greater proportion of present-day radical students will remain radical than was the case in the past.

HANNAN: In a large number of cases student radicals will rapidly forget what the word radical means. An organisation is needed for these people to help them maintain their militancy.

CAHILL: As a radical now I plan to remain a radical and I will try to influence my children but I have a horrible suspicion that what happened in the past will happen again, our generation will have its Koestlers but then there are people in the universities from previous generations who can be vaguely termed left, people like Rude and Turner, and there are some in the mass media too. There may be a further concentration of radicals in universities as university staffs expand and this could help to maintain and develop radicalism.
AARONS: As in previous times this will depend on events and circumstances. Undoubtedly some will follow the classical staircase from radical heaven to conservative hell, others will become apathetic or uninterested in doing things but I think that many will keep their radical views and continue to fight for radical causes. Much will depend on the possibilities they see for achieving some of their aims.

THOMPSON: Many radical students after graduation will continue in either post-graduate work or will become professionals, or may enter certain areas where radical politics will have real meaning. If a student radical has an intellectual commitment to the movement then he will not accept professional status. This would be anathema, unless he was still involved in the process of radical political participation.

If radical students accept a non-political professional status then I say it is time now to produce professional radical groups in which they can continue certain radical activities.

I think that on the whole many will not be able to reconcile the differences between their involvement in on-campus radicalism and the off-campus life of the mundane a-political public.

DUNCAN: I honestly don't know what is likely to happen to present-day radical students when they graduate. I guess some will become frustrated dissenters within the system while others will become more radical and still others will fit comfortably into a middle class niche.

O'BRIEN: I really don't know what is likely to happen.

What does a democratic society mean to you?

KIRSNER: A democratic society is one in which people have control over their own lives. On these terms there is not a democratic society in the world today. In one way or another people are more or less manipulated or manipulated by those in power. To me a democratic society is very close to the marxist concept of anarcho-communism. Whether or not this ideal can be achieved in our life-times is not the point. The closer we approach the ideal, the more democratic will our society become. We must recognise that the individual's control of his own life is an intrinsic good. Any paternalistic concept of democracy,
such as parliamentary democracy treats the individual as passive, it takes the initiative away from him. Democracy should not be seen within the very narrow limits of parliamentary democracy, of voting. Voting can, at best, be a means of achieving democracy or self-determination.

HANNAN: A place where each person has the greatest amount of control over his life, his work and his recreation. It means worker control, participatory democracy and it means a great reduction in the power of the state.

CAHILL: It is easier to say what a democratic society is not and it is certainly not one where the mass media is centred on a few families or where industrial wealth is in a few hands. I would say that a democratic society would need to be socialist because I see that democracy only really becomes available under socialism but this does not mean that I see present socialist societies as democratic. I think the first essential is to remove the power of private property but from that base you have a long struggle to achieve a society that combines socialism and democracy.

AARONS: Much the same as to anyone else I suppose. If you want a definition I would say that a democracy is where the individual's rights, happiness and involvement in decision-making are the greatest possible, compatible with the welfare of society as a whole. Definitions don't help much, and obviously the contentious issues are your judgements of what is best at a given time. For myself, I would say that Australian society doesn't need to conscript young men to go to Vietnam, therefore conscription for this purpose is undemocratic. Similarly much of Australian censorship is unnecessary, and imposed in an authoritarian way — hence it also is undemocratic.

THOMPSON: A democratic society means to me that where the individual is not subjugated to the irrelevancy of an automaton but has access to the means of decision-making, where there isn't the economic insecurity that plagues Western capitalist society, where pressure groups are represented in the decision-making apparatus, where one-third of the world's population is not starving.

It means an overall restructuring of society where workers' control of industry, students' control of their universities, in fact the people's control of the institutions in which they function and the whole apparatus of society, is a reality.

A democratic society should be concerned with the individual's full potential of creativity and productivity; where self-fulfilment is the motivating force, and not material incentives, where the
channels are open for the maximum participation of man in his environment in all media including culture, politics, arts.

A democratic society, in my view, is the antithesis of present-day Western capitalist society.

DUNCAN: I would not attempt in a few words to state what a democratic society means to me*.

O'BRIEN: I believe that a democratic society means participation at all levels of the decision making process by the broad mass together with the redistribution of the economic structure along socialist lines.

What is your attitude to socialism?

KIRSNER: I think that socialism is essential.

HANNAN: What I have said in respect to a democratic society is roughly what I hold to be socialism.

CAHILL: From what I have said it can be seen that I support socialism. I would say that socialism is necessary and to that extent inevitable but I would condition my statement by saying that I believe socialism could be put back a thousand years if the United States happened to win in Vietnam. If the US could force the Vietnamese to negotiate on American terms or if the US abandoned the present talks and undertook a large-scale invasion with nuclear weapons then this would be an open invitation to fascism. I don't think the Vietnamese will crumble and I see them as a bastion of the hopes of humanity.

AARONS: I support socialism, not so much as an end in itself but as a mean to an end — namely the progress of mankind. Socialism has not, does not and will not solve all man's problems, but it is the necessary condition for the solution of many of them. Socialism should be seen as the next framework within which man will progress until he decides he needs a new one. The present framework is definitely outmoded and constricting.

THOMPSON: The term socialism is intricately bound within the network of a democratic society. It necessarily must be a way of life

* On this question and the one that follows Peter Duncan said that the posing of the questions had led him to consider his own views more closely but that he would need to give both questions more thought.—Ed.
for man. It therefore requires the involvement of those points I have outlined as an integral necessity in the function of socialism. Socialism is the humanist principle and in terms of a flexible interpretation of Marx, is the necessary means to obtain man's liberation. But to me socialism means a lot more than what is practised in the formally structured dogmas such as Russia. A creative marxist approach is what we require, one that does not accept or compromise with the contradictions of capitalist societies and for that matter some of the present bureaucratic communist countries.

I consider that the logical extension of student power and workers' power is the socialist society. To me, socialism is the only means and way of life by which one can obtain the final state where organisations and institutions based on authority and force no longer exist.

O'BIEN: I myself am a socialist. I believe that an ideology is necessary for a transition to socialism. Socialism would require some form of nationalisation and would include collective ownership. I tend to have a view in support of Bakunin, in his difference with Marx, that despotism is bound up with any form of government.

There is a lot of seeking amongst our people but we know more of what we are against than what we are for.

Australia needs a real alternative which the A.L.P. cannot provide. It would seem that we need some alliance of the various groups seeking an alternative. Each section of those who want a new society, the workers in industry and the students at university, have the responsibility of changing their own environment. Each is an agency for change.

Editorial Note:

Because of pressure on available space in this issue of ALR the regular section, DISCUSSION, has not been included. Articles submitted by several contributors will now appear in the October-November issue.
An Austrian Marxist considers the political world view of Herbert Marcuse in an article originally titled, Prospects for 'Modern Industrial Society' — the Political World Scene According to Herbert Marcuse which first appeared in Weg und Ziel (No. 10, 1967), the theoretical journal of the Austrian Communist Party.

The writings of Marcuse are not so well known in this country, but his influence on young left, particularly student, circles is growing. Since this assessment was written Marcuse has further clarified his views and qualified some of the pessimism evident in his major works. This translation is by Jack Cohen.

THE CASE OF HERBERT MARCUSE is one of the most astonishing in the intellectual history of recent times. At one time on the staff of the Frankfurt Institute of Social Research, he later emigrated to the United States where he was always rather overshadowed by his former Institute colleagues, Adorno, Horkheimer and Fromm — and now, at one fell-swoop, he has suddenly become the idol of left-wing intellectuals in England, France, Italy and Western Germany. Every year sees new editions or translations of his books (published originally in the United States of America). Many of his own particular ideas and expressions now belong to the special, privileged, "in"-language of left-wing socialist students. Since 1964, when Marcuse first paid a return visit to Germany, the German translations of his books have had an incredible and profound effect.

Marcuse — philosopher, psychologist, sociologist — a man who knows his Marx and is greatly inspired by him, attempts analyses of modern society in a Marxist spirit, which are of great political importance. This is why, deliberately limiting the discussion of the problems raised in his writings, we wish to discuss his political world view in great detail.

