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IT STARTED EARLY. 1969 had hardly begun, with most factories still closed for the holidays before industrial action began to swing. Trans-Australia Airlines was reduced to skeleton operation by a strike of 600 men against a rigid bureaucratic structure behind which stands the Federal Government’s authoritarian policies. The postal service is ready to erupt again because of the same bureaucracy and the Liberal Government’s determination to hold the economic line by maintaining “proper” relations between master and servant. Newcastle steelworkers came out against the other giant Australian bureaucracy.

And this is only the beginning. Engine drivers and other railwaymen are still boiling over the way their claims were handled, and their indignation can be seen as expressing the general feeling of low-paid workers who get least from “work-value” cases. Bank officers, public servants and other unionists affiliated to the Australian Council of Professional and Salaried Associations are poised ready to make 1969 a year of militant action, in a most sensitive area for employers and governments.

On the other side of the industrial fence, the top policy-makers are spoiling for a fight. The Federal Government is today the most intransigent of all employers. Since it disposes of the State’s legislative and executive powers, it can spearhead the employers’ strategy. It is no accident that TAA sought and was granted an order under which individual strikers could be fined up to $100 a day (and jailed if they could not or would not pay the fines). No accident, because the Government is looking for a showdown—it tried much the same tactic last year with postal workers under service regulations, and learnt nothing from having to leave the fines uncollected. No accident, because the present TAA head is airforce brass-hat Sir Frederick Schergei, conditioned by military concepts of discipline and its concomitant arrogance. And perhaps no accident because a TAA stoppage helps Ansett, the second private-monopoly airline.

The Government has announced its intention to bring the public service under legislation that can punish unions for strikes and other industrial action. This declaration of intent foreshadows a whole concept of labor strategy integrated with the economic strategy of income regulation to keep wages low, maximise profits
and investments and increase military expenditure for the “new” foreign and defence policies incubating in the top circles of military advisers and Cabinet. This column predicted two months ago that “1969 will be a year of industrial action”, and suggested the need for an effective counter-strategy by the trade union movement.

A MILITANT COUNTER-STRATEGY should not only meet the impending employer-government, administration offensive but develop a counter-offensive designed to shift the working class movement from the defensive in which it is placed by the constricting arbitration system. This counter-offensive would challenge the whole official concept of wage fixation, that puts wage- and salary-earners constantly behind scratch as prices and taxes rise. It would raise new and bold demands for a living wage, equal pay, shorter hours and longer holidays, protection of workers' rights in conditions of technological change. These demands are in no way excessive even within the capitalist system, when scientific advance and technological innovation is raising the level of production and when all of this rise in national surplus is appropriated by the capitalist monopolies and the Federal Government’s taxation policy. Recent Arbitration decisions have put the judicial seal on the present division of the social product, in such a way that the trade unions can at most keep the workers' “share” as a constant percentage and never raise it; in fact this share tends to drop. These conditions will continue so long as the unions are content to work within the present Arbitration framework and rules.

The 1969 Congress of the Australian Council of Trade Unions, to be held in Sydney in September, will have to make important decisions on these issues, but events will scarcely wait until then. Immediate and urgent questions are raised by economic policy and political decisions.

WORKERS' DEMOCRATIC RIGHTS are the most immediate of these. The penal clauses of state and commonwealth industrial legislation have become a major area of oppression. Their extension to new groupings of workers, and the probings to apply them to individuals, adds a new urgency to trade union confrontation of this attack on democracy. Workers all over Australia are looking for a fighting lead, so far not forthcoming from the national trade union leadership or indeed, from most State Trades Councils. While no one would object to negotiations in efforts
to settle disputes like the present TAA strike, on terms satisfactory to the workers and averting the use of penal powers, many workers have the uneasy feeling that threats of penal action against unions and workers are used to intimidate the unions and provide a basis for compromise more favorable to employers than workers. The ACTU style of mediation, again illustrated by Mr. Monk’s intervention in the TAA negotiations, continually reveals its limitations. In this case there was not even a compromise.

It is time to make a change, to confront the legislation by militant counter-action whenever it is used. Unionists are in this mood today, for every strike (and even more limited forms of industrial action) is immediately blocked by bans, orders, fines and still more draconic threats. When the employers and governments take these powers even further, as in the TAA case, the West Australian boilermakers and the postal workers, and seek to widen these powers, still more favorable conditions are created for a militant confrontation.

The speeded up processes of technological change are introducing continually new issues in this field, at the same time throwing new sections of workers into positions where they feel more and more the need and urgency to assert their democratic rights, at the same time expanding their ideas of what those rights should be.

CHANGES IN THE ACTU EXECUTIVE, ending the power monopoly of the conservative right, have inspired new hopes for a more forthright stand and a new direction in national union policy. Unionists will be looking to the new executive majority for a lead on the urgent issue of the use of penal powers, as they expect other policy changes.

Besides defence of the right to strike, a new and bold program of wage and social demands, workers’ democratic rights have to be asserted in a new way. The TAA strike, like so many others, was sparked off by victimisation of a union delegate, a favorite employers’ tactic of denying elementary democracy. This tactic has the virtue of putting unionism on the defensive. In this sphere too, the best form of defence is attack, the demand for democratic control in which workers can counter the bureaucratic structure of capitalist production, based on the employer’s right to hire and fire, lay down and enforce the regulations and conditions of work with the final say left to the punitive apparatus of judiciary and government.
An important feature of recent industrial actions has been the spontaneous assertion of this demand in varied forms, by diverse groupings of workers. It is already possible to generalise this as arising from a profound social current, caused by the very process of modern production with its vast and remote bureaucratic structure of ownership and control. It is the assertion of human dignity and rights of the individual to a say in his work and the decisions that affect and determine it, with this important qualitative dimension the rights of individuals as workers can only be asserted collectively, by solidarity, organisation and mass action. Unless this demand is consciously developed into a program of democratic control and action, a frightening perspective opens up of a new authoritarian state-monopoly capitalism operated by a bureaucratic aristocracy of owners, controllers and administrators who decide everything.

Shape of things to come, at least in the conceptions of Big Business ideologists, was projected in a recent article in Nation's Business, as summarised in an Australian newspaper.

The top company boss of the future will be dressed ... in a purple robe. He will sit behind a desk that looks like a jet aircraft control panel. And he will dictate his letters to a topless secretary ... This special kind of office status will be reserved to future "super-executives", who may also be allowed to have "two legal wives" ("to regularise and legalise a situation that even in our own day exists, though often disguised").

The journal suggests a purple outfit, "in keeping with the ancient connotation of royalty," for the company president, blue for his assistants, and red for staff members. Sun-Herald 19.1.69.

Fantasy? Perhaps, but the thinking behind it is the concealed rationale of Big Business and Big Government, the concept of an aristocracy of wealth, power and talent. The rationale is really as fantastic as its projection, but only because it will meet a democratic opposition. If it should not, this fearsome fantasy could become reality.

SURELY IT COULDN'T HAPPEN HERE? The myth of Australian egalitarianism notwithstanding, the concentration of wealth and power already existing makes it quite possible to speak of a finance capitalist aristocracy, with its inner councils, its "royal marriages" that unite great fortunes and power, its special training schools which train the aristocrats and open to the brightest youth of the "lower classes" — so long as they will conform to the goals, ambitions and ideas of the ruling elite.

A revealing sidelight that illustrates an aspect of this ideology was contained in a recent series entitled "THE Schools", which appeared in The Australian recently. These are, of course, the
top private schools, educating sons and daughters of the rich — businessmen and executives, squatters, doctors and lawyers, and so on. Each school is examined under several headings: numbers (restricted and exclusive) waiting lists (to 1980 in some), fees (high and exclusive), social rating (high and exclusive), tuition and facilities (where money can buy them, excellent). But they are not snobbish, oh no; as the headmistress of one Church of England girls' school says, “It is open to all girls and I do not think the word ‘snob’ can be applied at all”. Anyone can go—if their parents can pay the fees (for a senior boarder at this school $1122 a year—about average). The headmaster of one boys' school says of his pupils “none is really connected to any single group of society.” Of course not—they are sons of businessmen, executives, doctors, lawyers, prominent squatters — a real cross-section of society, if this abstraction is given that special meaning which excludes laborers, fitters, wharfies, shearers, clerks, schoolteachers and the manifold other lower orders.

The Australian private school setup is not just a minor foible, a laughable imitation of the British Establishment. It is a part of the system of class rule of the power structure; the number of conservative Cabinet Ministers, company directors, public servants and other powerful men educated at these schools is out of all proportion to their numbers. And the Commonwealth “state aid”, is going in similar exaggerated proportions to these schools, is subsidising this instrument of class separatism and perpetuation.

Despite the prevalent ideology for rationalising the exercise of power, and its bolder assertion for an aristocratic elite, there are several inherent flaws in the concepts. One is the fact that money, inheritance, the best of education and training cannot ensure any monopoly of brains and talent. While the system controllers estimate this may be met by buying up the best brains from outside their circle, the growing number of intellectuals critical of their system is disturbing — witness concern at the student revolt. Another feature is the intellectual mediocrity of most business and political leaders, despite their hothouse training—or perhaps because of it.

John Grey Gorton exemplifies this harsh reality. If Menzies was no genius, he acted the part tolerably, sustained by his own certainty that he was; Holt was even less so, but had urbanity, experience and a certain homespun egalitarianism, even if a little self-conscious since obviously assumed. It would be a little hard to blame Geelong Grammar for Gorton's deficiencies, as compared to Wesley's two Prime Ministerial products, but the hard fact remains that Gorton is a mediocrity even by comparison. Stuck
with him, the Establishment is trying to make the best of a bad job, through a massive public relations exercise. The mass media have so boosted his performance at the Commonwealth Conference as to make it appear he was the star performer who acted as Harold Wilson’s righthand man and yet won the grudging admiration and respect of the Afro-Asian Prime Ministers. Having performed less than impressively at home, his PR team is intent on creating the image of a statesman abroad. The actual performance is less than impressive. Mr. Gorton emerged as a firm defender of White Australia, friend of Ian Smith’s Rhodesia regime, in the tiny majority opposing recognition of China, the extreme hardliner on Vietnam even to openly rejecting the usual formal obeisance to the Geneva Agreements.

AUSTRALIAN FOREIGN POLICY is not a source of strength for the Gorton Government, but its Achilles heel. The political and military successes of the National Liberation Front, which have inexorably forced the United States to the peace table step by step though reluctantly, have shattered the whole basis of what passed for an Australian foreign policy. Britain’s withdrawal East of Suez and understandable United States reluctance to repeat another Vietnam in South East Asia now confront Canberra with an agonising dilemma.

Gorton dreams of a strong Australian capitalism assuming a leadership role in South East Asia — or at least that small part of the region which is pro-“Western”. There is an insoluble contradiction in this dream which will turn it into a nightmare; capitalist Australia is not a great power despite all its development and its industrial strength relative to South East Asia.

This weakness, together with its exposed situation on the periphery of Asia, far from Western Europe and North America, the two centres of monopoly capitalist power, enforces a special type of dependence upon Australian capitalism, reinforced by inadequate economic power that puts an additional lever into the hands of foreign capitalism (the United States, Britain and Japan). This creates specific psychological tensions for Australian capitalism: fears of Asia with the impulse towards the “US Alliance” (and the more general fear of the “colored races” that leads some extremists to dreams of a Rhodesia-South Africa-Australia triangle). This explains the virulence of anti-communism, the pathological fears of Asia so inadequately compensated by protestations of an “independent Australian role”, the love-hate relation with the United States (also the new hate-love relation with
Britain), also the hysterical violence which can erupt through the thin veneer of "civilised" rational and democratic political life.

Entrapped in the web of geographical reality and historical necessity of Asian national liberation, this dream of a special Australian role in Asia can only lead the nation further into difficulty and ultimate disaster. Warning signals are already flying: a high and dangerous level of military spending that must grow (and complicate the balance of payments problem); increased dependence upon the United States (with its new Nixon administration likely to demand more military commitment from Australia and to adopt tougher trade policies); higher taxation, yet less satisfaction of rising demands for education, social advance and services.

A new political offensive on foreign policy and its internal impact is required from the Left and the labor movement. The Left has a special role to play here, since the uneasy balance of forces within the Australian Labor Party has largely immobilised it in this vital field. Vietnam events of 1968 certainly vindicated ALP policy as compared with that of the Liberal and Country parties; even Whitlam jumped on that bandwaggon. But Whitlam's policy is far too American-oriented in its fundamentals to allow him to draw the radical conclusions required to press home the political advantages flowing from collapse of the Vietnam policy. The ALP Left in parliament, who have a much more genuine claim to political foresight and courage, are still too restricted by narrow political considerations and have still not thought through to its logical conclusion the problem of Australia-US relations. Thus inhibited by theoretical unclarity and political considerations of Caucus numbers and electoral prospects, the parliamentary labor Left is unable to break the stalemate and take the Party along with it in the necessary bold challenge to the defence-foreign policy monstrosity now incubating in Canberra.

In these conditions, the Australian Left as a whole has to mount a new offensive on foreign policy, warning of the dangers ahead, explaining the sinister implications of a permanent Australian "presence" in Asia, and relating these issues with the economic and social demands which are calling forth industrial and other militant actions. This integration of political, economic and social actions and campaigning is not imposed but reflects reality. It is the effective and specific contribution that the Left can make to ideological preparation for this year's federal election, with the aim of striking a more effective blow against the policies of Australian monopoly capitalism.
A research officer of the AEU-Blacksmiths' Boilermakers' Research Centre looks at an issue which is increasingly being discussed by the Left. In its next issue, ALR will publish a symposium of views on the subject.

THE PURPOSE of this article is to express some preliminary thoughts on the subject of workers' control with the aim of stimulating further debate on it in the Left Review. For such a debate to be meaningful it is obviously necessary to define what I mean by workers' control so that people know what I am talking about. As a socialist I see action towards workers' control and even the popularisation of the concept as an important ideological counter offensive against capitalist control. The concept at this level means that workers are assisted to understand that industry does not need private owners. As a trade unionist I see workers' control as the extension of the right of the trade unions particularly in the workshops, through their representatives, to have an effective say in decisions made in respect to such matters as trade unionism, safety, welfare, discipline, wage fixation, appointment of supervisory staff, deployment of labor, technological changes, hiring and firing and access to financial records.

This is a pretty tall order when put against the usually recognised trade union rights. But if the word "control" is to have any meaning it must mean at least this, for the purpose of workers' control should be to have decisions made in the matters listed above which will take the needs of the workers into account to a degree that will effectively promote their interests. From the limited information available to me this also appears to be near enough to the understanding of what is meant by the demand for workers' control which is being put forward in Europe at present.

The concept is far from being a new one, for it was widely debated at the turn of the century in the controversies as to what was the best way of achieving socialism. The anarchists supported workers' control as an alternative to the state, which they held to be
an obstacle to the achievement of socialism, and proposed that it should be exercised through the trade unions as a form of working-class self-government. It was also supported by the Syndicalists, particularly in France, by the Industrial Workers of the World, and by the Guild Socialists in Britain. The last proposed that the state should acquire the ownership of industry and hand over its administration under a Charter to a Guild of all the workers engaged in it, both by hand and brain.

The concept of workers' control was also reflected in a more pragmatic way by the shop steward and workers' committees movement which developed in Britain during the First World War. At the end of the war the mining and railway unions each proposed that their industries should be nationalised and run by a Council consisting of an equal number of representatives from the unions and the Government. There is even some evidence that the concept of workers' control had some brief support in Australia at that time.

