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THE INSIDE LEAF of the dustjacket states, among other things, that . . . "he (John Hughes) has been careful to share with the reader the sifting of fact and rumor . . ." 

It is a puzzling admission to make. Did the author retain the "rumor" and create "fact" from it? How much of his book is actual fact, not political bias?

Today, some three years since the start of a political action that unleashed one of the most sickening massacres in modern history, most people still do not know — how did it start? — why the butchery? — what's the aftermath? So many governments, including the Australian, have calmly ignored the whole process by claiming only Communists were killed and that's O.K. 

Indonesian Upheaval continues that kind of ideological and political outlook. The author does three things. He condemns wholesale the Sukarno regime, doesn't eulogise but certainly justifies the massacre of at least one million men, women and children, and presents the Suharto clique like Caesar's wife, that is, above suspicion of anything but the highest political, moral and national ideals.

To what extent this outlook gets through depends upon the reader's outlook and knowledge of Indonesian affairs.

The author quite smoothly proclaims as fact some of the most vital questions about the whole events of 1965.

"Privately, the Communists began to spread the word that a 'Council of Generals' was plotting against the President. Aidit (Communist Party Gen. Sec.) reported this to Sukarno. Sukarno challenged army commander Yani. But Yani explained calmly that it was a group concerned only with promotions of colonels to the ranks of generals" (p.15).

It was, you see, only a Communist rumor about a generals' plot which was disposed of when one general denied it. But subsequent events surely indicate that the top military brass were not only contemplating a power seizure, but have done so fairly efficiently, testifying to careful and long preparation.

"There is no question, of course", Mr. Hughes blandly says, "that the Indonesian Communist Party was up to its neck in the coup attempt" (p.114).

Was the PKI "up to its neck" or did some Communist leaders react (yes even wrongly or unwisely) to a certain situation? This is, indeed, a big question with growing evidence pointing to the fact that the Indonesian Communists as a whole, as a Party, did not know of or become involved in the events — except ultimately, as victims.

Chapter 22, entitled, perhaps hopefully, "Return to Respectability", is the one more directly linked to present day happenings. This deals with the prospects for the Suharto military regime, and thus can be judged already on known performance.

Beginning on March 11, 1966, the already "sifted" Suharto opponents, People's Congress, banned the PKI, installed Suharto as acting (and actual) President, gave him sweeping emergency powers (far greater than
Sukarno ever had) and set the date for elections for July 5, 1968. July has come and gone and the election date is now set for three years hence.

Ex-President Sukarno’s “guided democracy” is heavily criticised and, truth to say, it wasn’t so good, but what should be said of Suharto’s “new” parliamentary democracy? In preparation for the 1968 Congress meeting Suharto appointed (Feb. 1968) 104 new MP’s, bringing his direct appointments to an estimated minimum of 65% of all deputies. Even so, when Congress met in March, some 30 battalions provided “security” so that in Major General Machmud’s words the Congress should be “protected from any pressure and intimidation”. (Sydney Morning Herald 20/3/68.)

John Hughes speaks with feeling of the huge cost of Malaysian confrontation to Indonesian living standards. One must agree with this. But in two years or so since the ending of confrontation, the army has not been reduced, but on the contrary is now established as the key personnel in the civil service. Suharto has stated the aim of trebling the armed forces by the end of the present decade.

John Hughes blames present weaknesses on the legacy of the Sukarno regime and on the Communists as the real villains in that period. In doing so he ignores achievements of the period. Since 1945, under extremely difficult circumstances, including continual imperialist intrigue and subversion, plus sabotage from home grown feudal and budding capitalist elements, a home and overseas shipping line was created (Australians please note), a civilian airline established, a successful crash program was undertaken to overcome illiteracy, an elementary country-wide medical service was developed, new industries were created, foreign enterprises were nationalised and there was some development of democracy, formerly unknown. True the economy was not strong, and over militarisation took its toll.