Modern Industrial Society

Marcuse’s point of departure is the development of modern, "industrial society", the classical model of which is the USA. It is
as he sees it, a society in which domination over individuals is more intense than ever before; a society which grows ever larger and richer, in which technical progress has resulted in a tremendous increase in the level of efficiency and a high standard of living, and which therefore restricts and subdues all opposition forces. Basically it is a society without opposition, which rests on an alliance of the business world with a working class interested in the maintenance of the status quo. All needs and freedoms are manipulated by the mass media, the opinion-forming factories.

The various parties and newspapers simply extol, in various keys, the virtues of a system which has transformed democratic advances into instruments of domination. The artificially stimulated needs of the different classes are not essentially different. The same lipstick and the same TV programmes suit the families of both bosses and workers and in such a system the revolutionary potentialities of the working class fade away more and more.

The triad of a mighty apparatus of production, highly developed services and totalitarian opinion-forming factories makes the whole system work. A system in which former personal dependence is replaced by dependence on an “objective order,” on the industrialised society, one in which above all, the employers are interested in government contracts and government intervention. Since in any case the direction of enterprises is increasingly delegated to managers, Technology emerges as a new form of rule and domination and the working class is oppressed above all by the technical apparatus which “produces the amenities of life and increases labour productivity”.

It is technique above all which instrumentalises men, which operates as the “vehicle of objectification” and which appears more and more in the guise of management — as more and more consumers' goods are produced, so does the power of the bureaucracy increase. The effects of automation, which turns the worker more and more into a technician and which makes it impossible any longer to measure the degree of exploitation of the individual worker, the significance of “psychological energy” as opposed to physical energy, round off the features of modern industrial society.

Since increased living standards are unavoidable in this manipulated industrial society, the decreasing role of the oppositional forces is likewise an objective process. The working class is integrated in the welfare state, not simply a minority — the labor aristocracy — but, by and large, the whole class. The trade union leaderships are corrupted. They collaborate with the capitalists in joint Lobbies. The working class ceases to be an historical subject of the revolution. Those who are in opposition to modern industrial
society consist solely of the outsiders of society, the racially oppressed minorities, and those rejected types who have been called "white negroes" by Norman Mailer.

**West and East equated**

Marcuse takes the situation in the USA as his starting point and there is little in his analyses which we have not already encountered in the writing of C. Wright Mills, Vance Packard and Paul Baran. A characteristic feature of Marcuse's analysis is a certain vagueness in his description of the "technical society". He draws attention now and again to its class foundation but on the other hand, he declares this to be not simply a development inevitable in the capitalist countries of Western Europe, but also in the Socialist countries. This equalisation of East and West (Marcuse adopts, *inter alia*, the curious standpoint that democracy must advance in the socialist countries because of the place of technical control in modern industrialised society) is, occasionally interspersed with emphasis on the capitalist, class character of modern industrial society. Indeed towards the end of his book — *One Dimensional Man* (Routledge and Kegan Paul), Marcuse takes issue with many marxists, accusing them of having made a myth out of technique, of having underestimated the dependence of technique on extra-technical factors, a charge with which marxist readers are confronted continually as they read his books.

This is not the only woolly side of the always brilliant but frequently quite abstract presentation. What is also lacking is a concrete analysis of how the modern development of capitalism in the USA in all its aspects, is that towards which the advanced countries of Western Europe are proceeding. Many forms of modern capitalism and of state monopoly capitalism (nationalised sectors, state regulation) are much more pronounced in the capitalist countries of Western Europe than in the USA, a fact which is naturally of no mean importance with regard to the problems facing the Labor movement, which, in any case, has different traditions, has assumed different forms and, in the last analysis, has different kinds of trade unions in Western Europe than in the USA.

**One-dimensional thought**

One of Marcuse's fundamental ideas is that modern industrial society is a one-dimensional society with a one-dimensional consciousness and a one-dimensional way of life, one-dimensional thought and behaviour, including political behaviour, for the present differences and shades of opinion are merely "alternative techniques of manipulation and control". People have an irrational-rationality, a false consciousness imposed on them which is an acceptable kind of consciousness for the majority.
Only an elite feels fear, disgust and frustration, sensations, which can also be utilised for fascist ends. Language itself fixes and stabilises the meaning of words in the interests of the system, fixes the thought processes and decisions.

Transformed by the mass media, words become cliches and dominate language, both written and oral. People speak in the language of the advertisement, repeat what they are told by the opinion-forming factories. Ideas are ritualised and constitute the framework of the logic of a society which can permit itself to dispense with logic. Language becomes authoritarian because the means of communication have a quite hypnotic character and utilise language as an instrument of control. The language of politics is simply advertisement and the freedom of speech and thought guaranteed by constitutions do not in the least prevent the bringing of "one-dimensional man" into line (Gleichschnittung), the man whose free time is not really free because it is dominated by the mass media.

Two-dimensional culture which might project itself beyond the existing social system, "transcend" it, is incorporated into the established order. Sociology bases itself on detailed social research, reduces classes to groups and sections. Its empiricism is the ideology of one-dimensional society. One-dimensional philosophy abandons the conflict between essence and appearance in positivist fashion. Its one-dimensional analysis refrains from discussing the background of philosophical concepts; it is a self-sufficient, integrated part of the one-dimensional world. Cultural dimensions are likewise undermined. Literature and art no longer reflect agonised consciousness of a divided world. Art, robbed of its substance, is absorbed into the one-dimensional world in the same way. All conceivable alternatives become integrated into and essential elements of, one-dimensional society.

Marcuse's gruesome picture of the "co-ordination" (Gleichschnittung) of thought, although often open to discussion and disagreement in places, nevertheless possesses a fascinating power.

Repressive tolerance

The decisive means for containing all alternatives is "Repressive Tolerance" which is "firmly rooted in the increasing satisfaction of needs as well as in technological and intellectual "Gleichschnittung", which contribute to the general ineffectiveness of radical groups in a well-adjusted society" (Critique of Pure Tolerance — German edition, p. 105). Past democratic freedoms have lost their content. In view of the manipulation of people, general tolerance simply involves deception, on an even greater scale, especially as it is limited in any case by "institutional inequality". This is one
of the few passages in which Marcuse’s ruthless critique of bourgeois democracy is linked with an appreciation of its class basis.

The only attitude to this fraudulent repressive tolerance which integrates all alternatives, is one of total rejection and negation. Whoever accepts the rules of the game is integrated. It is on this basis that Marcuse accuses the great Communist Parties of France and Italy of being “doctors at the bedside of capitalism” (Praxis, Zagreb, 1965), the self-same capitalism whose rosy cheeks and robust bearing are vividly described by Marcuse himself. The organisation of demonstrations and all other forms of protest are really only an alibi for enslavement if they are organised within the framework of the system; if, for example, they are undertaken by a working class which has ceased to be a Factor and Subject of Revolution. The realisation of real tolerance must involve intolerance towards the dominant practices which tolerate conditions which one should not tolerate on any account. There must be no toleration for propagating rearmament, chauvinism, racism. The fight for real tolerance demands intolerance with regard to the militarisation of science.

It demands a “reversal of trends” which, in certain circumstances, may have to be achieved by undemocratic methods since, in the last analysis, all societies rest on force. It is necessary to achieve a form of living in which individuals are autonomous, in which maximum satisfaction of the most important needs can be secured on the basis of the minimum amount of labour and injustice.

Naïve?

All this sounds really good and radical, but it is fairly abstract, especially as the radical terminology emanates from a position of weakness, hopelessness and pessimism which do not simply arise from the actual problems of modern capitalism but also from the aloofness, naivety and lack of understanding with which Marcuse approaches political problems. Boycott the rules of the game of a fraudulent democracy? — Splendid. But when attempts are made to abolish the rules of the game themselves and there are reactionary groupings seeking to do away with formal tolerance itself, what should be the attitudes of the revolutionary forces? Marcuse himself says in one passage that this “totalitarian democracy” is better than a dictatorship which destroys all past achievements. Good, then these achievements must be defended against fascist, pro-fascist, or reactionary assaults; but one is then accepting the existing rule of the game and, according to Marcuse, one then becomes integrated into the system of repressive tolerance. The problem of the defence of existing gains, of the fight for their extension, is infinitely more complicated than the way Marcuse describes them in his grandiose formulations. As a consequence,
Marcuse's theses concerning "the reversal of trends", the necessity ultimately to use force against the system, the obligation to confront intolerance with intolerance, etc. dazzle rather than enlighten because they do not base themselves on concrete facts but on naive and beautiful images.