The difference of marxism with the political ideologies which have been mentioned was that while it agreed on the vital importance of the trade unions it held that the working class required a marxist political party to help it achieve its objectives.

After the First World War, the workers in a number of European countries were able to force through legislation for workers' representation in industry in some limited form as a concession to the revolutionary mood of the workers, and in Britain it was toyed with on a voluntary basis. But these developments were soon brought to an end by the postwar depression.

After the Second World War the trade unions in some European countries were again able to obtain legislation giving them certain rights of representation with management, particularly in nationalised industries. But the experience was disappointing as the employers were able to isolate the worker representatives from their rank and file, with the result that in practice what operated was a diluted formal participation without the workers having any effective say in the decisions made. This is not of course surprising; for the employing class had in the past proved itself very adroit and successful in diverting demands for effective workers' control into the diluted form of workers' participation, which usually finished up as class collaboration.

In a research which I made some time ago on the history of Joint Consultation it transpired that as far back as 1893 a group of industrialists in Britain met and put forward the idea of an Industrial Union to promote harmony between employers and employed and to realise in a larger measure their common inter-
ests. The persistent prosecution of this idea eventually led to the setting up of a Government Committee in 1916 under the chairmanship of J. H. Whitley M.P. to examine the widespread unrest in wartime industry.

One of its conclusions was that, "What is wanted is that the working people should have a greater opportunity of participating in the discussion about and adjustment of those parts of industry by which they are most affected". It also led to the establishment of Whitley Councils in some minor industries and the Civil Service in the post war period. So it is a long time since the employers woke up to that tactic. But the basic attitude of the employers was shown by the bitter fight in Britain between the engineering employers and the Amalgamated Engineering Union in 1922 over the demand of the union to be consulted on the working of overtime. The union was soundly defeated on this comparatively minor aspect of what the employers regard as inviolable managerial rights. I am stating an obvious, but often underestimated truth, that the ruling class will always seek to contain, deform and divert demands for workers' control and fight bitterly against anything which actually curtails their power.

The issue of effective workers' control became increasingly urgent to European workers in recent years because of the multitude of difficulties imposed on them by such things as the Common Market, automation, trade competitions, currency crises, incomes policies, alienation from work, growth of monopoly, and the penetration of American capital. In some countries the means exist to assist workers to extend their power in the form of vigorous trade unions and mass workers' parties. In these countries considerable numbers of workers see workers' control as the key to solving or alleviating at least some of the problems which press closest on them at a factory level and perhaps some at a higher level. Active workers know the problems of their industry well and are able to speak knowledgeably of the problems to be faced.

The desire for workers' control is also stimulated by the growing awareness and demand for consideration of the workers' human dignity. This has become something common to many industrialised countries, including Australia, because developing technology has led to increased alienation from work, even though in some countries workers' control itself has not yet become an issue.

The question the foregoing raises for us in Australia is just what significance does the concept of workers' control have for the trade union movement here? It can be said at once that workers' control in the sense as defined by me at the beginning of this article is not a real proposition under present Australian conditions, as the
favourable conditions necessary for its achievement are at nothing like the level which exists even in Europe.

There is a trend of thought that the trade unions have failed to push the idea vigorously and one gets the impression that the only obstacle standing in the way of workers' control is this lack of vigor. One cannot be blinded by the undoubted attractiveness of the concept to the limiting factors which exist in Australia (which includes a very powerful right wing within the unions and labor movement) and the basic groundwork which has yet to be done. For one thing, a major limiting factor is the small size of the Communist Party, for this is the only political party in Australia which believes in actively fostering mass movements and is capable of giving tactical industrial leadership of the required quality to enforce workers' control. But the existence of limiting factors does not mean to say that workers' control is not valid as a long-term objective. Nor does it mean that the trade unions have done all they could to take it as far as they can, within the bounds of the limiting factors that exist in Australia today.

There is an urgent need for the trade unions to intensify the struggle for even elementary industrial democratic rights. These do not as yet exist here, but they must be achieved before any further steps can be taken towards winning workers' control. Such elementary rights include increasing the rights of Shop Stewards, (who at present have little more legal rights than a stray dog in a factory), the recognition of Shop Committees, (which have no legal rights and are denied full acceptance by the right wing of the trade union movement), the abolition of the penal powers, (which are a throwback to the dark days of the Industrial Revolution), the right to consultation over questions raised by technological change, and the right to have a say in the safety protection of members. The challenge to the Left is to promptly seize and develop those opportunities which favor some degree of workers' control in a particular matter. In the industrial field this usually arises on questions of job safety, the rights of union organisation and the right of hire and fire.

A measure of the entrenchment of managerial rights in Australia and the resistance which has to be overcome is given by the recent major disputes where the employer at the date of writing had flatly refused to give even one tenth of an inch on them. These were the refusal of TAA to reinstate what the union considered to be a victimised job delegate, the Tramways Board refused a union request to transfer a member who worked during an official stoppage, and the refusal of the Post Office to reinstate a union member in Victoria who had supported the action of members in New South Wales against strike breakers. I do not know how these
disputes will end. But all three have been intense industrial struggles with the workers concerned exercising their industrial strength. The degree of their eventual success will therefore be a measure of the organised strength of workers, their present capacity to encroach on and limit managerial rights and the quality of leadership of the trade union movement.

These disputes have also shown what a powerful bulwark is the arbitration system to encroachment on managerial rights, and this is a formidable limiting factor to the achievement of workers' control which is peculiar to Australia. It is my view that a vital pre-requisite towards the development of workers' control is the breaking of the stranglehold of this system which so often contains workers' struggles.

The concept of workers' control raises a number of other important questions which space precludes me from dealing with, such as to what extent it can develop socialist consciousness, what is its importance to a socialist Australia, how can the danger of falling into class collaboration be avoided, and so on. These and those I have raised are left to others to develop as it is a subject with wide ramifications and considerable importance the analysis of which could have easily filled the whole of this issue of the Review.
NEO-CAPITALISM is a distinct historical stage in the evolution of capitalism, characterised by the scale of State intervention and control. Of course, State intervention has always been an essential condition of the development of capitalism, but now we find the massive entry of business into the institutions of State supervision, planning, coordination and control. This movement on the part of business is not compensated by the inclusion into these same institutions of what the British political scientist Ralph Miliband has described as "a number of generally tame and 'responsible' trade union leaders." The containment and ultimate incorporation of the trade union movement is an essential part of neo-capitalism. As the authors of the May Day Manifesto wrote: "In relation to labor and the unions, it is the State which draws the unions into the consensus, identifies them with the planning decisions and the fixing of norms, and thereby wins their collusion with the system."

Neo-capitalism has not developed evenly in the advanced industrial countries of North America and Europe. France has reached a stage of what Herbert Marcuse calls "organisation capitalism" far in advance of the USA. However, British capitalism is now beginning to undergo rapid adaptation and change. The trade unions and industry have been drawn very much closer to the machinery of the State, particularly since the Wilson Government came to power.

In one sense, the association between the trade unions and the State in Britain is nothing new, but rather a continuation of a process that began several decades ago. The Second World War in particular saw a change in the relationship between the unions and the state:

No established right of access to the Government was conceded to unions until the Second World War. The long duration of the war and the much longer duration of post-war economic problems encouraged its establishment. Indeed, communications often moved in the opposite direction. Frequently it was the Prime Minister or one of his Ministers who wanted to meet the trade union leaders.
After the Conservatives came to power in 1951, the union leaders showed no desire to forego their rights of access to the Government or their policy of collaboration with the State machine. Thus, the General Council of the Trade Union Congress stated in 1952:

It is our long-standing practice to seek to work amicably with whatever Government is in power and through consultation with Ministers and with the other side of industry to find practical solutions to the social and economic problems facing this country. There need be no doubt, therefore, of the attitude of the TUC towards the new Government.\(^5\)

One historian, sympathetic to the views of the union leaders, noted:

The TUC leaders \ldots saw to it that the cautious and moderate policy which they had pursued under the Labor Government was maintained under the Conservatives. Among other things, they ensured that resolutions denouncing all forms of wage restraint — such as were regularly submitted to Congress by the Communist-dominated unions — were voted down by adequate majorities.\(^6\)

The number of Governmental committees on which the unions were represented rose from 60 in 1949 to 81 in 1954.\(^7\) Whatever the color of the Government, British trade union leaders enjoyed direct access to Government departments.\(^8\)

The notorious Incomes Policy of the Wilson Government has rapidly furthered the process of coming together between the trade union leaders and the State. V. L. Allen has scathingly pointed out the logic in the sequence of the responses of the Trades Union Congress to the employers and the Government:

The logic is an acceptance of, but not necessarily a belief in, the concept of the Corporate State. Firstly, by its membership of the National Economic Development Council, the Trade Union Congress accepts the organic totality of nation and state. \ldots The general theory of the corporate state assumed a complete conciliation of class interests with workers and employers co-operating for the sake of increasing national production in much the same way as the National Economic Development Council envisages. But there are other points of similarity. The state stands above corporations and syndicates in the theory. These notions, as in the corporate state theory, have no other ethical basis than to consolidate what already exists; that is to maintain the present distribution of income, to preserve the distributive process and to guarantee the rights of the private ownership of industry.\(^9\)

Nevertheless, the TUC is caught in a dilemma. In its "responsible" public role it is compelled to support the notion that wages should be restrained to keep pace with the role of production, but in its role as an interest organisation it has to oppose restraint and press for higher wages. The integration between the trade unions and the State has revealed that the power of the voice of the trade union leaders is small. They sit on innumerable Government committees and affect Government and business policy hardly at all. For their services to "the nation" they win knighthoods from
the Government. Of them it has been said: "Power corrupts, but lack of power corrupts absolutely." However, there are signs of growing opposition in the British trade union movement to the wage restraint policy, which is reflected in recent Left successes in a number of key union elections.

The association between the trade unions and the machinery of the State in Australia is not as far advanced in many areas as in Britain, although Australia is one of the few capitalist countries where the unions are part of the State apparatus by virtue of their participation in the arbitration system. The key role performed by arbitration towards the smooth running of the ongoing system should be well known to readers of *Australian Left Review*. As the Industrial Workers of the World recognised sixty years ago, the overthrow of capitalism in Australia would be inhibited, by a disease of the working class itself, the disease of complacency. They divined the origins of this: 'protective legislation', the Arbitration Court, the existence of a Labor Party.

During the Second World War the Australian Council of Trade Unions was represented on manpower and many other committees, but in the post-war period the scale of its participation on Government committees lags far behind Britain. It has been represented on the Immigration Planning Council and the Immigration Advisory Council, and along with leading industrialists on the Business Advisory Group of the Australian Atomic Energy Commission. It also participated in the now defunct Consultative Committee on Export Policy established by the Tariff Board. The trade union representatives have invariably included Albert Monk, President of the ACTU, who was made a companion of the Most Distinguished Order of St. Michael and St. George by the Menzies Government in 1966 for "outstanding service in the field of industrial relations."

In 1955 the ACTU accepted a place on the Ministry of Labor Advisory Council, established in the previous year and comprising representatives of Government and business. Don Rawson observed: "It showed that the ACTU was prepared to concede that, even in peacetime, employers, employees and governments could and should have common interests." About the same time Monk testified the interest of the ACTU in the notion of productivity, in "co-operation" with Government and industry. However, the divisions within the ALP and the increased strength of the Left in the trade unions led to the ACTU withdrawing from the Ministry of Labor Advisory Council in 1958, whereupon the organisation dissolved itself. Already in 1957 the ACTU had rejected an offer by the Federal Government of a place on the Economic Advisory Committee. Nevertheless, in the absence
of the Ministry of Labor Advisory Council, there is continuous consultation with Government and business on an ad hoc basis.  

A return to a formal form of consultation took place recently with the establishment in April 1968 by the Minister for Labor of the National Labor Advisory Council. A thirteen-member body, it comprises five representatives of the ACTU, two representatives of both the Associated Chambers of Manufactures and the Council of Employers Federations, one representative each from the public utilities and the rural industries, the Secretary of the Department of Labor, and the Minister for Labor himself. Its functions are to enable the Government, the employers and the trade unions to consult together on employment, industrial relations and matters connected with technological change and automation, and to advise the Government and the Department of Labor on these matters.

Bruce McFarlane has pointed out the dangers inherent in such a development:

Where Labor's political representatives have not held power for long periods and the strength of the trade unions has been weakened, the tendency may be for union leaders to seek a place in the administrative machine, to increasingly collaborate with Departments of Labor, to agree to a de facto "incomes policy" and to be passive in industrial relations. . . Australia's hydra-head system of planning, the network of government regulatory agencies linked with trade union bureaucracy, evolves into an (admittedly mild and diluted) form of corporate economy.

There is a consensus in Australia among Government, business and the official representatives of the trade union movement. The key work which crystallises the consensus is "productivity":

The emphasis and agreement upon productivity are created by the demands of the large corporation made upon a society required to pay tribute to business; and the success of the large corporation in inflicting upon society its own self-justification is a measure of the success of the mature corporation. It is also a measure of the mindlessness of modern man, "one-dimensional" man. Both here and in USA unions have fallen prey to the fiction that the dominant aim of society is production. But it remains one of both production and distribution.

Nevertheless, the trade union movement has repeatedly stated that it will not cooperate with any system which controlled only the wage element in the economy. Attempts to introduce a centrally-imposed incomes policy, notably by the present Minister for Labor, Mr. Bury, and by the authors of the Vernon Report, have been abortive. Still, there are clear and present dangers and it must not be forgotten that in the 1950s the Menzies Government achieved some success in imposing a de facto incomes policy, particularly through the activities of the Commonwealth Conciliation and Arbitration Commission. Moreover, the Left has failed to launch a campaign against the formation of the National Labor Advisory Council.
The growth of corporate relations between the State, the trade unions and industry threatens the existence of the trade unions as an autonomous and free force. As Perry Anderson has put it, in words whose relevance is not confined to Britain:

The threat to subordinate the trade unions to the State ultimately threatens the extinction of working-class consciousness as such. It amounts to an attempt to create a totally uncoordinated and purged social whole — the monolithic integration of Marcuse’s “One-dimensional society.” It must be resisted, if socialism is to retain a future in Britain.18

It would be a mistake to conclude that Marcuse’s pessimistic and fatalistic picture as depicted in One-Dimensional Man is an inevitable outcome of neo-capitalism. But the system will never be decisively defeated until the producers — workers, technicians, intellectuals — become conscious of their own collective force and determine to be masters of their own production.

5 Cited in ibid., p. 23.
7 Allen, op. cit., p. 35.
17 McFarlane, op. cit., pp. 188-189.
DISCUSSION:

MORE ON SELF-DETERMINATION

REACTIONS to Ted Bacon's article "On Self-Determination" (ALR 5, 1968) have predictably been widely divergent. A central point of issue has been whether the right of self-determination is a fundamental principle in relations between socialist states or whether it is only a principle which may or may not apply depending on circumstances at the time.

J. B. Henderson (ALR 6, 1968) refers to the fact that the socialist world has entered the epoch of the transition to communism and concludes that old formulas regarding self-determination no longer have full application. This would seem to accord with his quotation from Lenin's The Position and Tasks of the Socialist International: "The socialist movement cannot triumph within the old framework of the fatherland. It creates new, superior forms of human society, in which the legitimate requirements and progressive aspirations of the working masses of every nationality will for the first time be satisfied in international unity on the basis of the abolition of existing national barriers."