But now what is the situation in the “New Order of the ’65 Generation?” Stronger? Be your own judge. Education has broken down, parents now pay teachers bribes to get their children accepted into schools, illiteracy is on the increase; foreign loans and investments are seen as the solvent of the country’s economic problems; medical services have all but ground to a halt; graft and corruption have become a way of life in the face of declining wages due to galloping inflation. (In the last year prices have increased on normally used goods 10-20 times.) Discontent is mounting while continual military forays against “Communists” (i.e. Suharto opponents) are increasing. Foreign investors are given practically unlimited concessions.

The wealth of Indonesia is about to be plundered by Belgian, British, Japanese, German, Australian and US monopolies.

John Hughes goes to great lengths to indicate that the hands of the USA Administration remained pure and unsullied throughout the critical 1965-66 period. No serious student of international politics could be so naive as to accept this for three good reasons:

1 The record of US policy in relation to the liberation movement, particularly in Asia.
2 The continual exposure of CIA (USA Central Intelligence Agency) activity throughout the world in Guatemala, Cuba, the US Labor movement right through to Australian literary fields.
3 The particular record of the CIA in Indonesia, financing rightwing groups, revolts, etc.
If my review appears too critical it is because the “New Order”, much vaunted by the author as a welcome break from the past, has some 100,000 people rotting in concentration camps, untried, unfed and largely uncared for. Military courts plus heavily censored news media, “try” patriotic leaders. Running out of sufficient “reds” at times, fresh “enemies” are created. The Chinese have become “foreign subversives”. Now the minority Christian Churches are uneasy over deteriorating relationships with fanatical “holy war” Moslem groups, protected by the “New Order”.

Against this background Australian businessmen and conservative politicians scurry to Djakarta, while “New Order” apologists come to Canberra, cap in hand, proclaiming unconditional fidelity to private investment.

I see Indonesian Upheaval as part of the promotion for the acceptance of this Indonesia, but not for an Indonesia of enlightened development based on wide democracy and economic independence.

M. Burnham

SOCIAL ORIGINS OF DICTATORSHIP AND DEMOCRACY

BY ANY STANDARDS this is a major work which many critics consider may indeed be a great one. Certainly Barrington Moore has set himself a huge canvas — that of studying the changes, and their causes, from feudal-agrarian society to modern industrial society in most of the major countries of the world and the connection of all this with democracy.

He attempts the task of outlining “the role of the landed upper classes and the peasants in the bourgeois revolutions leading to capitalist democracy, the abortive bourgeois revolutions leading to fascism, and the peasant revolutions leading to communism”. His work may well become an important part of future study on these vital problems.

Barrington Moore’s theory seems to propound the view that where bourgeois revolutions occurred as in England, France, etc., peaceful democratisation and modernisation followed in those countries; that where bourgeois revolutions failed or were only partially enacted as in Germany, Japan, China and Russia the future resulted in either fascist dictatorship or in Communist-led “peasant revolutions”. His contentions are “proved” in long, and often original chapters which all students of revolutionary change should study. His material is vivid and instructive. It is also extremely dubious in many areas and in many of its implications.

Perhaps the main area of doubt arises from the classification of the socialist revolutions as “peasant revolutions” and the idea that in countries where huge peasant masses exist the road to modernisation is blocked by the reactionary and conservative nature of the peasantry who lend themselves to fascist or communist manipulation from “above”.

Historically the conservatism of the peasantry, economically and culturally, is undoubted. However the political developments in the modern world see masses of peasants participating in tremendous social movements for progress, independence from imperialism, and for the ending of despotic social formations and for modernisation.

It would be hard in the political sense at least, to define the role of the Vietnamese peasants as being conservative and reactionary. The world’s radicals, including most of the foremost minds of modern society, have bestir-
red themselves in support of the Vietnamese cause. In many countries, movements involving huge masses of peasants are in existence under the guidance of socialist and marxist theories and have the goal of establishing newer and higher forms of society. Since the Russian Revolution most reactionary movements involving huge masses of peasants have had this influence and this aim.

Barrington Moore states that “by themselves the peasants have never been able to accomplish a revolution”, that “the peasants have to have leaders from other classes” and that “for them to succeed requires a somewhat unusual combination of circumstances that has occurred only in modern times”. Almost all peasant revolts nowadays are linked with marxism and the working class and socialist movements and in that sense surely cannot be simply classified as “peasant revolutions” notwithstanding their superiority as to numbers of participants.