Marcuse says that the democratic freedoms of the past have lost their content and that new freedoms are necessary. Unfortunately, although one looks vainly for an answer to the questions — "what kind of freedoms and how are they to be won?", one may find the assertion that even participation by the workers in the control of the factories would involve no real change as long as the working class is a basis of support for the regime. But this kind of statement hardly helps to solve the difficult problems connected with the fight to secure joint participation and consultation by workers in the factories. Here we are really at grips with new freedoms which go beyond the system of "Repressive Tolerance". And those who understand their Lenin will also know that one cannot accept the idea that this struggle is useless as long as the working class is not ready to change the social structure. What is necessary is to develop the consciousness of the workers precisely during the course of the struggle for realisable demands, to utilise "lightning flashes" in the consciousness of the workers, as Lenin calls them, in order to inject knowledge of important connections and necessities.

This example of Marcuse's ideas is of course not really important, since, as he is obviously dominated by the situation in the USA, he has no real hope that the working class will make any worthwhile contribution to the overthrow of the fraudulent system.

Hope in hopelessness

Marcuse regards this overthrow as absolutely essential. The equalisation of East and West is only occasional and the critique of modern industrial society develops unequivocally into a critique of modern capitalism, as can be seen in this passage: "... the increasing irrationality of the whole; waste and restriction of productivity; the need for aggressive expansion; the constant threat of war; intensified exploitation; dehumanisation". (One-Dimensional Man, p. 252). And the alternative to all this is a socialist one even though, in general, Marcuse tends to avoid using the term — "existence in free time on the basis of fulfilled vital needs" (p.231); "... the planned utilisation of resources for the satisfaction of vital needs with the minimum of toil, the transformation of leisure into free time, the pacification of the struggle for existence" (pp.252-253).

And, adds Marcuse, this transformation consists in the reasonable organisation of the realm of necessity, in liberating technique from
its exploitative features, in eliminating and diminishing step by step, power as the fundamental motive, in transforming the masses into a host of individuals and, as a result of a new definition of needs (how blessed it would be, sighs Marcuse, if we could only do away with advertisements and television) re-establish the right of privacy, the decisive basis of which is the social-control of production and distribution.

Without going into details, it is the necessity for a socialist alternative which is emphasised by Marcuse. And he becomes more explicit when he speaks of those shining hours in the history of humanity when brief explosions shattered the continuity of injustice and cruelty. Marcuse cites as examples, after the English and French bourgeois revolutions — the Chinese and Cuban revolutions (it is typical of his approach that he never even mentions the October Revolution). In addition, Marcuse does not hesitate to speak of the possibility of developing resistance to the point of overthrowing the system of repressive tolerance by force where legal means prove to be inadequate, and he has great fun attacking those who advocate non-violent ways, although it has to be said that Marcuse's own statements about the possibility of using force are general in the extreme.

The forces of opposition

But all this is closely connected with Marcuse's ideas about the forces which embody "real consciousness as against the irrationality which exists" and the hope for a necessary historical alternative within the pervading hopelessness. These ideas bear the indelible stamp of the situation in the USA, nevertheless Marcuse regards them as valid for all advanced capitalist countries.

We have already mentioned the fact that Marcuse no longer regards the working class as a Factor and Subject of the Revolution. Only when it attains consciousness of the irrationality of existing society and of the deceptiveness of repressive tolerance, can it become an element of negating practice. He has his doubts about the possibility of this happening. The only chance he sees are the eventual struggles by the workers against the effects of automation, that is, struggles against the advance of technology, an advance which he himself says is the foundation for domination in modern industrial society. For him, the potentially real, revolutionary forces are above all, those strata "which constitute the human basis of the pyramid, the outsiders and the poor, the unemployed and the unemployable, the persecuted colored races, the inmates of prisons and madhouses". These strata stand outside the system and the rules of its game; they constitute an opposition from outside even though they still lack a revolutionary consciousness.
The revolts which took place this summer, in which white unemployed workers often fought side by side with Negroes, seem to confirm Marcuse's ideas in many respects, at least as far as the USA is concerned, even though what was significant about them was that it was precisely the Negroes living in the industrial North who led them and not those of the backward South — quite apart from the fact that these struggles did not witness that unification of the most exploited sections of humanity with those of the most advanced and critical intellectuals, which Marcuse regards as providing the great world historical opportunity.

For Marcuse attributes the leading role in "the reversal of trends" to people who have learned to think rationally and for themselves, to that small handful of intellectuals who expose the false consciousness, who, scattered and isolated in modest positions and out of the way places, pave the way for reflection and, by means of radical criticism and the discrediting of the system of repressive tolerance, create the pre-conditions for the intellectual overthrow of the system.

"Critical Theory"

The advance of freedom depends more than ever on the advance of the consciousness of freedom. Marcuse's sympathies are with the students most of all, because in politics and in sexual matters, they make it clear that they do not recognise the rules of the system, also with those scientists in the USA who refuse to work for the state or the big corporations and seek to safeguard their independence by taking inferior jobs in small towns.

"Critical theory" — this is the formula which Marcuse uses to indicate marxism especially — is re-affirmed and corroborated by the necessity for an historical alternative. It understands what is possible and what is necessary, but practice does not correspond to it. The dialectical concepts reveal themselves as hopeless because the working class lacks a correct consciousness as a basis for correct practice. The German sociologist — Habermas — wrote that correct theory finds no takers amongst the working class.

Then is the theory correct at all? And can "critical theory" content itself simply with referring to a few basic principles without being able to outline the possibility and necessity for a "reversal of trends" even on the basis of a changed situation?

Marcuse writes that the theory remains negative because it promises nothing and can point to no successes; this last point surely applies only to the advanced capitalist countries. But has everything been done in these countries to adapt the theory to these developments?
The weakest side of Marcuse's ideas is precisely that they do not attempt to solve this question in particular and content themselves with the thought that it may perhaps be possible to change society from its outer perimeter for there are no Negroes in Western Europe.

Problems and perspectives

Marcuse raises problems which require serious discussion. His critique of the fraudulent character of bourgeois democracy is brilliant, ruthless and witty, but it contains blurred edges and unclarities because although the class basis of the "repressive tolerance" is outlined, there is hardly any mention of Big Capital or of the monopolies. One need not necessarily be acquainted with Wright-Mills' outstanding study of the Power Elite in the USA — the merging and inter-connection of state, the economy and the army to justify the statement that it is not possible to analyse manipulation in modern, industrial society, the role of the opinion-forming factories and the control of public opinion in one-dimensional society in isolation, separate from the monopolies. The managers and technicians despite their undoubted autonomy, remain executives acting on behalf of a social stratum whose power must be limited and ended if those social aims which Marcuse himself supports, are to be realised. Deficiencies in the analysis also have the effect of making it impossible to develop a clear outline of the line of battle. This is the significance of nationalisation measures which have been won as struggle, which must go hand in hand with forms of workers' control, for the basic fact still remains that though the social ownership of the means of production does not yet mean socialism, there can be no socialism without it.

The occasional equalisation of "modern industrial society" in the West with that in the East likewise makes it more difficult to clarify and make more precise the practice which Marcuse demands. It is incontestable that industrialisation and the gigantic development of technique create problems which need not necessarily be different in countries with different social systems. Nevertheless, the problems of democratisation, of struggle for real tolerance, the effects of automation, etc. are different in those countries where the decisive means of production have been taken away from the capitalists. One cannot content oneself with referring simply to the very serious problem of bureaucracy and use this as a magic formula, making a differentiated analysis superfluous.