However we need to be mindful that this was written by Lenin in November, 1914, castigating the leaders of the Second International who took up positions of strong support for their "own" national governments at the outbreak of the imperialist venture of World War I. This is made clear in Lenin's next sentence: "To the present-day bourgeoisie's attempts to divide and disunite them by means of hypocritical appeals for the 'defence of the fatherland' the class-conscious workers will reply with ever new and persevering efforts to unite the workers of various nations in the struggle to overthrow the rule of the bourgeoisie of all nations." It seems hardly fair to Lenin to take this to be his attitude towards relations between socialist nations.

While Lenin on many occasions speaks of the duty of socialists within a particular country to take up this or that ideological standpoint or struggle, it is always a question within their own nation. I have found no example of his calling for the socialists of one nation to impose a particular viewpoint on socialists of another nation, which I believe has been wrongfully done in the case of Czechoslovakia.

Because at the time of the writings of Marx, Engels and Lenin there was no community of socialist countries, we cannot give positive proof of the attitude of the founders of marxism to the concrete problems at present under discussion. It does seem clear, however, that the right of self-determination was regarded as a fundamental principle. For instance, Lenin writes: "We have affirmed that it would be a betrayal of socialism to reject the implementation of the self-determination of nations under socialism ... By transforming capitalism into socialism the proletariat creates the possibility of abolishing national oppression completely; the possibility becomes reality 'only'—'only!'—with the establishment of democracy in all spheres, including the delineation of
State frontiers in accordance with the 'sympathies' of the population, including freedom to secede. And on this basis, in turn, there will develop the practical elimination of even the slightest national friction, or the slightest national mistrust, accompanied by accelerated rapprochement and fusion of nations that will be completed when the state withers away. (The Socialist Revolution and the Right of Nations to Self-Determination.)

When force is used, even if in good cause such as that of internationalism, national friction is increased and the cause of internationalism put back. I believe this has been the case with the invasion of Czechoslovakia.

Not so long ago the spirit of Lenin's views was endorsed in practical terms in various statements by the world communist movement. Following the Hungarian events, the Government of the USSR issued a document which was permeated with realisation of the essential nature of the principle of self-determination. It said in part: “Being united by the common ideals of building a socialist society and by the principles of proletarian internationalism, the countries of the great community of socialist nations can build their mutual relations only on the principles of full equality, respect for territorial integrity, national independence and sovereignty and non-interference into each other's domestic affairs.” (Tribune 7/11/56). That document is well worth re-reading in the light of recent developments in Czechoslovakia.

It further states “The Soviet Government proceeds from the general principle that the stationing of forces of any state, party to the Warsaw Treaty, on the territory of another state, also party to the Warsaw Treaty, is effected on the basis of an understanding between all its parties and only with the consent of the state in whose territory these forces have been stationed or are to be stationed at its request.”

In spite of Soviet claims that such a request was received from Czechoslovakia, no names of those who made the request have been given. Official reports from Czechoslovakia state that neither the Government nor the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia made any such request.

The statement issued by the 81 communist parties in Moscow, November, 1960, affirms: “It is an inviolable law of the mutual relations between socialist countries strictly to adhere to the principles of marxism-leninism and socialist internationalism... Guided by the principles of complete equality, mutual advantage and comradely mutual assistance, the socialist states improve their all-round economic, political and cultural co-operation, which meets both the interests of each socialist country and those of the socialist camp as a whole.”

Those who seek to justify the violation of the sovereign rights of Czechoslovakia seem to draw comfort from the fact that this was done by five socialist countries and presumably they would be more correct than one lone socialist country. This theory of the weight of numbers seems to have superseded the assurance by the 81 parties that “Every country in the socialist camp is ensured genuinely equal rights.”

Once we accept such a substitution, it is only a short step to the principle “might is right” which I have always regarded as a law of capitalist rather than socialist state relations.

The argument that in a situation which certain socialist countries consider sufficiently grave, they have the right to impose their will (by force if necessary) on a brother socialist country, is a very dangerous one.

For instance, China and Albania
have on numerous occasions declared their conviction that the Soviet Government and CPSU leadership are betraying the socialist revolution and are hand-in-glove with American imperialism. Surely a sufficiently grave situation! Could their armed intervention in the Soviet Union then be supported? Or is the fact that China is regarded by many as having substantially departed from marxism to be taken as valid grounds for military intervention in China by other socialist states?

How does the “right” of a group of socialist countries to intervene in the affairs of another socialist country work out in practice? We might give all the other member nations of the Warsaw Pact the “right” to intervene in the Soviet Union, but are they militarily or economically capable of doing so even if they considered they should? Is this not a case of all being equal, but some more equal than others?

Departure from the principle of self-determination as a fundamental principle in the relations between socialist states can well provide a theoretical basis for war between socialist states—which marxism has to date refuted. Subsequent developments have shown the mass popularity and support among their people for the leaders of the Czechoslovak Government and Party. There can be little doubt that had the leadership called upon the people to resist the entry into their country of the Warsaw Pact forces, there would have been war. It is naive to expect that similar interventions in the future will not at some stage lead to armed conflict between socialist nations.

J. B. Henderson refers to the “colossal assistance of all kinds given by the U.S.S.R. to socialist countries and progressive movements, especially in the developing countries.” This is undoubtedly so and is in contrast with the many-stringed aid offered by capitalism. However to newly developed countries political freedom from foreign domination is a very precious thing (though many soon find economic chains remain). I believe they would be more attracted to taking the socialist path of development if the colossal assistance given them by the Soviet Union were matched by colossal evidence of the complete equality and self-determination they could expect as a right if they chose to become a member of the socialist community—a right extending to the point of withdrawing from the socialist community if they wished.

Similarly, the majority of people in advanced capitalist countries cannot be expected to support the platform of socialist parties within their countries while ever events like Czechoslovakia make it clear that that platform must be acceptable to foreign socialist powers if it is to be implemented.

Events in Czechoslovakia have taken the world socialist movement along a dangerous path. Let us hope the present debate will see a return to the position of the Soviet Government as set out in their statement of 30.10.56: “consistently putting into effect these historic decisions of the 20th Congress which create conditions for the further strengthening of friendship and cooperation between the socialist countries on the immutable basis of respecting the full sovereignty of each socialist state.”

G. Sanderson

SELF-DETERMINATION A BOURGEOIS PRINCIPLE

IN THE ARTICLE “On Self Determination” (ALR 5, 1968) Ted Bacon does his cause serious damage by seeking to use Lenin as an authority to support his views.
In 1917, Lenin wrote "Marxism is an extremely profound and many-sided doctrine. It is therefore not surprising that scraps of quotations from Marx — especially when the quotations are not always to the point — can always be found among the arguments of those who are breaking with marxism". (A Letter to the Comrades — Little Lenin Library, Vol. 13, p. 42.)

Here Lenin's words stress that to understand and faithfully present the views of the leaders of marxist thought, it is necessary to examine, not scraps out of context, but the whole range of their writings on the particular subject.

Certainly, if we are going to Lenin for advice on national self-determination, we need to look further than Comrade Bacon has done.

Of four quotations from Lenin, three deal with the responsibility of the Russians towards the non-Russian nationalities in the Soviet Union, which is only one aspect of the question, that aspect acceptable to a bourgeois nationalist, and certainly not "the fundamental approach to the national question hammered out by the Russian Social Democrats". The fourth quotation appears to have been thrown in because it seems to give support to Comrade Bacon's views on democracy, although any proper examination of Lenin's views on democracy will show that they were vastly different.

Ted Bacon speaks of the "Communist principle of self-determination of nations." But Lenin tells us that "the demand for self-determination of nations" was advanced "before us, as far back as the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, by the petty bourgeoisie"—Meaning of the Right to Self-determination, Selected Works, Vol. V, p. 271.

It is, in fact, not a marxist principle but a bourgeois democratic principle which marxists support, in general, but not in every case. The condition of our support is the interest of the social revolution.

Marx, for example, was against Czech independence in 1848, because the Czech nationalists were aligning themselves with Czarist Russia, the most reactionary force in Europe. Lenin makes the point in Caricature of Marxism and Imperialist Economics that "it is not our duty to support every struggle against imperialism."

Czechs who know their modern history could remind us that, during the negotiations with Chamberlain, Hitler demanded self-determination for the Sudeten Germans, a classical example of the use of this slogan for purposes of fascist aggression.

Lenin wrote "The Social revolution cannot come about except in the form of proletarian civil war against the bourgeoisie in the advanced countries combined with a whole series of democratic and revolutionary movements, for national liberation." (Caricature of Marxism and Imperialist Economics.) So he supported and fought for the principle of self-determination to assist the socialist revolution.

In The Socialist Revolution and the Right of Nations to Self-determination he speaks with approval of Marx "having in mind mainly the interests of the proletarian class struggle in the advanced countries" when he demanded the separation of Ireland from England.

In the same article he said "There is not a single democratic demand which could not serve, and has not served, under certain conditions, as an instrument of the bourgeoisie for deceiving the workers. To single out one of the demands of political demo-
The notion of national self-determination is fundamentally wrong in theory. In practice, the proletariat will be able to retain its independence only if it subordinates its struggle for all the democratic demands to its revolutionary struggle for the overthrow of the bourgeoisie (p. 273, Vol. V., Selected Works).

Again, in the same article, Lenin wrote that “The central point in the Social Democratic program must be the distinction between oppressing nations, which is the essence of imperialism... the Social Democrats of the oppressing nations must demand the freedom of secession for the oppressed nations... The Social Democrats of the oppressed nations, however, must put in the forefront the unity and the fusion of the workers of the oppressed nations with the workers of the oppressing nations” (p. 284). This was the “fundamental approach” of the Bolsheviks.

In the Preliminary Draft of Theses on the National and Colonial Question (written in June, 1920, for the Second Congress of the Communist International) Lenin wrote: “The struggle... against the most deeply rooted petty-bourgeois national prejudices, come the more to the forefront, the more the task of transforming the dictatorship of the proletariat from a national one (i.e., existing in one country and incapable of determining world politics) into an international one (i.e., a dictatorship of the proletariat covering at least several advanced countries and capable of exercising decisive influence upon the whole of world politics) becomes a pressing question of the day,” and he followed this up declaring:

... in states which are already fully capitalistic and which have workers' parties which really act as the vanguard of the proletariat, the struggle against the opportunist and petty bourgeois pacifist distortions of the concept and policy of internationalism is a primary and most important task.”

Comrade Bacon, wrongly declaring national self-determination to be a communist principle, has failed to understand the central point, the fundamental approach of the Bolshevik program on the national question, and he does not see that socialism and internationalism are the primary questions at all times. Nor does he see how Lenin's principles have been carried forward into the decisions of the 81 Communist Parties as a right to independence in formulating policy together with (and always together with) a duty to unite.

D. Gillies

CZECHOSLOVAKIA — NEED FOR OBJECTIVITY

J. B. Henderson in his contribution to the controversy on the Czechoslovakian crisis says that “the evasion of the case of the Five has been a marked and disturbing feature of those in Australia who disagree with the actions of the Five”. This accusation is groundless. What materials are necessary for the presentation of such a case?

Firstly, a correct estimation of events in Czechoslovakia would be impossible without the facts, relevant documents, and if possible the evidence of scrupulous witnesses. Were these things available? The 'Tribune' Sept. 18, said: “Our examination of the international communist press shows that none have surpassed our objectivity in presenting the main contending viewpoints”.

Even so, at the most these evidences are only empirical and descriptive. What is wanted, an explanation, an
interpretation of the facts and events in Czechoslovakia, and the necessary condition for this is the application of marxist principles.

The witnesses were Eric Thornton and Malcolm Salmon. At the end of his detailed report Salmon wrote: "The unmistakable conclusion both of Eric Thornton's enquiries in June and my own in the last week of July and the first week of August, is that far from there being a rising counter-revolutionary danger in Czechoslovakia, the Dubcek leadership of the Communist Party was in the process of successfully delousing this danger, which undoubtedly existed mainly as a hang-over from the Novotny regime."

There are the other documents readily available, including the contradictory 13,000 word Pravda statement, and many other happenings that have built up the case against the Warsaw Pact countries.

The very character of the crisis in Czechoslovakia gave the assurance that a great controversy would ensue, and that this would be revealing. The invasion was not only a violation of socialist territory, but also of socialist principle. Concepts firmly fixed in socialist thinking have been completely shattered. The inadequacy of the habitually accepted point of view is being challenged. The old ways of thinking still survive but they are doomed and have to go.

The controversy now raging all over the socialist world has its own logic. It is already demanding objective thinking. The elements of subjectivity, which are prejudice, habitual and wishful thinking are being severely tested.

The participants (no matter how sincere) in this controversy urging justification for the invasion by the five socialist countries imagine they are loyal to and are defending socialism, when actually they are defending concepts which have nothing in common with socialism, and practices which hinder its advance. Such ways of thinking cannot furnish the party or the class with any satisfactory method of action.

A comparison of the arguments in this debate should be sufficient. Henderson's article is typical of those who support the interventionists. Read it a second time. It is narrow. It treats the whole question in isolation. What is happening in the Soviet Union or any other place is not important. A wall is erected between the domestic and foreign policies of the socialist states. The problems of democracy are seldom raised. When they are they are unrelated to the principle of self-determination which stands at the heart of the problem. J.B.H. mentions democracy once, and only casually, accidentally.

"The proletariat cannot be victorious except through democracy, i.e., by introducing complete democracy and by combining every step of its struggle with democratic demands formulated in the most democratic manner."

This is the essence of Lenin's teachings on democracy. Only the old and the blind can mistake the issue in Czechoslovakia as one against counter-revolution when it is one for democracy.

The Ted Bacon article endeavours to see the Czech problem in its all sidedness. Happenings over the years are disturbing, and these when related to the Czechoslovakian events compel the conclusion that "marxist thinking is not keeping pace with the vast changing reality." Bad policies and practices inevitably flow from this. The weakness in the communist world is derived from the failure to understand the question of democracy, its
relation to the right of self-determination of nations, and to the struggle for socialism.

J.B.H. does concede a fragmentary thought on the problem of self-determination. He quotes from Lenin about the higher interests of socialism, which the master himself would have condemned as having no bearing on the situation under discussion. He then proceeds to inform us that “old formulas regarding self-determination no longer have full application.” “This is the period to ever greater integration, not drawing away”, says J.B.H.

This sounds profound but it is not true. In the first place the word integration as used in this connection is not a good word. In the small socialist countries it would have the flavor of compulsory conformity. Secondly, the real trends in the modern world are not at present towards homogeniety, and there have been trends of “drawing away”.

“Even in the socialist world this is to be observed, and up to a point is natural and inevitable. The “integration” of socialist nations, their togetherness, requires above all else an understanding of Lenin’s teachings on self-determination which extend over a period of many years and must be studied as an organic whole.

The ever deepening general crisis of the capitalist world increases complexities and contradictions. The wrestler needs first to embrace his opponent if he is to toss him onto the mat. Such is life. To bring nations together in order to hasten their dissolution will be a long and protracted process. Compulsion will not help but can only hinder this. Impositions from without can only impede the process of “integration”.

There can be no victory here “except through democracy”. This may appear to be taking the long road around. Lenin’s whole life was a struggle against those who were for “short cuts”.

“My country right or wrong” is the slogan of chauvinists, not socialists. If a socialist country errs in its relations with its neighbors, then it is obviously the duty of its friends to face the unpleasant task of telling it so. But in doing this we should not mistake the blemish for the whole body.