Of course Barrington Moore considers socialist countries as being totalitarian. He describes the peasants as being “the principal victims of modernisation put through by Communist governments”. However despite the frequent mistakes of socialist regimes, past and present, it boggles the imagination to think of Chinese, North Korean or North Vietnamese peasants as being “victims” of their present governments; for they no longer starve (except via the terroristic actions of the Americans), they have land, education, social services, vastly increased democracy (however imperfect by modern standards) and seemingly a future of modern development opening up before them.

The lessons of contemporary history seem to show that only on the basis of marxist ideology and organisation can social movements achieve lasting successes against modern imperialism and in the struggle for the development of a newer and more democratic society.

The question of violence receives much attention by the author. In an interesting chapter on the English “enclosures” which brought about the destruction of the English peasants “the massive violence exercised by the upper classes against the lower” is vividly revealed. The violence perpetuated in other countries is similarly examined, and the conclusions reached as follows:

“For a Western scholar to say a good word on behalf of revolutionary radicalism is not easy because it runs counter to deeply grooved mental reflexes. The assumption that gradual and piecemeal reform has demonstrated its superiority over violent revolution as a way to advance human freedom is so pervasive that even to question such an assumption seems strange. In closing this book I should like to draw attention for the last time to what the evidence from the comparative history of modernisation may tell us about this issue. As I have reluctantly come to read this evidence, the costs of modernisation have been at least as atrocious as those of revolution, perhaps a great deal more”.

“As long as powerful vested interests oppose changes that lead toward a less oppressive world, no commitment to a free society can dispense with some conception of revolutionary coercion. That, however, is an ultimate necessity, a last resort in political action, whose rational justification in time and place varies too much for any attempt at consideration here. Whether the ancient Western dream of a free and rational society will always remain a chimera, no one can know for sure. But if the men of the future are ever to break the chains of the present, they will have to understand the forces that forged them.”

John Sendy
LENIN, KRUPSKAIA AND LIBRARIES. Edit. S. Simsova, F/a F. W. Cheshire, 73 pp, $2.75.

LENIN'S WRITINGS on libraries and librarianship, and the legislation which he introduced after the Revolution, possess a classic status in the history of Soviet bibliography. His articles, letters, reviews and decrees on the subject in the period 1905-1923 were first edited by his wife, Nadezhda Krupskaiia (herself an educationist of standing), and published in 1929 under the title What Lenin Wrote and Said About Libraries; enlarged editions appeared in 1932, 1934, 1939 and 1955. The volume under review contains the first English translation of the main items in What Lenin Wrote and Said About Libraries, together with Krupskaia's Foreword to the first edition and a condensed version of a speech which she made to a conference on library science and bibliography in 1936; the third section offers some 'Reminiscences about Krupskaia and Lenin' by, among others, the noted Soviet bibliographer, Nicholas Rubakin, and Lenin's chief executive in library matters, Lunacharskii.

Lenin, Krupskaia and Libraries is the first volume in a series, World Classics of Librarianship, a project for the publication of international studies in comparative librarianship, designed 'to provide historical source material for student librarians, as well as interesting glimpses for practising librarians of the origins of their profession in other countries and ages'. Unfortunately the book loses some of its value as a source book because of its incompleteness. A list of thirty-six untranslated items from Krupskaia's edition is given, and of course it is impossible to know whether they are all as 'minor' as is claimed in the Bibliographical Guide at the end of the book. The format could also have been much clearer; the incorpora-
of Lenin’s approach, born, no doubt, of his own experience in the British Museum, the Bibliotheque Nationale and the library of the Societe de Lecture in Geneva; the procedures which he instituted produced not only the specialist libraries but a vast network of village libraries serving the whole community.

J. L. Sturm

THE WOBBLIES, by Patrick Renshaw. Eyre and Spottiswoode, 312 pp, $6.65.

PATRICK RENSHAW has written an exceedingly interesting book on the Industrial Workers of the World. This movement, affectionately known as the “Wobblies” had an effective life span of less than twenty years after its formation in 1905; yet its influence was immense. The author confines his study to a detailed analysis of the United States movement. However, the international aspects of “Wobbly” activity are mentioned, usually with a concise appraisal of the main ideological thread behind each national organisation. It is interesting to contrast the Australian I.W.W. with its American counterpart. Mr. Renshaw suggests that in 1905 both the Australian and the American working class were faced with the reality of the wage system. This era saw the end of the frontier days.