New freedoms

It seems to us that it is no accident that Marcuse's reference to the "critical theory" lacks recognition of the sharpening con-
tradications between the social character of production and the private ownership of the means of production. But this phenomenon which, in the period of monopoly capitalism substantiates the "critical theory" absolutely, and which underlines the anachronism, senselessness and the historically outdated character of the capitalist ownership of the means of production, is of enormous significance for the whole aim of socialism. Amongst other things, it justifies a strategy directed towards the winning of workers' control and concentrating on joint participation by the workers in the factories even though large sections of the workers have not yet broken away from the false consciousness of modern industrial society.

Marcuse says that the freedoms of the past no longer suffice; we must win new ones. We have already said that one cannot renounce the freedoms of the past even though many of them have been robbed of their content to a considerable extent, otherwise one only assists the efforts of those groups whose aim is to do away with these freedoms altogether. And do not these efforts prove that despite their limited, gilded and undermined forms, these freedoms are not a matter of indifference?

But these new freedoms — in what should they consist? There is no doubt that in this regard Gramsci had a deeper insight when he said that one of the features of the inadequacy of bourgeois democracy is the fact that the citizen as producer is not much esteemed. And, in fact, this is one of the most obvious forms in which alienation is expressed, namely that the men on the shop floor — where they spend the greater part of their time and their energy — have no rights of control or of joint participation worth mentioning. The ending of this situation is a precondition for really making working men the leading force in society. The effects of automation, which are much more complicated than Marcuse imagines, only intensify these problems because automation demands higher qualifications from large numbers of workers and the necessity for a higher level of education for large sections of workers and employees.

**Role of the working class**

Here we come up against the thorny problem raised by Marcuse — one which he has raised before. Does the working class in general and in the advanced capitalist countries in particular, still play a progressive role? Has it not been hopelessly integrated into the system in the advanced capitalist countries? Marcuse's writings are an amalgam of different theories — those of the Chinese Communists that the village will conquer the town and that the backward countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America will play the decisive role in the conflict between capitalism and socialism; those of
Fanon, that the proletariat in the colonial and semi-colonial countries are a privileged stratum and that it is only the peasants in alliance with these sections of the lumpen-proletariat which distinguish themselves in the struggle, who can carry through the anti-colonial revolution; the strategy of the Cuban Communists expounded by Regis Debray, according to which the Revolution in Latin America must come from the hills to the towns because the towns corrupt and enfeeble the labor movement; and finally the outlook of Stokely Carmichael who proclaimed at the Havana Conference that the Negroes can expect nothing from the white workers in the capitalist countries.

Marcuse bases himself on the position in the USA and celebrates the unity of the ghettos and slums of the rich countries with the Vietnams of the "third world". We do not believe that the countries of the "third world" can renounce the solidarity of the labor movement in the capitalist countries if they are to achieve the "redistribution of wealth" demanded by Fanon. We are, nevertheless, confronted with a real problem which cannot be disposed of simply by reference to the "critical theory" — that of the function of intellectuals as the "connecting tissue of the nation" (Gramsci) especially, which has been criminally under-estimated by the labor movement for a long time. But without the backing of the working class these can be no "reversal of trends" which, as Marcuse himself says, requires the social control of production.

The outsiders of society, those rejected by the system, can certainly organise fairly large-scale revolts — but never revolution. The difficult task consists precisely in finding such slogans, solutions and aims as will lead the working people — whose numbers are constantly increasing — to higher aims, those which "transcend" the previous ones. The mere "boycott" of the system, which in practice can hardly amount to more than words, does no harm to the system. Even the "hippies" who, on occasion, refer to Marcuse, and who do not respect the rules of the game of "repressive tolerance", are regarded by those in power in the system as mere jokers whose activities cannot do any harm.

Marcuse ruthlessly attacks all ideologies which do not go beyond the system, which do not stimulate thought — about the possibility and necessity for its dissolution and which base themselves on the status quo, etc. But it seems to us that his criticism is to a certain extent unjust to a number of thinkers and to various ideas. But since his analysis of the system is not always particularly correct; since he abandons the revolutionary task of finding forms of revolutionary struggle appropriate to our time and to our world, even though he uses radical language, he can lay himself open to the accusation that his ideas and views can also be integrated, that
they do not really represent any great menace to the monopolies — especially as he hardly mentions them.

In the philosopher's brain

This applies at any rate to the books quoted; translations of works which were first published in the USA a few years ago.

In more recent writings, Marcuse is much more clear and precise, especially in the July issue of the Kursbuch, in which he says that the "chances for liberation exist primarily when the means of production are socialised. The political economy of socialist countries requires peace, not aggressive expansion". He adopted a much more concrete position, in many ways, in his otherwise not so fortunate interview with Der Spiegel (August 21st, 1967). In this he referred specifically to big capital even though in slightly muted form, when he described the system which needs to be overthrown as that of "the big trusts, their publicists, politicians and consumers". In the same interview, directing pungent irony at himself, he said — "the powers that be can take the fact that I can travel anywhere here and say everything I want to, because they know quite well that they have nothing to fear from the Professor". The powers that be are not quite so accommodating with other forces which aim to "transcend" them.

There remains, to be sure, the great vision of an intellectual and moral revolution — one which we also share because "modern industrial society has now reached a point where new people are not only possible but also essential". The Revolution matures in the philosopher's brain, wrote the young Marx, also in the ideas of Professor Marcuse, even though we regard some of them as inadequate and incorrect.

MARCUSE — A Pamphlet containing several of his essays.

Available now for 10 cents per copy, bulk orders of ten or more, 8 cents per copy.

Write to the Communist Party of Australia, 168 Day Street, Sydney, 2000 for this Communist Party publication.
Jim Baird

BUDGET PROSPECTS

A research officer of the AEU, Boilermakers', Blacksmiths' Combined Research Centre considers the link between the Federal Budget and the first annual wage review which are both scheduled for August. He argues that Government policies in support of monopoly profits and for continued military intervention in Asia will be reflected in both.

AUGUST 1968 will see two matters of national importance decided, the Federal Budget 1968-69 and the first of the National Wage Annual Reviews, as decided by the Commonwealth Conciliation and Arbitration Commission, June 1967. Both will be decided in different areas, the Budget in Federal Government, the Wages Case in the Commonwealth Conciliation and Arbitration Commission. Despite this, there is an unbreakable link between the two, that is the ideology which guides the Government, the Judges and the ‘establishment’ through to the press, TV and the leaders of industry and the public service hierarchy.

That ideology is for retention of the present policy of intervention, along with the United States, in wars of national independence and, under the guise of anti-communism, the countering of any development which will strengthen the independence forces in Asia or Australia. Continuation of the anti-Communist dogmas and an increasing drive to suppress developing Australian opposition and criticism, by methods requiring restrictive legal and police actions, will increase. In the course of this the aim is to strengthen overseas interests and the position of monopoly in Australia. The Budget will take specific steps to obtain and direct finance toward these objectives.

If there is no obvious slug in this budget it will be a pointer to an early election, after which one may expect a “little” and “horror” budget to follow.

Defence, actually war expenditure, will be increased from last year’s estimate of $1109 million to $1250 million, according to Government statements, an increase of approximately 18 per cent. This continues the trend since 1964 of an average yearly
increase of approximately 22 per cent per year. The table below shows that since 1963-64 defence expenditure has more than doubled in money terms:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Net Expenditure on War and Defence $ million</th>
<th>% of Gross National Product</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1963-64</td>
<td>484</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964-65</td>
<td>556</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965-66</td>
<td>681</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966-67</td>
<td>873</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Estimated 1967-68 figure</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One cause of the increase in defence spending is its high component of overseas spending, mainly on ships, aircraft and equipment, necessary because of the complicated nature of the weapons system into which they are integrated. The table below shows the increase in overseas expenditure:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Overseas Expenditure $ million</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1964-65</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965-66</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966-67</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967-68</td>
<td>321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968-69</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This overseas expenditure has been severely criticised as it is a factor which has detrimental effects on the balance of payments.