G. Burns

ANALYSING ‘ANALYST’

“ANALYST” avoids the main points of my article “Censorship and Socialism”. He contends I am in error in saying that those who uphold censorship as a principle seem to have the view that ideas alone can cause a counter-revolution. As I do not adequately prove this in my article, but only mention it in passing, he may have a point here.

But he then goes on at some length to attribute to me the view that “ideas alone can win and defend a revolution.” I do not hold this view as will be clear from reading the article itself (e.g. 3rd paragraph page 47 and top of page 50). Nor will such a view be found in anything else I have said or written.

What I do contend is that the struggle of ideas is a vital part of the class struggle (recall Engels on this); that censorship is not necessary for victory in the socialist revolution (even could it be practised on any significant scale); that censorship is, generally speaking, an ineffective method for winning the struggle against the survivals of capitalist ideas after the victory of the revolution; and that if practised to a major degree will hamper the advance of socialism to communism.

“Analyst’s” example of the flat earth theories is an interesting one.
Does he seriously suggest that such ideas are so dangerous they might prevail unless people are protected from them by censorship?

More important, ideas do not all fit neatly into boxes labelled bourgeois and proletarian and we are not without examples of political ideas, later accepted as socialist, being outlawed under Stalin as being of the "flat earth" variety.

Such erroneous labelling of other ideas was extended not only to directly political ones, but to those concerned with art and even to those having to do with natural science (e.g. the Lysenko affair).

Today, in more advanced conditions of socialist society and of the crisis of capitalism, such practices are particularly harmful. A characteristic of our times is the struggle against bureaucracy ordering things from on top from positions of power, with consequent manipulation and lack of involvement and purpose by the majority of people (the "mass society").

Capitalism is incapable of overcoming this because of the relations of private ownership. But socialism has, up to now, inadequately grappled with it, though Lenin placed particular importance on this in the years after the revolution.

Imperialism is certainly the enemy, but the point is how to defeat this enemy, frustrate its plans and build unity against it. I contend that in Czechoslovakia a blow has been struck against socialism, not imperialism; that lack of development of democracy in socialist countries also hinders the struggle against imperialism, and that the invasion of Czechoslovakia has led to greater disunity in the world movement.

Interference in the affairs of other Parties, attempts to decide which leaders are acceptable and which not, attempts to impose by pressure or force one interpretation of what is "true marxism-leninism", are all great obstacles to building unity in the struggle against imperialism.

Communists are also concerned with the nature of the society they seek to build. We should be concerned to understand why such things as stalinism could come into existence and what measures are required to prevent them growing up again.

As many have pointed out, no satisfactory analysis has yet been made by the CPSU — which is to take nothing from the courageous exposure of many of the facts by Khrushchov and others. But in the absence of an authentic and substantiated analysis from this source, others can rely only on their own assessments.

In mine, I include an at present overly defensive attitude towards imperialism and associated theories which come close to the view that the class struggle intensifies as socialism is built; a tendency to equate the national interests of the USSR with the international interests of socialism; a failure to curb bureaucracy and to sufficiently develop democracy and narrow interpretations of marxism in many ways.

Considering that such factors as these made possible the rise of stalinism, I am concerned to see evidences of them still in existence and even being actively defended and propagated.

Analyst makes much of the machine guns and ammunition in the Prague House of Journalists.

What are the facts?

The head of the workers' militia in Prague has declared these and other arms seized to be those belonging to workers' militia units in factories, of-
fices and institutions, and has demanded their return!

The “clandestine radio stations” similarly featured by Soviet authorities as proof of the imminence of counter-revolution, were in fact those belonging to the Czechoslovak armed forces. They were used by President Svoboda and other Party and Government leaders to broadcast to the people when normal communications were disrupted by the invasion.

No one has been arrested by Soviet or Czechoslovak forces for possession of these arms or use of these radios, and in December the Czechoslovak Parliament recorded that the communications equipment used between August 21 and 28 was Czechoslovak (not foreign) and that its employment was entirely legal.

Whether it is dishonesty (Analyst’s word) to misinform people concerning these questions on which so large a part of the case for invasion has been built, readers can judge for themselves. In any case, it certainly speaks against censorship, which would allow such misinformation to go unchallenged.

Analyst is pleased to denounce me as anti-Soviet, and to hold that I believe 50 years of socialism has produced nothing more than a “monumental blunder”.

To one who, like myself, has spent a lifetime praising and defending the Soviet Union such a charge can only be treated with derision. I will continue to defend and praise the Soviet Union and other socialist countries, but will not blinker my eyes or mind, as in the past, to defects and blunders when they become vital issues, as in the present case. Nor do I believe that defects and blunders can be disposed of simply by balancing them against greater achievements.

Today, mass trials and executions from the 30’s on are condemned. But how much better it would have been to have had the facts available to condemn them at the time, together with the censorship, lying and arbitrary use of power without which they could not have occurred.

Having many of the facts now, and being entirely unconvinced by the case put forward for the invasion, or in support of censorship as a part of that case, I regard it as a socialist duty to attempt to assess the situation, draw appropriate conclusions, and make them known.

- Eric Aarons

MARX AND CENSORSHIP

IN DISCUSSION of the Dec-Jan ALR Mavis Robertson referred to the dilemma which faces the critics of the majority viewpoint in the Australian Left on current problems and illustrated this very well in regard to zig-zagging assessments of the policies of Yugoslav communists over the last twenty years.

This raises the broader question of maintaining a consistent, independent analysis if one is to avoid, or overcome, the position of being regarded as a mindless follower of an arbitrary line laid down by some organisation which is held to be virtually infallible.

The coyness which implies this infallibility rather than proclaims it, no longer foils anyone. The situation would not be so bad if it were only a matter of a single zig-zag or one subject. But more than one subject is involved, and sometimes, as with Yugoslavia, it was not one zig-zag, but a double zig-zag.

Something less dramatic, but similar, goes for the subject of censorship. Critics of Eric Aaron’s article on this subject can pounce with glee on a
few formulations of the late fifties (remembering that the maestro in this field was E. Hill) with which most would now disagree, as is their right; but if they are to do so as marxists, they are obliged to begin their investigations with the man who gave the movement its name, and study the trenchant criticisms of censorship *in itself* (unqualified by reference to social systems) made by Marx.

It is clear from Marx’s writings that, quite apart from the Prussian legislation of the 1840’s, he regarded the practice as an evil one, bringing inhuman relationships in its train and exalting a bureaucratic *caste* (not class) which takes upon itself superhuman powers.

It is no less clear that Marx regarded censorship as a key weapon in the preservation of bureaucracy, whose essence he saw, not in the poor organisation and muddle of overworked officials, but in the preservation of concentric layers of *secrecy*, which effectively transformed organisations into *deciders* and powerless *implementers* of policy.

These studies of Marx, although made in the 1840, are still of use in the present, when many enquire just how the abolition of censorship in Czechoslovakia was intimately connected with the smashing of the bureaucracy which had almost brought the economy to a standstill and sowed cynicism and irritation throughout the working population.

One needs to briefly add to this the fact that free-expression was wider in the Soviet Union in its early years, when it was relatively weak, than in recent years, when it is enormously strong, and that Lenin fought gamely in his last years to at least have freer expression in the struggle against bureaucracy, and to compare this with the situation during Stalin’s tenure, to realise the real seriousness of the situation that has been carried over.

No one, thank goodness, now makes airy statements about “mopping-up the last remnants of the personality cult” as was the fashion once.

On this final note, I can only agree with Gajo Petrovic, that “personality cult” was a great misnomer. It was, in fact, an “impersonality cult”—the cult of the impersonality of the mass of the Soviet people.

The desirable cult—the cultivation of the personality of the mass of the people everywhere—as individuals—is incompatible with the ugly paternalism of any censor, be he tyrant or the representative of some self-nominated elite which seeks, in Chairman Mao’s phrase, to paint pretty pictures on the blank minds of the masses.

S. COOPER
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**ON WRITING HISTORY**

MY PURPOSE HERE is historiography—the authentic method in the writing of history for appraisal of leading figures and events. Of decisive importance, as I see it, is to discern basic trends and movements to view everything from the large of history, the total approach; in Spinoza’s phrase, “under the form of eternity.” This specially demands the ability to surmount current “passions and pragmatisms” whatever their immediate compelling importance. Failure in this
regard reduces history-writing to scholastic exercise; it is useless for the needed practical politics to combat, say, (I'm anticipating here) certain official Soviet tolerance of anti-Semitism.

Since the Soviet invasion many Left writers in Australia seem to have lost all historical perspective. Say what you like about Stalin's crimes and I will say the same, but serious writing of history cannot ignore his contributions to theory, organisation and military affairs. Particular conditions and happenings can be understood only by reference to general principles, and vice versa: genesis, historicity, inner development and contradictions, relation and relevance. Stalin was guilty of great nation chauvinism, but examination of his mistakes requires of the scholar concurrent analysis of his earlier work in this sphere which earned Lenin's commendation: "A young genius on the national question."

Under Stalin's direction scores of the formerly-oppressed nationalities and ethnic groups advanced (through literacy with invented alphabets, industry, establishment of the University of Eastern Peoples, etc.) to freedom and culture.

Except for cataloguing Stalin's misdeeds (and the misdeeds of his "heirs") there is a complete black-out in many Left writings. Stalin becomes an "unperson"—as Khrouchtchov made him and who was himself un-personned by his successors. But objective facts: Under Stalin's dictatorship socialism was built; he was generalissimo of the army that planted the Communist flag over Hitler's chancellory. It was the USSR advance to socialism, led well or ill by Stalin, that helps account for such momentous events in civilisation as colonial freedom, the youth-student revolt, the ever-widening fissures in the R.C. Church and the "startling" new experience in the open criticism of the CPSU by non-Soviet CP's.

The denial of "everything Stalin" becomes intellectualist conformism to old-style anti-Sovietism. It suits Moneybags perfectly in his claim that repression is integral to socialism and communism.

Some dates of the Stalin period are nodal points in Soviet and world history.

1927. Soviet production finally reached again the (tsarist) total of 1913 which was only seventh among the industrial countries; a feeble level, and in that post-October decade USA and other States had meantime shot way ahead.

1931. "We have only ten years," warned Stalin, to prepare for the anticipated imperialist onslaught.

1941. Exactly ten years later, so it happened, imperialism's Nazi shock brigade attacked with a prodigious aggregation of forces. But USSR parried the blow, defeated Hitler, and mankind's future progress was assured. (In passing, one of the very first decisions of the newly-established Soviet State, even before the well-known decrees on peace, land, etc., was consolidation of power. The Nazi defeat signalled the final historical consolidation of socialist power).

Stalin played a prominent role in drafting and in the adoption of the USSR Constitution (1936). Here indeed is a wonderful declaration of rights and freedoms, by very far the most advanced in human affairs. Socialism elevated Soviet citizenry to foremost place among the nations in literacy, education and culture.

"But, damn it all," one can validly object, "despite the Constitution and culture Stalin was able to kill off thousands of Party cadres, intellectuals and military specialists. He nearly brought USSR to destruction. And
now with Stalin's 'heirs' we have the Czech events, new repressions . . .

Yes, true. Awful. But culture is essentially humanist. Culture becomes synonymous with man's sensibility, intelligence and creativity, with human worth and dignity. Culture is impossible without democracy (in the given historical stage of social evolution), and by the same token has always been the first challenge to injustice and authoritarianism. The Soviet society that reads Tolstoy and Gorky, Shakespeare and Goethe in hundreds of editions will overcome Stalinist crime and political folly.

It has already overcome much! The repression against young Litvinov and the others is shocking, but it isn't one-hundredth as bad as the Stalin purges.

The total view, the all-sided approach. I reject the doctrine of the "Socialist commonwealth and the right of interference," but cannot forget USA's thousands of N-weapons, or that two-thirds of humanity suffer undernourishment. Or the 20 million Soviet people who died in the war.

Left writers of history are makers of history; hence their responsibility for integrity by which I mean wholeness in presentation. But the Lefts I am criticising describe Soviet history only in unrelieved black; there are no nuances, no tiny light amid the encircling gloom. They are, to me, historians who adopt the advice of German militarist theoretician von Moltke: "Tell the truth, tell nothing but the truth, but don't tell the whole truth." The very language used by some of the Lefts is an "improvement" on "Voice of America" style, but it is the style of nihilism and sceptis.

I am not querying the facts these Lefts present, but writing and remaking history require more than regurgitation of ingested facts however authentic per se.

Summary. Let's forget historiography. What do I think about Brezhnev and his colleagues? There are two statements of mine (Tribune and Discussion), but to emphasise:—Brezhnev and his colleagues are bureaucrats and were naturally misinformed about Czechoslovakia. They don't trust and cannot grasp the dynamism and creative potential of full socialist democracy; they are guilty of repression, falsification and, understandably, of political gaucherie and propaganda ham-fistedness.

But to balance up, one (here only one) fact: Thanks in large measure to Brezhnev and his colleagues USA imperialism has suffered military, political and moral defeat in Vietnam.

L. H. GOULD

BREAD PRICE SWINDLE

Condensed from material prepared by Research Officer L. J. McPhillips for the Federated Liquor and Allied Industries Employees Union, N.S.W. Branch.

BREAD MANUFACTURERS in N.S.W. will nett a cool $2 million extra profit this year as a result of the recent bread price increase so generously approved of by the anti-Labor Askin Government.

On December 2nd, 1968, the press reported a price increase in flour "announced by the chairman of the N.S.W. Flour Millers' Council." The increase was $3.50 a short ton (2,000 lb) of flour and was said to be "due to the increase of 5.5c a bushel in the home consumption price of wheat" and to what was loosely called "wage increases and general cost rises in the milling industry."

From a bushel of wheat weighing 60 lb the millers get approximately 43.2 lbs of flour. The remainder of
the wheat is converted into bran, pol-
lard and other products, with a very
small 'waste'. On this basis it requires
46.3 bushels of wheat to produce a
short ton, i.e. 2,000 lbs. of flour.

43.2 lbs of flour is approximately
72% of the 60 lbs of wheat contained
in a bushel. Since the rest of the bushel
of wheat is not waste but is, in the
main, converted into other products,
not all of the 5.5 cents increase in the
price of a bushel of wheat can be said
to increase the price of flour.

72% of 5.5 cents—the amount by
which the price of a bushel of wheat
was increased—is 3.96 cents. If this
is increased to 4 cents as representing
the amount of the 5.5 cents wheat
price increase which should affect the
price of flour, then with 46.3 bushels
of wheat being needed to produce a
short ton (2,000 lbs) of flour, the in-
crease in the price of a ton of flour
should be $1.85.

If this is increased to $2.00 to allow
for some of the cost of the waste pro-
duct of wheat to be recovered in the
price of flour, it would leave $1.50
increase in the price of a ton of flour
to meet "wage increases and general
cost rises" in milling 2,000 lbs of
flour.

The value of wheat used is approx-
imately 93% of the total value of all
materials used in producing flour and
the value of materials used in produc-
ing flour is approximately 70% of
the total value of the output of flour
mills. So to cover the cost of the
major ingredient in flour production
only slightly more than half the price
rise is needed.

The other portion of the increase
in the price of flour, i.e. $1.50 would
give the millers an extra $790,023 on
1966-67 production. That sum of
money equals approximately 27.5% of
the wages bill for flour mill opera-
tives for 1966-67. But wages for those
workers have increased during the year
only by amounts ranging from 6% to
16% of previous wage rates with most
workers getting increases equalling
only 9.5% and 10.5% of their previous
wage.