In the United States, in the early years of this century, conditions for the unskilled workers (and especially the large force of itinerant unskilled workers) were intolerable. Lumber workers, for example, were forced to sleep on bunks without mattresses, were given appalling food and paid subsistence wages. Only five per cent of the working class were unionised and embraced by the American Federation of Labour; and the vast majority of these trade unionists were semi-skilled workers and craftsmen. Some attempts were made to organise workers in a few industries on an industrial basis, but, by 1905 95 per cent of the American working class were without organised protection.

It was within this context that the Industrial Workers of the World were formed. Their aim, as set out in their Preamble, was revolution; to be achieved by organising workers on an industrial as opposed to a craft basis. Under this system “an injury to one becomes an injury to all”. The I.W.W. vetoed the “conservative” motto a fair day’s pay for a fair day’s work and replaced it with a call for “abolition of the wage system”. With these aims, they set out to encompass all the working class, but especially those without previous experience of trade union organisation. Many of the unskilled were immigrants, whose language difficulties and ignorance of local conditions enabled employers to use them as strike-breakers, or at least to pay them at sweated-labour rates.

Apart from Union activity, the I.W.W. became involved in free speech fights reminiscent of today’s civil rights demonstrations. The “free speech” fights centred around the right of the Wobblies to recruit members at open-air street meetings. At Fresno in 1910, when the police began to arrest I.W.W. members and charge them with vagrancy, Wobblies came from hundreds of miles to pack the jails to overflowing. The city officials were forced to repeal their legislation forbidding street meetings.

A fascinating aspect of the I.W.W. campaigns was their use of songs. Ralph Chaplin, Joe Hill and many others composed lyrics to well known tunes. “Solidarity for Ever” and “Halleluyah, I’m a Bum” are just two examples of the many which comprised the “Little Red Song Book”. The I.W.W. used their songs to spread the message of their movement across
the countryside. Known as the movement "with a sense of humour" the Wobblies made many friends among workers, but roused intense hatred among their class enemies. The initials I.W.W. were variously interpreted by their opponents as "I Won't Work", "I Want Whiskey", and, during the first world war as "Imperial Wilhelm's Warriors".

Many legendary characters appear in this book. Margaret Sanger, Helen Keller and Elizabeth Gurley Flynn, each supported the Wobblies in their own way. Elizabeth Gurley Flynn was the most active within the I.W.W., but then the others were not sitting at home in the sink. Daniel DeLeon, a Marxist founder of the I.W.W., was highly praised by Lenin. DeLeon was known as the Pope, because he thought he was infallible in interpreting socialist writings. Wesley Everest, a war veteran and a leading member of the I.W.W. was lynched in his army uniform by a mob on Armistice Day, 1919. Finally, Big Bill Haywood, the miners' leader, who spoke for three days during the trial of 165 I.W.W. members in 1917. Among Haywood's statements to the court were these somewhat familiar words, "I have a dream, that there will be a new society sometime in which there will be no battle between capitalist and wage earner, but every man will have free access to the land and its resources". Bill Haywood's dream in 1917 was shared by Martin Luther King in 1963, but the Reverend King's dream envisaged the end of the battle between black and white.

Patrick Renshaw has made a notable contribution to the literature on the Industrial Workers of the World. Internal dissension wracked the movement from its inception, but this is an occupational hazard of any organisation aiming and working for change. The factions involved, despite their rather confusing mixtures, are carefully sifted and clarified by the author. The main Australian heritage of the I.W.W. has been the organisation of the Australian Council of Trade Unions with its aim of industrial unionism.

The Wobblies enables readers of some forty years later to understand how the I.W.W. came about; and why it died.

SHIRLEY WAKEMAN

POWER WITHOUT GLORY, by Frank Hardy. Sphere Books, 672 pp, $1.90.