Another aggravating feature of defence expenditure for the economy is that relatively small credits have been allowed by the United States and none from Britain for these purchases. United States loans, totalling $450 million, have to be repaid in periods of five to seven years. As a consequence major defence spending must be financed directly from income raised in Australia, the primary source being taxation.

Income tax is being continually increased, tax revenue rises without the need to formally increase income tax rates. The inbuilt tax increase system provides automatic increased tax as wage levels rise as a result of wage increases granted in the main as compensation for earlier price rises. From 1963-64 to 1966-67 Pay-As-You-Earn taxation, taxation paid by wage and salary earners, increased by 88%, but all other forms of Commonwealth taxes, company tax, sales tax, by 50%. The following table shows the tax
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increases for 1967-68 over 1966-67 as outlined in the 1967 Budget estimates:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tax</th>
<th>Increases $</th>
<th>Increase on 1966-67</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pay-As-You-Earn</td>
<td>160,463,000</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company</td>
<td>40,456,000</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay Roll</td>
<td>17,042,000</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Taxation</td>
<td>365,032,000</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Federal Treasurer, Mr. McMahon, on July 4, 1968, issued figures which show that every form of taxation, except Pay Roll Tax, yielded more than that set out in the above table.

The increasing burden of war expenditure is shown in the decline in consumer spending which is causing alarm in many areas of industry directly concerned with the production and sale of consumer goods. Mr. McMahon, in a speech to the Federal Chamber of Automotive Industries, said:

It is true that in recent years consumer spending has fallen as a proportion of the G.N.P. and in 1966-67 the proportion went as low as 59.3% which compared with a typical level of 64% before the defence build-up began in 1963-64.

Maxwell Newton, well-known Canberra journalist, in an article in the Manufacturers' Monthly claimed that trade union agitations over wages arose from increased defence spending: “the Australian workers may be paying a price in terms of stagnating living standards, for the accelerated Australian defence effort of the last three or four years, that they are fundamentally unwilling to pay.”

Personal income tax is year by year taking more of personal earnings. The following table shows the percentage of personal income absorbed in income tax over a number of years:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Percentage of Personal Income absorbed by Income Tax</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1958-60</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962-63</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963-64</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964-65</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965-66</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966-67</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The increase of Commonwealth Government expenditure is affecting also many high and middle income groups, scientists, engineers, doctors and technical specialists, etc. A publication of the Institute of Public Affairs contained a scale critically comparing
taxation on this group with several other countries. A married executive (engineer, doctor, etc.) on a salary of $12,500 retains after tax the following amount for $100:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Amount per $100 retained</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>$44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>$78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Britain</td>
<td>$63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Germany</td>
<td>$62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The publication noted this resulted in a loss of highly trained personnel and compared this with the Soviet Union, where the policy was to encourage specialist skills and abilities by financial reward rather than penalise them by heavy tax burdens.

Social service standards are continuing to decline in relation to international standards. This is shown in the 1967 International Labor Office publication *The Cost of Social Security*, which shows Australia to be in 23rd position, whereas in 1949-50 it was in 18th position. The old age pension, expressed as a percentage of the present average weekly male earnings of $61.90, has fallen from 26.3% to 20.9%. To restore it to 1949-50 value it would be necessary to increase the pension to approximately $17.00 per person.

Child endowment has been reduced by 50% in relation to the average weekly wage since 1941, the date of its inception, even though an additional category has been added, that is, payment for first child. The maternity allowance has also declined in value. In 1919 it was equal to 134.4% of the average weekly male earnings; in 1968 it represents 51.6%. Other examples have been shown by a number of surveys which point to the urgent need for increased social service expenditure.

The 1968 National Wage Claim of the ACTU will seek to increase wages basing the claim on a formula which increases wages by price increases as shown in the Consumer Price Index, and increased productivity since 1953. This formula has been used in national wage applications over recent years and has never been granted in full. The failure to grant what have been most conservative claims has resulted in a continued decline in wage purchasing value, particularly reducing the standards of low wage earners, many of whom rely heavily on overtime and two jobs to provide a family living wage.

The Commonwealth Government when intervening in wage cases has opposed the unions’ claims and lent support to the argument of the employers who traditionally ‘can’t afford to pay’ despite record profits over recent years. Mr. McMahon, Federal Treasurer,
recently received a public chiding for his aside to Sir Richard Kirby, Chief Judge of the Commonwealth Arbitration Commission, during a speech in which he warned Sir Richard of the need for him to take into consideration the Treasurer's problems when considering wage claims. No one should have been offended, after all it was being said in the atmosphere of the Employers' Annual Conference Dinner, surely an 'in Club' occasion.

The wages policy of the Government is dictated by its aim to reduce consumer spending and to direct finance to defence to increase capital expenditure, and assure maximum profits for Broken Hill Proprietary, General Motors-Holden and Colonial Sugar Refining and other monopoly groups. No interference will be tolerated, no control of monopoly is contemplated, the emasculation of the Restrictive Trade Practices Bill is an epitaph to that objective. The decline in wage values can be seen in the following scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Three years ending</th>
<th>Average weekly earnings</th>
<th>Consumer Price Index Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961-64</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964-67</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mr. McMahon's statement when introducing the 1967-68 Budget expressed the Federal Government's determination to drive on with the "guns before butter policy" when he commented on the 27% increase on defence over the previous year and the $4,058 million spent since 1962:

Lest anyone should suppose that it has been costless, let him reflect what would have been done if all the additional expenditure and the resources they represent had gone into the enlargement of our industrial capacity and other basic facilities for growth.

He stated further on:

Defence must and does, rank high in our national priorities, we must be prepared to play an effective role in our defence and in co-operation with our allies, in the security and stability of this part of the world.

Mr. Bury, Minister for Labor and National Service, on February 27, told the Associated Chamber of Manufacturers in Canberra:

Until three years ago, average wages in real terms were rising year by year sustained by heavy investment and progressive improvements in productivity. This has since ceased to be the case largely because the Government has been obliged by events to make greater demands for real resources in large part, but not wholly, to meet the rapid increasing requirements of defence.

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 directed into defence.
Finally, Prime Minister Gorton, in the Sydney Town Hall, February 5, said:

Lord knows, ladies and gentlemen, the one thing that I find grievous is that we should at this point of time, according to our own judgment of what is right, be required to expend so much upon an insurance policy, upon defence, when there is so much required to be done for our own people and in our own country.

What the Government considers ‘right’ is bound up in its idea that we must “fight them over there” in Vietnam or other Asian areas in company with the United States at the expense of the living standards of the majority of the Australian people.

Tremendous profits are made by oil and mineral speculators, monopolies record ever increasing profits. Subsidisation of, and grants to uneconomical industries are made to ensure continued political support, and GMH and Ford wave the wand and car prices and profits rise.

When all is stripped away, the objective of the Federal Government and those who direct them is to ensure maximum profits for the monopolies and to guarantee this objective and its continuation they see war as a necessary part of their program.

The cost will be paid by the people and this no doubt will be implicit in the August 1968-69 Budget proposals, the decisions of the Commonwealth Arbitration Commission and in the growing attempts to restrict and confine opposition and criticism by more authoritarian and police state methods.

The inevitable result of these policies will be to draw together larger and broader groups of people opposed to these policies. These policies continue the isolation from and opposition to the new forces in Asia who strive to end the backward, semi-colonial regimes in which they live. These changes need an equally clear ideology and objective. The first of these was expressed some years ago, that the people in the struggle for peace and freedom would find the power to rid themselves of bellicose war-making Governments.

The budget and wage claims must be watched by Australians for it is in these areas the politics of the nation will be more clearly distinguishable in the light of their effect on the lives of the people.

EVEN A QUICK dipping of the big toe into the icy turbulence of professional political science literature these days would be sufficient to make the faint-hearted shiver and lose breath. The older marxian-type jargonist would be somewhat humiliated by the queer sort of language which is now commonplace in the academic writings on society and democratic theory in the United States of America (and Australia). Such words, repeated ad nauseum, as dichotomy, charismatic, dysfunctional, behavioralism, equiliberal, eschew, pluralistic, infrastructuralism, are perhaps not bad attempts at creating a mumbo-jumbo superior to anything we may have had in the past and having the effect of repelling all but the most stouthearted layman from becoming initiated into the mysteries of what it is “all about.”