Increased wages could not possibly
justify a price rise for flour. For every
31 cents the workers in this industry
receive in wages and salaries, they pro-
duce another 69 cents for the flour
millers. So wages and salaries could
be doubled and without any increase
in the price of flour the millers would
still make a handsome profit.

But flour milling companies are
large scale owners of bakeries. At June,
1968 there were 691 registered bakeries
in NSW. Of these, 433 are in country
areas and 258 in Sydney, Newcastle
and Wollongong. What are called
"group" bakeries are the biggest bread
producers and these are owned by the
same people who own the flour mills.
Tip Top Bakery Holdings, Buttercup
Bakeries Ltd., Gold Star Group, Cob-
bity Farm and Marrickville Holdings
are the big bread manufacturers and
are all owned by companies owning
flour mills. Of 172 bakeries in the
County of Cumberland only 20 are
so-called independent bakeries and
the largest of these "ABBCO" is own-
ed by a flour milling company.

So, as flour millers, they charge
themselves an increase for the flour
they use as bread bakers and then, as
bread bakers, they "jack-up" the price
of bread to recover the increased price
they have paid themselves for the
flour they sold to themselves.

But even that is not all. The price
of flour rose $3.50 a short ton and at
2,000 lbs to the short ton the increase
was .175 cents per lb of flour. One
2 lb loaf of bread takes 1\(\frac{1}{2}\) lbs of flour.
The flour price rise increases the price
of flour used to make a 2 lb loaf of
bread by .263 cents. One cent being
the lowest valued coin available, the flour millers cum bakers "up the price" of bread by one cent. This gives them a "cop" of .737 i.e. \(\frac{3}{4}\) of a cent per 2 lb loaf of bread over and above the increased price of the quantity of flour used to make the loaf.

If the differing sized loaves of bread manufactured are expressed as equivalents of 2 lb loaves — production in N.S.W. in 1966-67 equalled 28,030,626 loaves. At .737 cents per loaf "cop" there would be a total "cop" on that number of loaves of $2,122,785!

So allowing for both these factors, our estimate of a $2m. "cop" for bread manufacturers is not exaggerated — and remember, the big bloke gets most of this.

The last general price increases for bread in N.S.W. was in July 1967. Since then there have been only two small wage increases totalling $2.35 for adult males in N.S.W. Awards covering Bakers and Breadcarters. Official figures link bakeries with cake and pastry manufacturing and they show that in those industries, for every 35 cents the workers receive in wages salaries, they make another 65 cents for the employers. So wages are not a major cost in these industries and the small increase in wages did not justify a price rise.

This seems to be a form of legalised robbery per medium of a price rise. And the Askin Government approves of this. In addition to approving such price rises, this same Government has increased fares, raised hospital fees and imposed additional taxation burdens. What we have said here in relation to N.S.W. is true also of the position in relation to other States with only slight changes of some figures. But this same legalised plunder by means of price rises applies to a vast range of commodities, e.g. steel and petrol.

The Trade Union movement has a policy of price control. Quite obviously this will need vigorous action for enforcement if the value of hard won wage gains is to be protected and living standards really raised.

**VIETNAM AND AFTER**

IRRESPONSIVE of the cynical lies of the US propaganda machine, the Americans from 1954 up to 1967, never once had the initiative in Vietnam. These were 13 years of defeats. However, due to the fact that the Americans have the capacity for telling the most outrageous untruths with an innocent face, and that they are experts in oiling over or violently silencing dissenting voices, they managed to keep up a facade of right-doing and victory till December '67. The events known as the Tet offensive sent this facade crumbling. American and world audiences witnessed Pro-Consul Bunker hiding in and refusing to come out of his secret bomb-proof bunker in his own fortress, and Westmoreland, the new Napoleon, hiding for dear life under his desk, hysterically shouting "I have the situation under control." This was too big a pill to swallow, even for the gullible folk at home. The world laughed and cheered. The laughs were directed at the gum-chewing crusaders, the cheers went to the indomitable fighters of Vietnam.

Just as the French defeat of Dien Bien Phu signalled the end of the French military adventurers' presence in Vietnam, the glorious Tet offensive heralded the end of the US adventure in Vietnam.

The following happenings would have been impossible, even unthinkable before the Tet offensive:

The US willingness to negotiate with Hanoi.
The acceptance of hostile, anti-US Paris (of all capitals) as the seat of the negotiations.
The humiliating acceptance of the rightful seizure of the US spy-ship Pueblo by the North Koreans.
The declaration of Johnson that he would not present himself for re-election, thus giving a free hand to a less compromised person to work out the details of US withdrawal from Vietnam.
The cessation of the barbarous bombing of North Vietnam.
The admission of the NLF delegates to the Paris talks.
The strongly worded rebuffs of Clifford to the Saigon lackeys.

I am of the opinion that the US will gradually disengage from Vietnam in 1969, but will keep some military bases in her vassal state of Siam. US efforts will be concentrated against the peoples of South and Central America, mainly against socialist Cuba. Castro's example of national independence is anathema to the US. If the entire socialist camp does not stand firmly behind Fidel Castro, socialism, freedom is doomed in this part of the world.

The Latin Sub-American continent is and always has been the principal source of the ill-acquired wealth of the US. Their stake in Latin America staggers the imagination. This is their redoubt—200 million slaves toil incessantly for US plutocrats in Latin America. By the turn of the century these slaves will number 5 to 6 hundred million. The signs are on the wall for everyone to read. America is on the defensive and retreating to her lair—military adventures are out, in Europe, the Mid-East, the Asiatic continent, Africa—but let us watch Latin America and the Caribbean.

It would be unwise to conclude that the US has decided to stop meddling in the affairs of nations outside her own continent. She would not be the US if she did. What I put forward is the view that she will not use massive force for many years to come anywhere in the world except in Latin America and the Caribbean. The Socialist Camp and others such as de Gaulle of France are cutting the US down to size, which in fact is not a tenth of what her propaganda would have the world believe.

MICHAEL PERDRIEL
Radovan Richta
MODELS OF SOCIALISM

The author, an eminent philosopher and a member of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia, directs a scientific institute which produced the following as a contribution to the discussion then being promoted as preparation for the 14th Congress of the Party. It was printed in the Communist paper Rude Pravo on July 10-11-12 1968. This translation is from the German.

THERE IS HARDLY A GROUP in our society which, during the course of the past months when the process of renewal was asserting itself, has not publicly pointed to the harsh conditions and obstacles with which they had to wrestle before the January days for their legitimate interests which had remained unsatisfied. When the curtain was lifting and people began to speak openly about their worries, naturally everybody saw a different aspect of the old system as the most aggravating. For a long time the workers had already come up against the barriers placed against their lives through the stagnation of the living standard and the waste of labor power. The technicians and specialists felt frustrated in their striving for creative activity and personal initiative. For the intelligentsia the suppression of democratic liberties had become unbearable, from Slovakia came the protest of a people which could not unfold its inner forces. For working women, securing the conditions for their existence had become a road of hardship. The youth expressed their dissatisfaction with the restricted possibilities to prove themselves in the future.

The multiplicity of these complaints could give rise to the impression that we are faced with a knot of diverse conflicts which cannot be disentangled: conflicts between the intelligentsia and the workers, between social security and economic dynamic, between social self-management and political democracy, between artists and technicians, between Czechs and Slovaks, between young and old, between party functionaries and ordinary party members, between Communists and people belonging to no party. But this interpretation is only a superficial expression or a distorted form of the deeper conflict which in reality is deciding the future of this country.

What is really involved is the model of socialism which has become established here in the past era. This model rests on a
restricted and distorted conception of socialism; it contains within itself the danger of degeneration and discredit. There is therefore no alternative but to dissociate oneself decisively from this model and to attempt to create a new model of socialist society free from bureaucratic narrow-mindedness and cleansed of arbitrariness based on power politics and doctrinairism.

The traditional model of socialism arose mainly in countries which did not immediately possess a material, social and cultural base for a socialist development. This concept unfolded as an attempt of a revolutionary negation of the fundamental forms of bourgeois society on a basis which did not enable it to fill this negation with a positive socialist content and to shape the life of the socialist society in accordance with its own inner logic. This led to a transition period during which the socialist orientation was carried through by means of external intervention by the centre of power. These circumstances have already by themselves deformed the base. Out of the necessity conditioned by the time a virtue was made. Stalin considered the restrictions and deformations as genuine and permanent attributes of socialism. The development of a functioning socialist system is not possible solely on the basis of the negation of the capitalist forms—the bourgeois institutions of power and private property—of the means of production. Socialism in its specific form cannot exist as a society in which bureaucrats rule, in place of the overthrown bourgeoisie, in which the state in place of the capitalists implements industrialisation and transforms the country into a single large centrally directed factory; where social justice and security for all is "guaranteed" in such a manner that nearly all the people are robbed of the possibility to develop their capacities and creative impulses.

Marx, Engels, Lenin and other socialist thinkers have conceived of socialism in a different way. In their opinion a truly new society can only come into being on the basis of a positive overcoming of capitalism, its economy, its cultural-political heritage and its whole base of industrial civilisation. This means an actual socialisation of the means of production, the creation of relations of all-round mutual co-operation and consequently also of an economic interest structure which will stimulate a general spirit of enterprise. This involves the constitution of particular democratic decision-making organs which guarantee a higher measure of freedom. It finally means the creation of an adequate material base, in other words a dynamic of the productive forces which can provide ever-growing scope for the creative self-realisation of man and the development of his potentialities.

Behind us lie years in which important elements were removed from this socialist project; as a result its whole content was falsi-
fied and distorted. Stalin's conception was an expression of this degradation. Those who defend socialism in its deformed shape either err themselves or mislead others. Thereby they discredit socialism as such.

Socialism cannot abandon the total complex of historical tasks which make it into socialism, that means into a higher form of society. Since Marx's day the revolutionary movement has proved that in order to fulfil such a huge task it is necessary, at every stage, to muster enough courage for the movement to be renewed and raised to a higher level. The courage, the force, to overcome the old model of socialism — that, above all, is what we need today.

For a free and democratic socialism

The socialist movement already faced the reversing tendency of political power when it took the first steps of the revolutionary transformation of human living conditions, when it established the dictatorship of the proletariat to expropriate the capitalists and break their power. Directly following the revolution there occurred such a concentration of power over all aspects of man's life as had never existed in any former social order. At the same time no guarantees were created against the misuse of this power, which soon began to get out of the control of the movement and to contaminate the leadership, by transforming the instruments of revolutionary change into power organs of bureaucratic forces. This experience should lead us to the conclusion that socialist society can only exist as such if alongside the overcoming of class differences it also liquidates step by step those instruments of repression which have lost their justification for existence.

A society can only be described as socialist if it gradually restricts and abolishes its organs of political power so that they cannot turn against the socialist development, a society which stops the intervention of the organs of power in those spheres which do not belong to it (such as economics, science, culture, party life etc.). This involves the continuous enlargement of freedoms and democratic rights for everybody. The citizen of a socialist country should not have only as many or even fewer freedoms than exist in a bourgeois society, freedom of movement and travel — but more; he should not enjoy fewer or as many, but more rights: personal and national right of self-determination, the right to education, to work and the development of his capabilities, the right to individual property, to participation and decision-making.

When ever the pre-conditions can be created, socialist democracy moves from the ordinary representative system to the higher form of direct democracy, to the system of self-management and combines these two forms. We currently face the task to develop
our own system of socialist democracy, to open up by stages new possibilities for representative democracy on the basis of the national front to which additional organisations which have proved their socialist orientation shall be added over a period of time.

The modern mass media, in so far as they truthfully reflect a lively public opinion, have a great significance for socialist democracy. We point to the fact that the modern means of science and technology present the old problem of democracy which Rousseau already recognised in a new light: it has become possible to give man a permanent over-all picture of public opinion, of expert views, to familiarise him with alternative scientific views, give him a maximum choice of potential leaders. Modern communication and computing techniques permit direct participation of the population in basic decision making. Socialist society should not allow itself to lose the initiative in this respect.

The alternative with which we are concerned today does not consist in the "substitution" of socialism by democracy, nor in "complementing" socialism with democracy by administrative means from the outside, as the defenders of the old model understand it, the alternative rather calls for: the development of the democratic dimensions or the collapse of the socialist project — for socialism without democracy and its development is not socialism.

For a socialism with a spirit of enterprise

During the last years we have reached the conviction that it is impossible to make the necessary changes in the economy without a radical turn to democracy in political life. The coming months and years will probably bring the experience that democracy cannot exist for long without its own positive socialist forms of economy which can reflect, unify and accomplish the fundamental interests resulting from social labor. In this respect, also, we face fundamental changes in the conception of socialism, changes which have already knocked at our doors for some years thanks to the initiative of our economists.

We have abolished capitalist property and thereby paralysed the former driving force of the economic self-movement. This mere negation however, has not by itself created any higher stimuli and forms of movement of the economic development, it has not brought into being a particular socialist system with a universal spirit of enterprise. The negation has merely transferred the direction of the whole economy to the centre which under these conditions had to succumb to bureaucratisation and subjectivism. Outside the centre this has led to a lack of interest and irresponsibility. As a result of this our society, in its attempt to create the social wealth which is the prerequisite for the fulfilment of the
fundamental humane tasks of socialism, has not achieved the
degree of efficiency which is necessary for us and which has been
achieved by some capitalist countries.

Our system, which allegedly represented a policy “in the interest
of the workers”, “in the interests of the people” was completely
insensitive towards the working people as producers as well as con-
sumers. The worker was forced to chase after quotas (or norms)
which became an end in itself. At his place of work he was in
constant struggle against disorder, against deficiencies in the pre-
paration and the quality of materials and tools. He constantly
suffered from the shortage of consumer goods and the high-handed-
ness of the service industries, he was always looking for living
quarters etc. The system which justified its centralised structure
by the alleged requirements of scientific direction, did not provide
scope for enterprise and technical initiative, it frustrated the will
to work of a whole army of engineers, technicians, economists,
foremen and skilled workers. In place of a dynamic social security
which offered opportunities to everybody, the security offered
under the old system consisted in the preservation of an intolerable
state of affairs (at the expense of the economic dynamics and in
the final analysis at everybody’s expense). A society which does not
have at its disposal an economic system with a socialist spirit of enter-
prise which has been positively thought through, will always tend
to substitute the lacking economic instruments by direct interven-
tion from the outside, in order to achieve the necessary advance of
production in a bureaucratic fashion.

We are facing now the historically as yet unfulfilled task, to
work out a particular positive economic system of socialism in
which the subjectivity of social labor will really assert itself. This
presupposes the freeing of enterprises from the tutelage of the
state, whereby the enterprises, as economic subjects shall be con-
structed on the basis of the principle of self-management. At the
same time market relations are to be fully developed, namely so
that every working collective (or work-collective) will develop social-
ist initiative and be placed in a position where it has to mobilise
all capacities and to convert them into economic activity for
personal benefit as well as for the benefit of the whole of
society. Only under these conditions will the state be able to carry
out a rational and planned economic policy. The state will then
no longer intervene to replace the other subjects of the economic
dynamic, but will create the conditions in which the free effect
of economic interests will be of benefit to all and where the whole
economic activity will clear the way for the stream of suggestions
which can come from modern science as well as from the initiative
of the workers.
For a socialism with modern orientation

Full socialist democracy cannot be realised without a functioning economic system, at the same time the successful functioning of the economic system cannot be separated from a change in the orientation of economic development towards intensive growth. The method of guiding the economy by bureaucratic directives which looked upon the whole country as a single industrial enterprise arose out of the conditions of extensive industrialisation.