FROM THE TIME it hit the headlines when its author was prosecuted for criminal libel, Frank Hardy's famous novel, Power Without Glory, has continued to maintain its extraordinary popularity. It is still, in fact, in the best-seller class, and it is not surprising that a new paperback edition has been issued, with an excellent introduction by Jack Lindsay.

The story of how the book came to be written and of the legal process which followed its publication, is an epic in itself. Frank Hardy comes from a working class background and was well acquainted with the illegal gambling and sporting rackets which are so typical of the Australian scene long before he conceived the idea of the novel. He was also well aware of the connection between the men who controlled these gambling organisations and the Australian Labor Party, men who ruthlessly and unashamedly exploited the average working man's natural desire to get a bit more from his wages than they are normally worth by making a few small bets.

The central character of Power Without Glory was a Melbourne man, John West, a notoriously wealthy and powerful entrepreneur in the twin fields of sport and gambling, a man who had been governed all his life by an insati-
able lust for power. Later Hardy was prosecuted for libel, it being alleged that John West was in fact a certain John Wren.

To obtain material for his novel, the author carried out an extensive programme of research, much of it involving the detailed questioning of living persons. On more than one occasion his investigations exposed him to the risk of violence and even of sudden death. Even when he had completed his manuscript, he was faced with the problem of getting it printed and published, normally difficult enough, but in this case complicated by the highly libellous subject matter of the book. But Hardy was almost fanatically determined to bring his great opus to the birth, and with the help of loyal friends and supporters he succeeded in doing so in August, 1950.

Sales were fairly slow at first, mainly because, unless a commodity is extensively advertised, it takes time for its value to become known. However, the novel received nationwide, and, in fact, world-wide advertisement when its author was arrested for criminal libel. Sales figures mushroomed almost overnight.

The author could have been prosecuted for ordinary civil libel and would almost certainly have lost the case. Hardy was in fact prosecuted for alleged criminal libel of John Wren's wife. John West's wife in the novel was driven to adultery by a loveless marriage, and it was alleged that this libelled Mrs. Wren.

Conviction for criminal libel, a rare action at any time, carries with it the possibility of a severe prison sentence, and obviously this was what Wren and his supporters hoped for. In the event, the savagery of this aim worked against Wren and for Hardy. It served to rally to the author's support all the progressive forces in the nation, based on a solid core of workers, trade unions and intellectuals. Frank Hardy was acquitted after a dramatic trial.

*Power Without Glory* has undoubtably made a greater impact and been more successful than any other Australian novel, both in the country of its origin and abroad. Why is this so? It is certainly not because the book is a highly polished work of art. Although it is powerful, dramatic and exciting, it is in some respects a little crude and naive. But, as in the case of many another great novel, faults of style are only minor flaws in a work of otherwise outstanding quality.

The fact is that *Power Without Glory* is a novel of exposure, revealing to the shocked and horrified eyes of its readers certain scandalous aspects of Australian social and political life. It is not that the average citizen did not know about these things, even if he was only vaguely conscious of them — corruption and gangsterism in sport and gambling, bribery and corruption of police, courts and officials; the fact that the Labor Party could be supported by donations from the tycoons of gambling and vice and that politicians could be no more than the tools of such men. What the book did was to recreate these things in a fictional form which presented them in a new light and for the first time made the Australian public conscious of their significance.

If it had done no more than this, it would have been no mean achievement. But the novel rises far above the level of the local and national. In sum and essence it typifies the power structure and corruption of a whole society, the social order of capitalism, and it is this above all which has made the book as interest-
ing to readers all over the world as it is to Australians.

Although many of its characters and situations are drawn direct from life, it is a highly imaginative novel and no mere documentary. As Jack Lindsay says in his introduction: "... Hardy succeeds in powerfully expressing the processes of social development, not as abstract things, not as a mere background of the story, but as forces imbedded deep in the spirit of West, his protagonist. This is what gives greatness to the novel..."

"The novel itself and the circumstances surrounding its conception, birth and publication, make up a singular unity, and even the reader whose political convictions are far from those of Hardy can hardly fail to be moved by such a tale of dedication and its results, both in the world of action and that of literature."

RAY WILLIAMS

SEX AND POLITICS IN AUSTRALIA by Morris Revelman. Publicity Press, $1.35.