However the Australian John Playford and the American Charles McCoy have performed a considerable service in presenting the collection of readings in *Apolitical Politics*. The volume constitutes a powerful broadside into the bows of the elite-pluralist political science school which has held sway for many years in American and Australian university teachings.

These theories advocated by such titans in the world of bourgeois political science as Dahl, Parsons, Lipsett and Bell, based upon the earlier writings of Mosca and Pareto and others, and upon empirical studies of social and political behaviour in US society, idealise the status quo and argue that the ultimate in democracy has been reached. Mass movements are anathema, holding the possibility of upsetting the equilibrium or stability of present monopoly-capitalist society. Too much political action outside of voting or lobbying is dangerous in the extreme. The theories are also vitally concerned to perpetuate the kind of elite leadership which will maintain the system.

The introduction to *Apolitical Politics* states “The articles collected together in this volume all share a unifying focus, from which three main points emerge: these authors find the professional writings of the behavioralists characterized by conservatism, a fear of popular democracy, and an avoidance of vital political issues.”

McCoy and Playford further indicate that as the title of the book implies “it is the failure of the behavioralists to address themselves to genuinely significant political matters that concerns us most. By establishing methodology as the most relevant criterion for research they turn the students of politics into political eunuchs. Yet important political questions will continue to be discussed by the poet, the Bohemian fringe, the propagandist and the opportunist. In fact one is struck by the renewed interest in politics of students and the public at large; the only place where a discussion of politics is not likely to take place is in the political science journals and in the political science classrooms.”

The volume contains a dozen contributions written mainly by professors of political science at US and Canadian Universities. One Australian, Graeme Duncan, senior lecturer in politics at Monash University, pairs with Steven Lukes in a hardhitting critique of the “new democracy” of the elite-pluralist school. (Duncan, incidentally, is the

The most penetrating material is written by Christian Bay (Politics and Pseudopolitics: A Critical Evaluation of some Behavioral Literature); James Petras (Ideology and United States Political Scientists); Jack L. Walker (A Critique of the Elitist Theory of Democracy); Maure L. Goldschmidt (Democratic Theory and Contemporary Political Science) and Todd Gitlin (Local Pluralism as Theory and Ideology). Gitlin, by the way, was the 1963-64 president of Students for a Democratic Society (SDS), an organisation much in the limelight today.

The editors point out that their reader "may be properly described as a 'liberal' critique" and this is so. The contributors are worthy representatives of that growing body of political scientists and students who are critical of the elitist and pluralist theories of democracy and therefore play an important part in the ideological struggle against modern capitalism. Mostly they express support for the classical bourgeois democratic theorists (such as John Stuart Mill) and for a participatory democracy that does not rule out the need for social change. However while criticising modern industrial capitalist society and posing the need for a community of participating members they present few views of how such is to be achieved. The weakness of most of these progressive theorists seems to be their inability to think outside the 'system' or outside the theories of classical bourgeois democracy even though they are trenchantly critical of its modern operations. Maure L. Goldschmidt however does indicate "the need for the revival of a dynamic democratic theory which will point the way for the next generation . . .".

The goal of a community of fully participating citizens is a most worthy one, but it will be hard for society to realise. To lay the basis for such a society it is necessary, in this reviewer's opinion, to end the capitalist system of exploitation, profiteering and rottenness. In capitalist society the struggle for democracy is necessarily tending to merge more and more with the movement for socialism. The movement for democracy is becoming revolutionary because the way to greater democratic freedoms and 'participation' lies through the revolutionary restructuring of society.

Apolitical Politics, I believe, plays a part in this battle. Perhaps it could be followed by another volume devoted more to the subject of how to achieve democracy. If you want to improve your knowledge about pluralism and current intellectual political attitudes then turn to this volume.

JOHN SENDY

CONTEMPORARY SOVIET GOVERNMENT.
By L. G. Churchward.
Routledge and Kegan Paul, 365 pp, $7.00.

THESE DAYS, when so many people have visited the Soviet Union, one has either to have a particularly loud voice or really know something about the country to get a hearing on the subject. Lloyd Churchward is in the second category.

Although intended as a textbook for university studies, his Contemporary Soviet Government is a most valuable and interesting book for the general reader — the standpoint of this reviewer.

Naturally there are explanations of the functions and role of the various organs of government such as the Supreme Soviet, the Council of Ministers, and the local Soviets. But if it were a mere expanded version of the Soviet Constitution, as many such books
produced in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics tend to be, it would be a pretty dull affair.

The real interest is in Churchward's discussion of the underlying theories of government currently held in the USSR, and the degree to which the practice of Soviet government corresponds with the Constitution and the theories. A sample of his approach is to be found in his opening paragraph of the chapter on the Supreme Soviet. More than one icon is cracked by the statement:

"The Supreme Soviet of the USSR is often referred to, even in the Soviet Union itself, as the Soviet Parliament. This is inaccurate except in a purely formal sense. The Supreme Soviet is not and never has been the main legislative body in the Soviet Union. On the other hand it is not merely a kind of collective 'rubber stamp' for the automatic registration of decisions arrived at elsewhere."

Worshippers of the Soviet Constitution will wince, as will those who write off Soviet legislative processes as a facade for a dictatorship, but serious readers all will read on to find out what is the main legislative body, what say the ordinary people have, and what the Supreme Soviet does anyway. And they will not be disappointed.

The author is a reader in political science in the University of Melbourne. He has made a close study of Soviet government over a long period, including an extended stay in the USSR in 1965. Churchward states in the preface one of his aims as being an analysis "essentially in the Western tradition, but the main line of explanation is marxist."

Churchward lists early in his book a number of distinctive features of the Soviet political system. The first listed, and probably the most important is its socialist basis. But it is the second feature, 'the political monopoly of the Communist Party' which intrudes itself most forcibly into the treatment of the various aspects of Soviet government.

Although the one-party system is backed by a large volume of theory in the Soviet Union, there seems to have been no theoretical justification of such a position prior to its 'happening'. In addition, there are a diminishing number of Communist Parties in western countries at least, which regard the one-party system or even the domination of one party among others as an inevitable feature of socialism.

But the fact is that this was one of the most important features of Soviet Russia when it emerged from Tsarism, torn by years of world war, revolution and civil war. It is a feature which, whatever might have been the case in other circumstances, and for better or worse, seems likely to remain a feature of the USSR for a long time.

One does not need to be anti-communist, or even opposed to the main lines of the policy of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union to be concerned with this question. For example, Churchward demonstrates that the electoral system, while producing Soviets with appreciable numbers of non-party people (from 25 per cent in the Supreme Soviet up to about half in local Soviets) gives the Communist Party the main say in who shall or shall not be candidates and hence deputies.

Churchward rejects the conclusion that the existence of only one party makes the USSR a 'totalitarian' state, and clearly does not regard the Party's monopoly of political power as an unmitigated evil. For example, in his chapter on local government he points to stimulating and encouraging aspects of the work of the party in involving millions of people in the work of local government as well as to the stultifying
effects, where citizens tend to wait on Party policy before coming out with proposals for the tackling of specific problems.

In contrast with most Western writers, Churchward gives serious examination to the ‘considerable success’ of the Soviet system in fostering mass participation in a long list of activities. Apart from elections, these are categorised as public debate of policy and legislative proposals; popular involvement in administration; participation in trade unions, co-operatives and collective farms, comradely courts, volunteer militia and fire brigades, street and house committees, parents’ councils, pensioners’ councils etc; and through socialist competitions.

Discussion of Soviet democracy is a highlight of the book, and some readers will not be able to resist the temptation to read first the second last chapter on this topic, although it is in a sense a culmination of the previous sections.

In the style of the book as a whole, the author examines the concept of democracy which is held in the USSR, relating it to views commonly held in the West. He then compares the theory with the reality of contemporary Soviet politics.