At the time, special historical circumstances led to the tying together of two heterogeneous processes: socialisation and industrialisation. In Stalin’s conception industrialisation was simply placed alongside socialisation as the particular base and the particular historical task of socialism. This interpretation rather ignored the fact that the completion of industrialisation, the creation of an industrial structure of the productive forces, reaching “industrial maturity” constitutes a prerequisite for socialism.

The “industrialisation model” of socialism was applied for two decades to our conditions for which, at least during the last ten years, there was no longer the slightest justification. The process of industrialisation is connected with tendencies in respect to labor (growing abstractness, dehumanisation of work for the majority of the people), to consumption (limiting the majority to the mere reproduction of labor power), to leadership (sharpening of the contradiction between the leaders and those who are led) as well as generally with specific limitations for man’s self-expression, which are in contradiction to the socialist development.

This leads to an interest structure, which does not permit a permanent, spontaneous free development of socialism in accordance with its real content. Such a structure therefore requires a particular interest group which comes forward in the name of the working class, which carries through industrialisation, but which at the same time separates itself from the working people and which acquires certain non-socialist traits. For this reason the bureaucratic forces hang on so tenaciously to the industrialisation program in which they see their justification for existence and which they absolutise. The ten year long artificial prolongation of the extensive development in our country, instead of a turn towards the scientific and technical revolution has led to a serious delay in technical development, to a huge waste of human labor in simple mechanical work, to a catastrophic situation in the services and the standard of living, to a restriction of the possibility for a shortening of working hours and for the enlargement of consumption.

This fact lies at the root of the crisis that we have been through. The “industrialisation model” of socialism already contains the
bureaucratic and anti-socialist deformation, and it would therefore be a hopeless attempt to try to "improve" this model by pseudo-reforms, without altering its nature. This problem is all the more difficult because here we are touching the core of the historical tasks of socialism. The greater part of our citizens to this day carry out only simple, monotonous, operative activities, which for them serve only the purpose of earning a living. At the same time this work, even on the basis of the time involved, consumes their main energies. Inner satisfaction they do not find in it. Socialism cannot be satisfied with this. It has to change step by step the profile of human labor and to shorten the working time, it must develop modern projects for the "humanisation of labor" which rationally take advantage of the social character of labor, which compensate for the fragmentation due to the division of labor, which reduce monotony and raise the culture of labor. These projects will need to take into account improvements in the standard of living, coordination of work and education, compensation for routine jobs by creative tasks, of manual by mental labor, the enlargement of participation and so forth. All this should lead to the position where man will gradually be freed from such restrictions, and come closer to freer, more creative work.

The same applies to consumption. A considerable proportion of our society exists on a standard of living which does not transcend the barriers of the daily cares of living, the simple reproduction of labor power. This consequently does not make it possible to lift everybody's style of living permanently and substantially. If, however, everybody does not find within his circumstances ever more time to free himself out of the sphere of necessity, if people do not have ever better opportunities for advancement, for the satisfaction of and the creation of new and higher requirements, then socialism cannot remove the barrier of the pressure of consumption and cannot satisfy the general interest in the up-grading of the whole of society. In this way socialism would lose its human core, its human perspective.

Socialism is tied in all directions to a transformation of the civilisation-base of human life, to a dynamic of the productive forces which can bring about a gradual alteration of human labor and of man's life. This would alter the general attitude of man whereby every success in the unfolding of human forces would create the pre-conditions for a further acceleration of the development of the structure and the dynamic of the productive forces. This involves finding the starting points to the scientific and technological revolution which is beginning to break through in the world.

We regard it as our duty to point out that the democratic model of socialism cannot be grafted on to the process of industrialisation.
Children of the Desert

Above: Tjamiwa

Right: Maluya

Photographs reproduced by courtesy of the publishers, Thomas Nelson (Australia) Ltd.

A review of Children of the Desert appears on page 70.
Such an attempt is bound to fail, because in this way the whole nature of the lack of freedom, which millions of working people know and feel, would not change.

For a humane mission of the Party

The fate of the further development of socialism in our country depends today directly on the state of the Communist Party. If the Communist Party is to prove itself at the present time and to inspire a new model of socialism, then it must itself undergo a deep transformation and change its traditional form.

As a basic factor of the political system the Communist Party must constantly strive for a position which enables a control of power on the basis of partnership, the contest of ideas and people, and of confrontation and posing of alternatives. But even that is not sufficient. We are of the opinion that the time has come for communists to return to the thought which they expressed at their founding congress: namely that they are not only a political party, but strive to be the vanguard of a new epoch, a movement which grows out of depth of this time and strives to solve its fundamental contradictions.

The type of Party which developed under the conditions of the dictatorship of the proletariat and the process of industrialisation, now belongs to the past. The quicker the Communists grasp this, the quicker the crisis which has gripped the Party can be overcome. In the first place one has to give up the notion that everything which happens outside of the Party or without its sanction is either harmful or suspect. When the interests which are asserting themselves in society are already exhibiting socialist tendencies, then the above notion really expresses the fact that a particular group demands the right to decide without regard to the interests of the people.

The question how far something contributes to the strengthening of the political power of the Party can only have validity as the criterion for Party activity under conditions of a struggle for power. In the proper perspective the basic task for Party members is different—to accomplish the development of socialism as a movement, that means to stimulate the positive activities of the people. For this too much power can in certain cases rather be a hindrance.

The conception of the Party as a force which is held together from top to bottom by professional revolutionaries has no general validity and is obsolete. It rests on the assumption that all others are unable to fully comprehend social problems. Consequently they can only participate in the carrying out of tasks, but not in the decision about the future road. The organisational structure, the methods of work and the selection of cadres correspond to it—they all carry the stamp of a bureaucratic system. In today's
conditions the Party cannot carry out its tasks without the democ-
ratisation of the processes of decision-making, without the freedom
to take different alternatives into account, without permanent
renewal of cadres, without constant exploration of the opinion
of Party members, without secret elections, without giving a free
road to all leading positions in the Party to capable Communists
who enjoy the confidence of the public.

The principle of democratic centralism was originally interpreted
in a sense which arose from a period of violent class struggle as a
temporary and forced measure. Essentially this pre-supposes that
the Party does not need to look for new ways but simply needs
to apply the old general schemes in the particular conditions. But
today when we are concerned with the mobilisation of the creative
forces we cannot regard groups within our Party with diverse
opinions which are struggling for a crystallisation and sorting out
of views as factions which have to be destroyed. The minority
must have the right to strive before the eyes of the whole Party to
become the majority.

To push differences of opinion on to the periphery of Party life,
which was perhaps justified in conditions of hard class struggles,
paralyses the development of thought at a time when the search
for new ways for socialist development and the co-ordination of
the socialist interests of all strata in society has become the main
task of the Party.

If the Party is to open every door to science this must also
apply to the bearers of science themselves, to all who are interested
in the realisation of scientific knowledge. The Party should create
organs which are capable of transmitting the most modern con-
clusions of science into our movement, conclusions which have
been reached outside the Party in the autonomous domain of
science. At the same time it is necessary to respect the specific,
special "rules of the game" of science.

The strongly emphasised demand for unity of the Party must be
freed from the superstitious connections which feed the sterility
of thoughts and ideas. Not unity about everything and at any
price, but capacity for action, that is the requirement. Where the
unity threatens the capacity for action, it rests on false foundations
and requires new differentiation and new creation. Unity as a
process, as a consequence of a permanent inner differentiation —
this is the only fruitful unity. The absolutisation of unity in
critical moments when confronted with new and unusual tasks
would understandably lead to a veto exercised by the conservative
forces.

If the Party is to renew itself as a movement which wants to
stimulate the permanent socialist development then it has to formu-
late aims and perspectives which transcend the horizon of today and the coming days. Then it must put forward a program to society without wanting to dictate to the people their manner of living. Otherwise the Party would continue on the path of the crisis and degenerate into an ordinary political party which even with the best of intentions has not got the right to lead the society of today.

Socialism as a system of society has its internal total logic and can only function when all its elements function. The realisation of the new model of socialism pre-supposes the realisation of all its basic elements. At the same time the necessary unity can only arise out of the total deeply-rooted forward movement which embraces all strata of modern life. Any attempt of a mere partial or compromise solution would destroy the unity. The choice before us therefore is clear: either we thoroughly realise the new conceptions of socialism and the Party or socialism remains stuck in the morass of compromise and struggle for positions, the pressure of the conservatives who do not shrink from the appeal to the most primitive instincts, and the desperate attacks of radicalised forces losing patience and calm.

One cannot escape from the crisis in which our movement has become embedded. The responsibility for this crisis cannot be placed on television, radio and the press, which — sometimes better, sometimes worse — reveal the depth of the crisis, but on the conservative elements which have brought our country to the brink of disaster. It does not make sense to scold the mirror if one does not like the reality it reflects. It is unworthy to point the threatening finger, in the name of concern for socialism, at those who are looking for a way to overcome the errors, instead of at those who want to block the road and thereby conjure up a repetition and a deepening of the crisis. It is dangerous to nurture the illusion that it is possible to defend socialism by defending its deformations. This is precisely the way to open the door to the real enemies of socialism. Our duty towards socialism and the international labor movement means: to realise socialism in our country in its genuine and complete form!

The Communists must counterpoise commandism and arbitrariness with the free socialist development of society and of man, the power hungry desire to order about by the democratism of self-management, the bureaucratic dullness by scientific reasoning, the humdrum by modern tempo, the violation of national and human values by patriotic and international responsibility, narrow-minded Party thinking by communism as a humanist movement, conservatism and capitulationism by socialist advance. They must do it consistently and in good time.
A participant from Australia in the International Prepara­tory Committee for the ninth World Youth Festival held in Sofia July-August 1968, raises some critical views on the work of the Preparatory Committee and the conduct of the festival.

AFTER ALL THAT HAS HAPPENED in Czechoslovakia since August it is hard to look back on the World Youth Festival and make a clear assessment of a world gathering of youth and students under the slogan “Solidarity, Peace and Friendship” when two weeks after it concluded one of the participating countries is occupied by its supposed friends. But my experience of four months work of the International Preparatory Committee (IPC) of the World Youth Festival (held in Sofia, Bulgaria, from July 28 till August 6, 1968) raised many questions in my mind which seem to be relevant to the situation in which many progressive organisations find themselves. For this reason it may be useful to draw attention to the kind of problems that occurred and the action that was taken in connection with them.

There are those of the left who have attempted to reconsider their positions in the real world at the end of the 1960s. They do this to lay a basis for broader and more meaningful work. To be effective one must put theories to the test and place emphasis on courage and flexibility as well as loyalty. If many young people of the left lack experience, what they offer — opening and question­ing minds — can be invaluable for those who seriously want to be effective in their aims. I believe that the Communist Party in Australia at its 21st Congress was one of the radical organisations seeking to be appropriate in policies and organisation and that it, and other organisations of the left might learn something from the experiences of the World Youth Festival.

What were the aims of the Festival in which about 120 countries as well as many International Organisations participated? First it was seen as a demonstration of support for the people of Vietnam and a protest against the policies of the United States. Second it was envisaged as a meeting ground for people with common aims,
people who could learn from each other and discuss current
problems on ideological and practical levels. That was the theory.
The problem with this idea, for those who already have all the
answers and see no reason to reconsider anything, is that when it
is put into practice one cannot give guarantees that everyone is
going to reach agreement or that people will not criticise the
existing order — in socialist as well as in capitalist countries.
You find that people are not very interested in highly organised
meetings where they feel they may not hear more than jargonistic
slogans and declarations of solidarity. In the circumstances, to
avoid spontaneous discussion and unpredictable results, an easy
answer is to organise until the meaning had almost gone out of the
very questions under study, and above all to keep away from any
question which is actually or potentially controversial.

These were the reasons, it seems to me, that the IPC refused to
allow the following topics to become an integral part of the Festival
discussion program:

The developments in Czechoslovakia from January to July
1968.

The significance of the new radical student movements, espe­cially those of Western Europe.

The actual and potential relationships between the radical
student movements and the working class movements.

The significance and interpretation of marxism in the world
today.

It may be that there are those who think that such questions ought
not to be discussed in a gathering of “Solidarity, Peace and Friend­ship”, yet all these topics have considerable bearing on the actual
movements in each country. It would not be true to say that these
topics, and many others, were not discussed — they were, not
always because the IPC saw them as important but because it was
impossible to quell the enthusiasm of thousands of young people
who are, above all, determined to find the answers to the problems
that confront them. Informal debates and teach-ins were organised
when many Festival participants found themselves dissatisfied with
the standard of scheduled discussions. In the formal discussions
the position was almost always black and white, good or bad and
the solutions simplistic. In contrast the spontaneous events were
challenging and often produced a genuine unity amongst partici­pants because this was a unity forged out of a desire to understand
and learn.

Not only did the IPC dismiss many suggested subjects as unfit
for discussion, but it missed the opportunity to take up many
issues. For example, whatever stand one takes in the progressive movement, it must be obvious that there are thousands of young people who feel an emotional pull towards Che Guevara. He is a controversial figure, his role is assessed differently but the fact that he is important to many young people cannot be denied. But the Festival organisers decided it could be ignored. This attitude seems to me to be self-defeating.

In a more serious area of political controversy, but not unconnected, while members of the National Liberation Fronts of Angola and Mozambique and of the African National Congress were present at the Festival, no real opportunity was taken of their presence. It is true that we condemned apartheid and colonialism in Africa but surely more could have been attempted. Some study is necessary of the role of these organisations in the liberation of their countries and what better possibility could there be to hear their views. The same could be said of various organisations in Latin America.

I could enumerate other incidents which left no doubt in my mind that the IPC was out of touch with many of the demands and pre-occupations of the young radicals of today. What is of concern is that the IPC is composed predominantly from the leading circles of the World Federation of Democratic Youth. These leading circles are by and large representative of organisations from socialist countries or individuals with similar views who have positions out of all proportion to the numerical strength of the organisations they are supposed to represent. Some other member organisations of the Federation have been unable to develop a sufficiently independent stand for fear of isolation. Thus those who represent the forces seeking renewal are in a distinct minority.

To those who are already formulating the stock answers, who want to point out for the nth time the difficulties of the anti-imperialist forces and particularly the difficulties of the world communist movement, let me say that one can understand historical reasons for something without necessarily accepting the end result. In this case I found that the IPC was intent on protecting the Festival, not from the right but from those of the left who do not see the Soviet Union in the way that its leaders seek to be seen—as the leaders, teachers and arbitrators. A main concern seemed to be to isolate the new left students (predominantly SDA from West Germany). It was the preoccupation with isolating progressive groupings that really worries me (and others). What is there to fear from these groups? The answer must be found, I am sure, in the ideology of those—particularly some Communist Parties—who believe that their answers are the only answers. One fears what one does not understand, but if there is no under-
standing of what motivates people and what they seek one does not get rid of the problem by denying it or repressing it. The gap only widens.