THIS BOOK would be embraced to the bosom of Rene Descartes and his school of anti-empirical rationalists. The author is a seasoned exponent of the armchair-method of political science. One settles into a comfortable armchair, before a cosy stove, and gently muses about "If I were an average housewife, how would I vote?" What is incredible is not so much that one should try to study the world in such a way, but that there is a genuine, living, 20th century exponent! Perhaps that's it, perhaps it's not genuine, perhaps it's a colossally clumsy send up which I have inanely missed? Throughout my interpretation of the book as serious, I was plagued by the nagging suspicion that it must be satire, the author couldn't be serious; but what could it possibly be sending up?

The entire book is a perpetration of an elementary methodological blunder — probably a result of the above non-empirical attitude — the Verification Blunder.

The Verification Blunder consists of proposing a hypothesis, and then looking for instances which verify the hypothesis. Thus in the twenties someone proposed the hypothesis that sunspots cause economic fluctuations; a search revealed several instances of economic crises being preceded by sunspots, and thus the hypothesis is verified. The fruitfulness of this method was recognised by Karl Popper and others, who urged the search for falsifying instances. And the sun-spots theory was abandoned shamefacedly as the list of economic crises which were not associated with sun-spots grew and grew!

This book is about the domination of Australian society by Feminists. Females in Australia have voted themselves a set of laws which set them apart as a favored group, viz., divorce and maintenance laws. They were able to gain this favored position by voting as a group for the party which offered advantages to females. Upon this sub-thesis rests the entire book; if the sub-thesis falls the main thesis falls.

"The laws became the way they are, in the first place, because the politicians sold your rights and liberties for the female votes, and the judges, who are the products of the political and social system, have assiduously interpreted the laws to favor the females."

The argument to prove this sub-thesis is, like the whole book, pathetically weak. There is of course no survey to see how women do in fact vote, instead there is an armchair sur-
mise. The author divides the electorate into six groups:

(a) Workers who are irrevocably committed labor voters;
(b) Workers who are not irrevocably committed labor voters;
(c) Managers, etc., who consider themselves non-workers and vote anti-labor;
(d) Dependants of group (a);
(e) Pensioners;
(f) Owners of capital.

How does the (f) group gain a political majority, when the numbers of owners is obviously tiny compared to (a)?

The capitalists obviously don’t get support from (a).

Group (b) is very small, and mainly female, who pass into (d) without having much opportunity to assist (f).

Group (c) supports (f) but (e) is obviously numerically small.

Group (e) is mainly of elderly people who are already in (a) or (d); (e) is also numerically small anyway.

Group (d) is numerically large, female and not directly employed. It must be from this group that the capitalists derive their majority.

Thus, the divorce and maintenance laws which grossly favor women, were brought about by an unholy alliance of wives and owners, for their mutual advantage.

This argument will be shown to be invalid by the following analogous argument which purports to prove a false conclusion, viz., that the Licensing Act which discriminates against women by forbidding them to drink in bars, was brought about by an unholy alliance of men and capitalists for their mutual advantage.

Let us divide the electorate into six groups:

(a) Women who drink;
(b) Women who drink only on very festive occasions;
(c) Members of Temperance Leagues;
(d) Husbands/lovers of group (a);
(e) Pensioners;
(f) Owners of capital.

How does the (f) group gain a political majority, when the numbers of owners is obviously tiny compared to (a)? The capitalists obviously don’t get support from (a).

Group (b) is not irrevocably committed, but is a small group.

Group (c) will support the Capitalists and vote for the Licensing Act.

Group (e) is mainly of elderly people who are already in (a) or (d); (e) is also numerically small anyway.

Group (d) is numerically large, male and not immediately affected. It must be from this group that the Capitalists derive their majority.

So the conclusion follows that women are voted out of bars by an unholy alliance of men and Capitalists.

However this is of course false, as the number of men or women who voted for the party which did or did not offer drinking in bars for women as a platform plank is zero or tiny. And parallel things are wrong with the argument under review.

The book is utterly misguided and worthless; I cannot recommend it to anyone, instead one is inclined to talk about wasting time on books which are remarkable only for being published at all.

C. D. STARRS