One of Churchward’s important conclusions is that Soviet democracy “depends neither on the rights guaranteed in the Constitution nor on the activity of citizens through the Soviets, but on the degree of inner-Party democracy and on the willingness of the Party leadership to exercise a voluntary self-restraint. This is an incomplete and an inadequate basis for democracy.”

The author does not set himself the task of providing a history of Soviet government, or of treating exhaustively the internal and external environment in which the institutions, practices and policies of the Soviet government developed. But his brief material on these points is nevertheless useful and at times dramatic. For example, in dealing with what is often described as forced industrialisation, Churchward quotes a Stalin speech of 1931: “We are fifty to a hundred years behind the advanced countries. We must make good this distance in ten years. Either we do it or we shall go under.”

Churchward follows with: “It was in fact ten years and a hundred and thirty seven days from the day of that speech that the Germans launched their attack on the Soviet Union. That the Soviet Union did not go under was largely due to the forced industrialization of the previous decade.”

Contemporary Soviet Government has an excellent bibliography, an adequate index, and a valuable list of appendices of important Soviet documents and extracts.

While not being an encyclopedia on the Soviet Union, Churchward’s book covers much ground which is either ignored or glossed over in other works, and as such deserves to be read by all who venture to argue the toss about Soviet government.

D. Davies


“THE SYDNEY HARBORSIDE suburb of Mosman”, said its Mayor, Alderman V. H. Parkinson, recently, “is one of the finest living areas in the world”, and he spoke of “the pleasure I have of waking each morning and looking across the blue waters of Middle Harbor”.

As a longtime resident of the suburb, I can, with the Mayor, attest to
its physical beauties, with its many graceful old homes, its pleasant bays and inlets and its wide vistas over the central and middle harbors. (There are other, less wholesome, facts about Mosman which are dealt with in a footnote below.)

Two years age two affairs brought Mosman prominently into the news, for reasons other than its historic charm. The first was the attempted assassination of the Leader of the Federal Opposition, Mr. A. A. Calwell, after an anti-Vietnam meeting in Mosman Town Hall on June 21, 1966. It was Australia's first attempted political assassination.

The political affiliations, if any, of the young man who fired the shot at Mr. Calwell, Peter Raymond Kocan, were never brought out, because he pleaded guilty at his trial. But there were reports current at the time that, minutes before the shooting, Kocan had been seen in conversation with a well-known extreme rightist in the foyer of the Town Hall. This anti-Vietnam rally, incidentally, followed one two months earlier at the same town hall, which representatives of extreme right groups had tried to break up.

But the real intrusion of the extreme right in this area, which came with the Federal elections later in 1966, forms the subject of The Politics of the Extreme Right: Warringah 1966, by R. W. Connell, a research student, and Florence Gould, tutor in the Department of Government and Public Administration, both of the University of Sydney.

It is a well-documented and fairly exhaustive analysis of the groups and people that make up the extreme right in Australia, their influence and size, but not, unfortunately the people who are behind them financially.

Mosman is the heartland of the federal electorate of Warringah which stretches from Cremorne, on the south side of Middle Harbor to affluent and fashionable Palm Beach to the north. Because of its social composition, predominantly middle and upper middle class (here analysed in detail), Warringah has always been a blue ribbon conservative seat. Only once has anyone (P. G. Spender, later Sir Percy, in 1937) ever successfully bucked the United Australia Party or later Liberal Party machine.

In August, 1966, the Warringah seat became vacant with the death of the sitting Liberal member, J. S. Cockle. In September, after an exhaustive examination of 19 nominees, the Liberal Party's Selection Committee for the electorate chose as the party's candidate Edward H. St. John, Q.C., 51, former Acting Judge of the Supreme Court, President since 1961 of the Australian Section of the International Commission of Jurists and Australian President of the South African Defence and Aid Fund, a body devoted to financing legal aid for political prisoners in South Africa.

It was this latter position which drew the fire of the extreme right. To the racists anyone who took part in any action which seemed to oppose South Africa's policy of apartheid was a communist or at least a pinkie. The South African Government had, in fact, declared unlawful Defence and Aid Committees in the terms of the Suppression of Communism Act.

The extreme right immediately launched a "Stop St. John" movement and, after shopping around, a candidate was chosen to stand as an Independent Liberal against the selected candidate. He was Keith Bernard Chambers, 49, a Mosman real estate man and former Mayor of the suburb, and a member of the Liberal Party.

The rightists swung into a vigorous
campaign against St. John and in support of Chambers.

Mr. Connell and Florence Gould list as individuals or groups who at some time became associated with the anti-St. John campaign:

- Local Liberal Party members dissatisfied with the workings of the party machine.
- Henry Fischer, chief of the rightist journal Australian International News Review (which was used extensively in the campaign), Sir Raphael Cilento.
- Individuals associated with the Basic Industries Group (later attacked by Minister for Trade and Country Party leader McEwen).
- The "Fifty Club", an extreme right group operating at Kings Cross, which had been refused permission to form their own Liberal Party branch.
- The League of Rights, a racist organisation (Eric Butler).
- The Friends of Freedom, whose national president is the well-known rightist, Owen Warrington.
- Various individuals sympathetic to various rightist causes—anti-fluoridation, support of South Africa and Rhodesia, etc.
- Chambers' own friends and relations.

The campaign was waged fiercely, with huge amounts being spent on newspaper publicity on both sides. The fight even attracted the attention of the national press. At one stage St. John issued a $100,000 libel writ against the proprietors of a local throwaway paper, The Mosman Daily, after he had learned that it intended to publish a rightist-backed supplement attacking him. In the end, not unexpectedly, the Liberal Party machine proved too strong and, although the Party vote was cut by 12 per cent, St. John had a clear 20,000 majority over Chambers.

In effect, the extreme right was left in tatters, and as the authors point out: "The extreme right vote, stripped of its accidental and personal components, was not large and did not have the distinctive social character which seems to be a necessary prerequisite for mass social support in Australian politics.

"If this is even roughly true of an electorate as conservative as Warringah, the results of the election clearly hold out little hope to the present extreme right for political action outside the Liberal Party".

That, of course, is the crux of the matter. There is ample scope for extreme right thought and action inside the Liberal Party, as the statements, actions and associations of many of its leading members, including Cabinet ministers, have shown. The faint suggestion by the authors that the NSW Liberal Party machine fought the extreme right, as such, in Warringah, is rather naive. The machine supported St. John against the right because it was bound to back the man it had chosen, and not because of the political beliefs of his opponents.

Other facts about Mosman: Among Sydney's northside suburbs, it has the highest incidence of mental illness, with one in every 430 residents receiving hospital treatment, apart from uncounted numbers receiving private treatment.

A NSW Health Department survey found that most of the psychiatric disorders in the area occurred among people living apart from their families in flats, flatettes, or home units.
Recent years have seen a great proliferation of home units in Mosman, known locally (after the Mayor) as "Parkinson's Disease" and these are mostly occupied by elderly, retired people.

Despite its outward air of affluence, Mosman is reported to have wide areas of poverty, mostly among retired people on fixed incomes, still living in big homes, and going short of food to pay their high rates.

Its relatively small population of 28,000 supports two flourishing pet food shops, both of which carry big notices emphasising that the kangaroo and horse meat they sell is not for human consumption, and there aren't all that many dogs and cats in Mosman.

T. Moody

THE UNLUCKY AUSTRALIANS.
By Frank Hardy.
Nelson, Melbourne, 257 pp, $4.95.

THIS BOOK is unusually successful in coming to grips with one of the nation's deepest social problems and is a landmark in its author's commitment to the rights of man, while also having the capacity to irritate, among others, some of the real characters that come vigorously to life in its pages.

It is the best book yet written about the rising struggle of Australian Aborigines as proletarians.

The subject is the Aboriginal Gurindji stockmen who in 1966 went on strike at Vestey's Wave Hill cattle station in the Northern Territory—beginning on the issue of wage equality with whites but developing around issues with much deeper social and historical roots.

Despite the boldly improvised form of the book—an amalgam of narrative, interview, introspection and rhetoric—the book achieves an uninterrupted pressure on the sympathy and conscience of the reader that should go far towards achieving the author's aim, the shattering of the complacency of White Australia.