Many of the criticisms I make may not have been obvious to many individual participants in the Festival and there were many positive features about the Festival. Although it is not so important now as it was in an earlier period to actually demonstrate that young people from all over the world can meet together, it still has some significance. The planned activity in solidarity with Vietnam, the demonstrations of support and the real aid — gifts of equipment, medical supplies and blood — were all important. Then too some of the national Festival organisations were free of the rigidity and dogmatism that was so much a feature of the IPC. The British delegation, for example, involved young liberals, communists, trade unionists and cultural groups. Among the socialist countries the delegates from Yugoslavia and Czechoslovakia contributed a great deal to debates because they were willing and free to discuss things in a constructive way — they gave the impression that they felt there were things to discuss rather than to proclaim on.

What relevance then has this for the radical movement in Australia? Perhaps I can be more explicit by saying that I was in a group of Czechoslovaks in Bulgaria on August 21 and I was overwhelmed by their reaction to the occupation of their country. I cannot believe that many people who support the action of the Soviet Union and others would have done so if they had seen and faced the utter desolation that these Czechoslovaks of all ages felt. It was gratifying for an Australian in Europe to be able to talk to people from Czechoslovakia and know that they were aware that the communists in Australia supported them. To my mind the decision of the communists was a test of its 21st Congress decisions, though I think that this is only a beginning.

It is not enough to say a mistake has been made (after all is this the first mistake?) without recognising that having said that there must be examination of the reasons behind the invasion, a close look at the relationship between socialism and democracy, consideration of the economic situation that socialist countries find themselves in, assessments of the past and continuing role of the Soviet Union in the world communist movement.

And what of other questions concerning the development of all the radical forces? Those who are seriously committed to the idea of social change and above all the communists, need to be aware of the preoccupations of different groups on the left, to discuss with others what they want to discuss and not simply talk
about one's own policy. It is not enough for the mainstream of the left, which I think the communists are, to seek to debate Vietnam with Liberal MP's or to talk over common ground with Christians. Certainly it is commendable to say "We are not afraid to put our views in public and we shall listen to others" but what is also needed is debate within the left. Communists might find it useful to know what others of the left see as its role and communist leaders might be surprised to learn how their own members see their role (or more accurately, roles). I believe that many people now are interested in socialist solutions to world problems but that large numbers of them doubt the communists' ideas for achieving socialism.

In this context there are young radicals who express uncertainty of the French Communist Party's role in the May revolt and many feel that the true revolutionaries on this occasion were students. Such views need examination, in the light of all the facts; they cannot be brushed aside if only because they may be right, or partly right. One cannot ignore the impressive radical student movements of Europe, especially of West Germany, and of the USA or the fact that in involvement, developing ideology and action they are often in advance of traditional leftwing organisations. And it would be foolish not to consider the experiences of the liberation movements in Africa and Latin America, to try to understand how and why they proceed as they do, what they are achieving and if there are any alternatives open to them.

To be effective on the left today does not mean that one must find immediate answers to everything; perhaps it is good not to have things too black and white but rather to seek to grasp the real implications of each initiative of the left in a wide and varied world. Of some things I am certain. Young people do not want slogans, they don't want jargon and they will not be blindfolded. Young radicals are not destructive, their questioning is genuine and meaningful. My experience working in the IPC showed me that no one has a monopoly on truth, and that socialism as it exists in the Soviet Union (or anywhere else) is not sacred since sometimes the practice is appropriate in one situation but not in another. Above all I believe that those who are active on the left need to realise that politics is a complex and subtle field and that it is inevitable that one will be continually confronted with new aspects, new ideas, fresh opinions. While all that is new is not necessarily relevant or valid, one cannot be sure of this until it has been looked at, discussed and honestly assessed. It is the preconceived position which must be avoided since this rejects new ideas and can very easily stultify genuine new developments for social change.
Gerald Griffin

Gerald Griffin, a New Zealand socialist and fighter for peace who earned fame in Australia in 1934 is interviewed by Malcolm Salmon.

An Irish-born New Zealander who has recorded his name indelibly in Australian history books is Gerald Griffin, member of the famous anti-war duo of Kisch and Griffin whose successful fight against Lyons Government efforts to keep them out of Australia was making headlines throughout the country just 34 years ago. I had the opportunity to interview Griffin for *Tribune* and *Australian Left Review* when he passed through Sydney late last year.

A man of the Left in the best sense of the words, Griffin, now in his 'sixties, has spent his days not only as anti-war agitator, but as white collar union leader — he was secretary of the large and influential New Zealand Public Service Association from 1945 to 1967 — and as an active protagonist of Irish freedom —he has been part of countless movements for the political rights of his homeland from 1916 to the present day. The son of a bookseller, he has also been a bookman all his life, with a grasp of marxist and progressive literature which has never faltered throughout his long years of activity.

It is doubtful whether any episode in the history of the Australian peace movement has seen such a massive rallying of public support as the Kisch-Griffin affair in 1934-35. Certainly, none has been so salted with dramatic incident. Certainly, none has resulted in such a clear-cut defeat for a federal government (in particular for the Attorney-General of the day, Robert Gordon Menzies).

It was the year after Hitler's rise to power in Germany. The Left everywhere was seized with the menace of this event to the people of Germany and of the whole world. Australia was no exception. Egon Erwin Kisch, an outstanding Czech journalist, who had been imprisoned and tortured by the nazis, was invited to attend a Congress Against War and Fascism to be held in Melbourne in November, 1934.

The New Zealand anti-war movement decided to send its secretary, Gerald Griffin, to represent it and to speak at the Congress.
On November 6 Kisch (who afterwards published a fascinating account of his experiences, entitled *Australian Landfall*, long out of print but soon to be re-issued by an enlightened Sydney publisher) was forbidden to land at Fremantle. Menzies had said (Melbourne *Argus*, November 8) that Kisch "had not been allowed to enter Great Britain because of his subversive views and his association and affiliations with communist organisations. 'The Commonwealth feels under no obligation to receive persons of this type'." But "obligation" or not, receive Kisch it did. When his ship, the *Strathaird*, tied up at Melbourne, Kisch jumped on to the dock, broke his leg, went to hospital, failed to pass a dictation test in Highland Gaelic and went into court to be declared a prohibited immigrant.

As for Griffin, he was given a dictation test in Dutch when he arrived in Sydney on November 2, declared a prohibited immigrant and marched across the wharf to be put on another ship headed back to New Zealand. But Griffin was back within the week — living in Scarlet Pimpernel fashion, popping up and speaking on the war danger at widely separated places, to the accompaniment of official denials that he was in the country at all.

It was almost three weeks before Griffin, on the advice of his friends in the Australian anti-war movement, allowed himself to be arrested when he appeared at a huge anti-war rally in the Sydney Domain on November 26.

In the meantime, he had appeared at a rally of 8000 people in West Melbourne Stadium on November 19, had addressed miners in Newcastle, and had actually called a "levee" of Melbourne pressmen who took photographs of his hands (signing a picture of Egon Kisch) in order to prove that he was in Australia after all.

For both Griffin and Kisch (slowly recovering from his broken leg, but still speaking to meetings to warn of the new German barbarism), a protracted legal battle followed, which was only to end after three months when the High Court threw out the prosecution cases, declaring in Kisch's case that Highland Gaelic "was not a European language in the meaning of the Immigration Act," and in Griffin's case that the Crown in its zeal had charged him under two sections of the Immigration Act at once. The government was ordered to pay costs of fifteen hundred pounds.

For some days in the process of the legal wrangling, Griffin came to know the inside of Parramatta Jail. He told me: "The irony of it all from the government's point of view was that they
would not let me land and then, due to the legal delays, they would not let me leave. I stayed in Australia for almost seven months and addressed far more people than I would have if I had been allowed in in the ordinary way. Altogether I spoke to about 100,000 people.

"It all represented a major defeat for the Lyons Government. But behind it all was Menzies, who came out of the affair with a badly battered reputation."

Piquancy was added to the whole Kisch-Griffin affair by the presence in Australia at the time of the Duke and Duchess of Gloucester and the British poet laureate, John Masefield, come for the Melbourne centenary celebrations. Kisch and Griffin, in the circumstances, carried off one of the most outstanding headline-stealing operations in Australian press history.

Concerning the big meeting in Melbourne, at which Griffin made his electrifying appearance to speak from a seat in the audience in a darkened West Melbourne Stadium, he wants it clearly understood for the record that he was in no way disguised.

Griffin's devotion to the cause of peace is as strong today as ever it was. He told me with some pride that in February 1965, when President Johnson announced the policy of systematic bombing of North Vietnam, he had been the first to arrive at the protest demonstration called at the war memorial in Wellington, and had stayed right to the end.

Asked to compare today's anti-war movement with the movement of the 'thirties, Griffin had this to say:

"I don't think there's any doubt that today's movement involves a very much larger section of society and that it is much more mature in its approach. This, of course, is a world-wide trend but is specially evident in the U.S. But in N.Z., too, the participation of intellectuals, students and the churches is on an unprecedented scale. Apart from actual participation, opinion against the Vietnam war is more forcibly expressed by these various groups than ever before.

"At least in N.Z., however, the trade union participation, as such, lags behind, and official trade union participation is less evident than in the 'thirties. The government here can no longer ignore the movement against the Vietnam war and the right to demonstrate against it is conceded. The numbers participating have reached dimensions far greater than in the 'thirties. Generally, it is a protest against the particular war, rather than the idea of imperialist or colonial war."
But the anti-war cause is far from exhausting the scope of Griffin's life of activity. He told me:

"I suppose the struggle for Irish freedom has been the dominant influence in my life. Here, my father influenced me very greatly. I think when I was very young he was no more than a very ardent Irish nationalist. But he moved very much Left of that position as time went on.

"I can remember, towards the middle of 1914, the Scottish Borderers shot down women and children in Batchelors Walk, Dublin, after the Irish Volunteers — precursors of the Irish Republican Army — had landed a consignment of arms in Ireland. The family had just then arrived in New Zealand from Ireland. My father came home with the news and was violently agitated. He explained to us what it meant.

"From then on, my father constantly talked about Ireland to us. He told us of the past struggles for Irish freedom, of Wolfe Tone, of Robert Emmet, John Mitchel and the 'Sixty-seven Men, as well as of the Young Irelanders of '48.

Griffin remembers vividly the outbreak of the Easter Week Insurrection in 1916.

"I was on holiday in Christchurch with a family friend," he recalls. "I was wildly excited and full of enthusiasm at the news. When we arrived home at the end of Easter Week I can remember my disappointment when I discovered that my parents did not share my enthusiasm. Like most Irish overseas they were bewildered and shocked. Then, in the following weeks, when the executions of the leaders were announced, there was a marked change. I felt proud to have been for the rebels before the rest of the family.

"From then on we were all for Sinn Fein, as the new movement became known, although when in Ireland my father had not sympathised with the original Sinn Fein movement founded in 1909 by Arthur Griffith."

There then began for Griffin a life-long association with Irish organisations in New Zealand. He told me: "In 1917 a monthly magazine, The Green Ray, was founded in Dunedin to propagate the ideas of Easter Week. It was suppressed in 1918, and the editor and manager were sent to prison.

"We were greatly influenced by the Russian Revolutions in 1917 and from 1918 onwards my father and brother were very pro-Bolshevik. I was still attending school but read all the pamphlets my father brought home. I remember especially
Frank Anstey's *Red Europe*. At about this time, my father and brother began to attend meetings of the Social Democratic Party on Sunday nights.

"The Wellington Group of the recently formed Communist Party declared their sympathy with the Irish Republican Association which I had founded in 1924, and gave us a lot of support. Through this contact I got to know John Loughran very well. I had known him slightly from 1921 when I enrolled him in the Irish Self-Determination League after a strong argument with him about 'bourgeois nationalism'. I was able to answer him by quoting Connolly, whose close friend and colleague he had been. I came to know Loughran intimately and he exercised a deep and lasting influence on me. Without any doubt he was the most outstanding Marxist to come to New Zealand from the U.K."

Griffin has maintained an unbroken association with the movement for Irish freedom. Only last June he attended the Dublin celebrations of the centenary of the birth of James Connolly. He travelled to his homeland as official representative at the celebrations of the NZ Federation of Labor (NZ ACTU), the Wellington Peace Council, and the Wellington Representation Committee of the NZ Labor Party (main local organisation of the party).

A continuing theme of Griffin's life has been a relationship with the Communist Party which has been to say the least of it complex. The connection has a long history.

He told me "Basically, as far back as I can remember, my standpoint has been a marxist one. This was at times complicated because of family associations. My late brother, R. F. Griffin, was for many years a leading member of the CPNZ and served several terms of imprisonment. He represented the CPNZ at the Sixth Congress of the Comintern in 1928, when he formally affiliated the NZ party which previously had been subordinate to the Australian Party.

"There was strong disagreement for a long period between my brother and me over policies and tactics and assessment of the role of particular party personalities, particularly F. E. Freeman and L. Sim.

"This was complicated by the fact of his being in the party and I not, with both living in our parents' home.

"I was reluctant to accept a leading role in the Friends of the Soviet Union in the early 'thirties because of my brother's already prominent—if not leading—role in the CP."
"In the mid-'thirties, when I was to play the main role as national secretary in the Movement Against War and Fascism, the CP, at my brother's instigation, tried to block this. Their own earlier efforts to man the movement with their own nominees had ended in failure, at least in Wellington.

"I was in the faction of the time labelled as 'Trotskyist', quite erroneously. In fact, I was one of the few concerned who not only understood the meaning of this term but had polemicised against the Trotskyist tendency as far back as 1927.

"About this time (1934-5) Freeman had returned to NZ where he took over the leadership of the party, after being in Moscow since 1929 at the Lenin School. In the 'twenties, I had been a consistent opponent of Freeman for his political unreliability. He had been expelled from the party with several others for disruptive activities and personal behavior bringing the CP into discredit. My brother was responsible for Freeman's readmission and nomination for the Moscow studentship.

"Because of his incorrect leadership in the historic 1935 general election, which returned the first Labor Government, Freeman was removed from the leadership and was later expelled."

The feud was carried vigorously across the Tasman to Australia.

Griffin said: "When in October 1934 I was selected as the NZ delegate to the Australian Congress Against War and Fascism, the party accepted this reluctantly. Freeman gave me a letter of introduction to the Australian party. This was in a sealed envelope.

"When I was arrested and placed aboard the Marama for return to NZ I opened the letter and was disgusted to read that I was being introduced as a politically unreliable person and a 'Trotskyist.'

"I have never been able to find out if the letter was written with party approval or not.

"While I was in Australia, I have every reason to believe that the NZ party, or at least Freeman as general secretary, did everything to undermine the confidence of the Australian comrades in me.

"During the latter part of my stay in Australia my relations with the leadership of the Australian party became strained because of maliciously false statements sent from the CPNZ. Until then these relations had been on a very friendly, cordial basis. The CPA leadership frequently commented favorably on this.
Encouraged from his earliest day by his father to read—"for knowledge or for entertainment, or perhaps I should say for enjoyment"—Griffin has a lifetime association with books.

He said "As I grew up and became more identified with the labor movement, my interests widened. My library extended from just Irish items to books on the history of labor, trade unionism, socialism, the Russian revolution and later the Soviet Union. I must have one of the best libraries of its kind in New Zealand.

"I also have a very large collection of pamphlets and periodicals including many rare items, especially on labor history."

Of his association with Egon Kisch, he said: "I was rather overawed when I first met him and I think he did not pay much attention to me. Later, we were very much in one another's company, travelled together by train and car and often shared the same accommodation. I came to know him very well, in many ways more closely than most.

"He used to talk very frankly to me about the various personalities who were associated with us. He found, very often, that I had formed the same opinion as his. He was very pleased to find I was aware of many details of his revolutionary career.