Hardy sets out the dimensions of anti-Aborigine discrimination by using at length the tape-recorded words of the stockmen themselves. The imposed degradation of admirable men and women (the latter do not come to life in the book) is forced into the consciousness of the reader again and again as, one after another and often overlapping, they tell of their long, unpaid hours of work which white men do less skilfully, the intolerably crude conditions of living and eating, the arrogant white abuse of the womenfolk, the totality of 10th class citizenship.

Intermingled are the accounts given by the small number of white territorians who, in various ways, assist the Aborigines in the historic defiance of white bossdom and white land monopoly.

Binding all together is the cement of Hardy himself, self-doubting yet gripped passionately by the monstrous inhumanity resulting from extermination, displacement, exploitation and indifference towards a whole race of people which continues today in our land.

Hardy allows himself to be scathing towards his fellow-whites, verges at times on condescension even towards some who played no small part in assisting the struggle and will not escape the charge of immodesty. But one is left with the clear conviction that, in substance, this is very much how it happened and that it could not have happened quite in this way or at this tempo without the rare compassion, commitment and drive of the author himself.
Since the book's publication, the Gorton Federal Government, armed by referendum with new powers, has nevertheless shamefully failed the Aborigines and, indeed, all Australians by bowing to the white land monopolists' sacred insistence on continued privilege. Part of the smokescreen for this was an official claim that Frank Hardy had talked the Gurindji into making the troublesome demand for return of a piece of their tribal land from the Vestey clutch.

It is precisely this claim which is exploded by one of the most absorbing themes in the book — the emergence, in the shy, careful talk of the Gurindji themselves, of their long-held aspirations to dignity and independence on their own land, to self-determination, the power and the abilities to build a decent life, pasturing their own cattle, maintaining their own vehicles, raising educated children. And all this on the land of their tribal Dreaming.

It began to emerge so subtly that Hardy recognised it only in retrospect. Vincent Lingiari, tribal leader of the Gurindji, tells him one night by the campfire “I bin thinkin’ this bin Gurindji country. We bin here longa time before them Bestey mob.”

It came out obliquely in another way from the respected Lingiari, explaining why, as strikers, they had not taken steps to cut off Wave Hill's pump water supply:

“We not bin let them cattle die of thirst. Them big Bestey bosses not hear them cattle die but I bin hear them cattle die.”

And “Pincher” Manguari: “We want them Bestey mob all go 'way from here . . . Wave Hill bin our country.”

And confirmed by the experienced, rebel Welfare officer, the bearded giant Bill Jeffrey: “Ever since we’ve been here, the main idea they’ve put up is the moral idea: treated like dogs, abused, and their land taken away.”

And Hardy, after cautiously digesting these statements: “I’m convinced that tribal identity and land are the real issues for them in this strike.”

And it was this, and only this, recognition that impelled three white people — Bill and Anne Jeffrey and Frank Hardy — to witness and transcribe the ideas of the four Gurindji tribal leaders in a letter to Gordon Bryant, MHR — their first formal request in claim of Wave Hill tribal lands “of which we were forcibly dispossessed in time past”, not for a “reserve”, but for use as a cooperatively run cattle station.

And while, down south, the movement of support and financial aid for the strikers gathered pace, particularly among trade unions and Aboriginal advancement organisations, prodded by the restless Hardy, the Gurindji occupied and built on their land and waited patiently for the Government approval that, to this day, has been denied.

Long before the recent rejection of their entire concept by the Gorton Government, Vincent Lingiari had said: “Don’t matter 'bout that Canberra mob. Wattie Creek bin Gurindji country. We go there.”

And Pincher Manguari had said: “That letter you wrote last year bin ASK 'em that Canberra mob, this letter bin TELL 'em we take 'em back Gurindji country.”

And there was the hard-earned conclusion last year by the outstanding Aboriginal organiser Dexter Daniels: “We have to act, fight all the time, to show them what we want.”

The Government and the cattle bosses could have fended off a lot of trouble in the future if they had understood the real significance of such words.
WORK: Twenty Personal Accounts, edited by Ronald Fraser, Pelican original, $1.00.

THE VERY TITLE of this book Work was enough to cause humorous comments by friends who saw me reading it. That reaction, probably more than anything else, was endorsement of the sentiments expressed in the collection of essays on work in the book.

The twenty short essays are about the experiences of a cross section of professionals and wage earners in carrying out their daily work and are selected from a series published in the British New Left Review. Together with the Introduction by Ronald Fraser and the final chapter 'The Meaning of Work' by Raymond Williams, it is an effort to examine people's experiences of and attitude to work and the broader question of the purpose of human endeavour in their daily lives under Britain's capitalist society very similar to our own.

It could be said that the writers of the essays are not typical, they are people with a progressive outlook and a critical mind; most have a reasonably good education and are occupied in some community activity, trade unions, political or peace movement. All of which indicates above average understanding and interest; so then, who else would carry out such an examination of themselves and their environment, but people so endowed?

How typical these experiences are can only be judged by what others say who have an intimate knowledge of the areas of work with which each essay is concerned, in much the same way as salesmen are the only ones who can fully understand the pathos and deeper significance of Death of a Salesman.

Constantly expressed through these stories is the feeling of dissatisfaction with work and its purpose. The lack of constructive objective and its demoralising effect is evident in the stories of the watchman and the croupier and particularly in the degeneration of the unemployed miner in On the Dole whose aim in life is to 'grow fat'.

The method of giving biographical details after each essay was intended to, and does, enable the essays to be read without preconceived ideas arising from knowledge of the writers' background. Like most people I was automatically prejudiced against 'The Copper' but found in the reading of the essay I became more reasonably disposed to his problems. The articles were interesting and in some cases they aroused sympathetic feelings which I had always considered peculiar to myself.

The concluding article by Raymond Williams deals in a much deeper way with the meaning of work, the attitude of British society to work relationships, the purpose of society in light of major changing technological methods. It causes the reader to question long accepted standards and look at work in a more critical way and many readers of this book will be left with the feeling that surely there must be a better meaning to life than the humdrum 'work for money to live to work' sequence, coupled with false and double standards in the lives of great masses of people.

The book is well worth reading and provides an insight into other people's personal feelings about their work and helps reach some understanding of the discontent and reasons for the movements of students, intellectuals and workers against the 'establishment', coupled as they are with the abandonment of fixed acceptance of old social and political standards by large groups of thinking people.

J. Baird
SCHOLARSHIPS

This newly-formed Research Foundation is offering the following two scholarships:

(1) Three months; grant $500. For research into available literature on the "new left" overseas and in Australia, with investigation into the situation in some Australian universities.

(2) The V. Gordon Childe Memorial Scholarship. One year; grant $2,000. For research with a theoretical tendency into matters of interest to the socialist movement in Australia, broadly within a marxist framework.

The precise topic to be defined in consultation with the successful applicant.

To commence early 1969.

Closing date for the receipt of applications for these scholarships is October 28.

Candidates should forward details of experience and qualifications to the Selection Committee, Australian Marxist Research Foundation, c/o Box A247, Sydney South P.O., Sydney. 2000.

SYMPOSIUM

THE MODERN INDUSTRIAL STATE

Three papers: Economic Characteristics — Bruce McFarlane.
Political Characteristics — Eric Aarons.
Cultural Characteristics — Ian Turner.

Chairman: R. Gollan.
August 25th, 1968, 10 a.m. till 5 p.m.
Boilermakers' Hall, 232 Castlereagh Street, Sydney.
Enrolment Fee: $1. Student Fee: 50 cents.
Australian Left Review Discussion Pamphlet

TROTSKY'S MARXISM

This controversial and stimulating pamphlet contains a critique by Nicholas Crasso, and anti-critique by Ernst Mandel and a rejoinder by Crasso. Available from ALR, Box A247, Sydney South Post Office, 2000, for 55 cents posted.

SUBSCRIBERS

This pamphlet is available to you for 30 cents posted.

Subscription Rates: One year $1.75; Two Years $3.25.

Students and Apprentices may subscribe for $1.00.