"After he returned to Europe in May, 1935, Kisch kept in touch with me. One of the prized mementoes I have of him is a postcard photo he sent me from Barcelona during the Spanish Civil War.

"I visited Prague early last August expecting to meet his widow and was grieved to learn that she had died almost two years before. His brother, who had been a well-known surgeon, is now living in retirement in Prague but is not in very good health."

Still spry, slim in figure, precise in speech, and equipped with a prodigious memory, Griffin is a living example of the fact that the chief answer to the ravages of the years is a constant interest in the world around us.

I asked him what he was going to do when he returned to New Zealand.

"Find something to occupy my mind," he said.

"I have no intention of retiring into carpet slippers."

More than fifty years of unabated political commitment is the guarantee he will be as good as his word.
Paul Eldar


WITH MANY MILLIONS OF BIAFRANS about to starve, with the evil legacy of Middle Eastern colonialism nearer to flash point than solution, with the reality of civil disintegration, both in America and China, as well as the terrible poverty of large sections of the world, it would not be unreasonable to object to books on political theory, let alone polemics. Yet, such is the reality of human existence, that the more awful its visage appears, the more voluble its ideologues become. The theories of ideologues require a lesser form of verbalising called "review" or "criticism".

My opinions about facts, theories and solutions can be expressed by three quotations from Ludwig Wittgenstein:

1 "The facts all contribute only to setting the problem, not to its solution" (Tractatus, 6.4321).

2 "The solution of the problem of life is seen in the vanishing of the problem" (Tractatus 6.521).

3 "The sickness of a time is cured by an alteration in the mode of life of human beings, and it was possible for the sickness of philosophical problems to get cured only through a changed mode of thought and life, not through a medicine invented by an individual" (Foundations of Mathematics II.6).

The late Paul Engelmann bridges the gap between these ideas and politics by saying: "the ideal strivings of human society, culminating in socialism on the one hand and nationalism on the other, must in future be acted out, not talked about". (Letters from Ludwig Wittgenstein, with a memoir, Basil Blackwell, p. 133). These attitudes are also reflected by Wolfgang Lefevre, an ideologue of the Socialist German Student Federation (SDS), who says "a movement towards radical democracy does not arrive at a consciousness of its aims at the writing desk". (Der Spiegel, No. 26,
1968, p. 54). Finally, to paraphrase Dylan Thomas, the hand that signs the paper (shades of "accords"?) may hold dominion over man by a scribbled name, but has no tears to flow (Collected Poems, J. M. Dent, p. 62). This reviewer, no sentimentalist indeed, would rather see more "tears" than scribbled names or theories.

On the day that Hitler invaded Austria in 1938, Dr. Karl Popper embarked on the writing of a two volume work entitled The Open Society and its Enemies (Routledge and Kegan Paul), which attacks Plato in Volume 1, and Hegel and Marx in Volume 2. He continued writing through 1943, and the work was published in 1945. By 1962, this work had run to a fourth edition and was also printed in paperback. Most libraries of any size carry it, even in Australia. The mere fact that Maurice Cornforth’s "reply" is dated 1968, more than a generation later, is significant. Had Cornforth’s book appeared in 1948, its value would have been much greater. But in those far off days, communists who said anything that was not an echo of Stalin’s "line" (or, worse still, pet prejudices), were faced with expulsion. One was not free to talk about "Open Philosophies". On the other hand, a great deal of what Popper says about marxists and communists is only true of stalinists of that period, and has little relevance to contemporary marxist thinking in many lands. The history of ideas, like the history of events, defies all efforts at severe simplification, if one desires to remain moderately objective and accurate.

At this point, I would like to recommend to anyone seriously interested in the problems surrounding socialism to read both books. They are eminently worth reading, not because they provide any real answers, but because they are so well written that they demonstrate the comparative irrelevance of a mere theoretical structure in relation to actual problems. Like logic, they say nothing directly about the real world, but apply to it obliquely and at times ambiguously. But they can be used as spring boards, to go forward to different, more practical ways of thought-in-action.

Both books are excellent examples of very different ways of writing on theoretical questions. Popper’s is European (despite its excellent English). Here we have all the references, notes, cross-references, and in general evidence of the widely read background of the author, so necessary on the Continent. Cornforth on the other hand, employs the British "essay" style, with few notes, fewer references, and little evidence as to the cultural milieu of the protagonist and his argument. Compensating for this we have lucidity, clarity and simplicity (qualities that are worthwhile and hard to achieve) on every page.
Basically the argument turns on the question "Will marxism lead to a democratic society or an authoritarian one?" At the time when Popper wrote, he had "the facts" on his side, in the sense that the communist world was a monolithic, authoritarian regime, when viewed from the point of the average westerner. Today, however, Cornforth has "the facts" on his side, insofar as the United States, which more or less embodies the alternatives that Popper offers, is anything but the sort of desirable society his theories promise.

If one is fortunate enough to live in a country that is not in the midst of war, dominated by a foreign power, or socially disintegrating, one still has a choice of attitudes. We, living in Australia, are in such a position. In today's world, this is a privilege, and one that not enough of our citizens make use of. Triennial voting in Federal elections is not really an adequate form of participation in the democratic process. The needs of modern society call for a more fundamental and comprehensive involvement on the part of its members. Here, both Popper and Cornforth demonstrate something important, and that is the possibility of a well thought out attitude. Nor is this due to the fact that they both have a university background. Proportionately, there are just as many muddle-headed "I'm all right Jack" types within the precincts of Academe as on the factory floor.

The really important thing about Marx was that he addressed himself not to abstruse questions concerning religion or philosophy, but to highly practical, contemporary issues. His focus was always to the existing state of affairs, what it consists of, and how it should and can be altered. When it came to the question of effecting some change Marx fully accepted the limitations and possibilities inherent in the actual state of affairs. He made every attempt to be realistic and prudent. Even so he made mistakes, aplenty, and would be the first to laugh loudly at the sort of "ex cathedra" infallibility ascribed to him by some "Marxists-Leninists". Scepticism will always be an essential quality of any attitude that desires to be described as "scientific" (whatever that might mean today). On the other hand, the temptation to ideological idolatry, in any field of human thought, is tremendous. It is so easy. Once we are "in possession of the truth", we need no longer think much, read much, agonise or doubt, and as all these activities are forms of work, people fight shy of them.

Two terms that are used by these authors in a fundamental way are "reason" and "science". Both terms are loaded with emotional undertones. Everyone wants to be considered "reasonable", and everyone wants to be either "scientific", or at least not in open conflict with science. The deliberations of both our authors about
these terms (Popper, Volume 2, Ch. 24 and Cornforth, Part 1, Ch. 1-4) are informative and stimulating, but not conclusive. Nor is this lack of conclusiveness the authors' fault. Both "science" and "reason" are terms that grammatically hide the fact that there are, in reality, only "actions" and "objects" that can be called "rational" or "scientific". But objects and actions are never conclusive. You simply cannot conduct an experiment to end all experiments, or write a text-book to end all text-books. The continually changing reality of which we are part does not allow for conclusive, final or absolute actions or objects. However, the way in which the abstract symbols "science" and "reason" are often used, by these and other authors, could easily lead readers to suppose that these constitute some sort of ultimate, almost oracular, court of appeal, whose judgement is final.

Generally speaking, theoreticians and writers, be they left or right, belong to a small group of people whose problems are rather specific, because they enjoy a higher standard of living. The average factory worker throughout the world at present is not nearly as concerned with "freedom" as the average novelist, or pedagogue. In most capitalist countries, sickness impoverishes the worker, and the opportunities for higher education for his children are poor, while in most communist countries there is a shortage of housing, and of consumer goods. These are the sort of problems that still mainly concern the masses, and it is from them that they would like to be "free". While governments prate about their good intentions, and the "freedom" of their societies, these problems are often only tackled at a snail's pace. The race to the moon, power politics, armaments and god knows what else take precedence. All in the name of freedom. It is little wonder that so many citizens view their governments with a cynicism and scorn, which results in self-centred, short-sighted political apathy.

What very few theoreticians of either side of the left-right dividing line are prepared to face, is the tremendous interaction of contemporary capitalism and socialism. Despite all propaganda, people are well aware of many of the good and bad features of both systems. Ordinary people, quite rightly, want to know why they cannot have the best of both worlds. Nor is protest restricted to ordinary people as the world-wide unrest among students and intellectuals has shown. This interaction will continue, will grow, in scope and pace, and will modify all the ideological pretensions current around the centres of power. Communists in the west are not "subversives", and dissidents in socialist countries are not "counter-revolutionaries". Indeed, the real revolutionaries are those who are critical of establishment humbug (a profession about as old as prostitution), and wish to introduce some purposive, rational change. Marx was such a revolutionary, and one might
say that "marxist is as marxist does" (the words and the labels do not make the reality).

Popper and Cornforth, respectively, present first class examples of traditional liberal and communist attitudes. Insofar as these two ideological positions have influenced our world in very many important and far-reaching ways, we should all be conversant with them. But this is not the case. A great many people's politics are like catechism or Sunday School religion, a primitive set of cliches, prejudices, oversimplifications, and sacred cows. Only by making a thorough study of these traditional positions can we hope to go beyond them intelligently and efficiently. These two authors give everyone an opportunity to create a dialogue within himself, to stimulate himself into more precise thought about the problems in his actual life situation. For this they deserve much praise and gratitude.

One element that neither book faces adequately, but which is a real component of the contemporary world is that of urgency. Many scientists (the new priesthood whose "imprimatur" is so often asked for) have warned that the statistical likelihood of the world avoiding a major catastrophe is small. I believe that the world situation is so critical that many people have developed a "crisis-immunity", which enables them to enjoy a completely unwarranted sense of security. Even a modest list of the present, possible risks to mankind would be formidable and frightening. Crises call for new attitudes, new approaches, new questions. Yet these cannot be culled from a vacuum. They must be developments (albeit revolutionary ones — "leaps" in fact) of traditional positions. This is the ideological task of the present. This also is the point where youth will begin to show an interest. They sense what is in store for them, and are looking for ways to equip themselves for it.

In his preface to the second edition of his book (1959) Dr. Popper writes "the fact that most of the book was written during the grave years when the outcome of the war was uncertain may help to explain why some of its criticism strikes me today as more emotional and harsher in tone than I could wish. But it was not the time to mince words — or at least, this is what I felt then." This reviewer feels that these days, when the outcome of the world crisis is in doubt, are also not days to mince words, least of all about political theory and practice. Cornforth partially acknowledges the critical and urgent state of affairs in the world. In Chapter 4 of Part 3, page 358, he says, "What is desperately urgent is to establish right away that measure of democratic control by informed working class organisations which can begin the planning of production in industrially developed countries.
and offer real aid to the underdeveloped". For Australians, living in a part of the world that is largely underdeveloped, this throws out a very real challenge. Is there a political working class organisation in Australia which

1 produces a national weekly newspaper,
2 provides political schools for all sections of the community,
3 opens its meetings to any interested observer,
4 creates a wide field for personal participation through conferences, journals and policy making bodies,
5 is making strenuous efforts to reconstruct itself to suit the needs of contemporary Australia?

This is the real question confronting the thoughtful citizen. The answer to this question constitutes the vital criterion in making a personal political decision. Nor should it be forgotten that Marx defined a "worker" as anyone who has no other means of maintaining himself than to sell his capacity to labor. Today this includes a lot of high ranking and well to do people. What people really need today is an "open" socialist party, in which they can truly be themselves as well as being members of a purposeful team. By a real fusion between marxism, the democratic traditions of Australia, and the available insights into the needs of the times, the Communist Party of Australia is becoming an "open" party, and will continue to become more open, as more people avail themselves of the opportunities it affords.

The continued reprinting of Popper's book, and the publication of Cornforth's book, demonstrates that "marxism" is very much a living subject. Readers of Cornforth's book will not realise from reading it that a large body of works dealing with all aspects of marxism is published each year in the west. There are many conflicting, even contradictory, views about what "marxism" is. Today any group claiming to be "the only true" marxists, will rather quickly look ridiculous, and suffer the consequences. In fact, the enterprise of marxist orthodoxy, so religiously attempted under Stalin, is a museum piece, and not a very attractive one at that.

The contemporary marxist task and problem is the development of marxist principles to cope with new situations, and the application of these advanced ideas so as to obtain mass support. The internal and external situation of the working class has undergone such vast quantitative changes that the inevitable qualitative change has followed. Revolution, in its many forms of which violence is the least desirable, is more necessary than ever before,
but, using Regis Debray's phrase in an altered context — we need a revolution within the revolution. There are signs of this within many socialist parties. In the CPA, the 21st Congress was a revolutionary turning point. To create and maintain such a revolutionary movement requires certain things from its protagonists. Among these the following would certainly find a place:—

1 They should be conversant with as much information about ideological and historical matters as possible (after all Marx, Engels, Lenin and Trotsky as well as many lesser revolutionaries were learned men).

2 They should constantly be involved in some form of socialist political activity (activism is the key attribute given by the masses to real socialists).

3 They should know and respect the needs, aspirations, fears and feelings of the masses — have, as it were, a continuing dialogue with them (the narrow-minded fanaticism that considers this unnecessary is the door to ineffective sectarianism).

4 They should be slow to resort to lies, violence, subversion, vituperation, factionalising, and the whole gamut of undemocratic and inhuman means that litter the political history of this and previous centuries (it is becoming harder each day to win worthwhile support with these means — as many men in and out of power are beginning to discover).

Once again, I hope that many people will read both Popper's and Cornforth's books. Whatever conclusions readers come to, it is also to be hoped that consequent to, or parallel with, reading, they will act. Action without thought is childish, thought without action is sterile. Only a growing intellectual maturity, coupled with a developing power of ethical action can be expected to produce better forms of human life. These in turn will lead to better thought-action patterns. This is the benign circle of progress, as opposed to the vicious circle of stagnation. Marx was primarily interested in helping men towards better states of life. His vision and insights are by no means used up. There is far more ahead of us than behind us. He would have been the first to acknowledge the sincerity and value of men like Popper and Cornforth. And while this is no time to mince (too many) words, it is also a time to work optimistically (or at least with a "forward looking pessimism") for the betterment of man's condition.
A DEMOCRATIC RIGHT

An examination of some of the facts of the growth of "big brother", of invasions of privacy and the threats to democracy from this quarter in our society.

ARTICLE 12 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights proclaims: "No one shall be subjected to arbitrary interference with his privacy, family, home or correspondence, nor to attacks upon his honor and reputation. Everyone has the right to the protection of the law against such interference or attacks."

The ultimate in lack of privacy is fascism, where one's every word, one's attitude, one's outspoken thoughts even are brought under the scrutiny of a police state; when even one's children can incriminate. A precedent for this category in this country is set within the activities of the unspeakables, the unknowables of the Security Service. These individuals carry out their invidious "duties" — reading private letters, eavesdropping on personal telephone conversations and so on. They possibly excuse their consciences with that ambiguous word "patriotism", an anachronism if ever there was one in this international nuclear age. Their patriotism is obviously not available for the human race.

It may be of interest to consider the need for personal privacy in primitive communal societies and indeed whether it was necessary. But when one thinks of the need for communal activity in order to exist, the under population and the wide, empty world, it could have little relevance to society today. Under capitalism there is no denying that the loss of privacy is another stress on working people. It is an obvious goal for those who amass money to buy a degree of privacy. The weight of pressure for a safe conformity, for status at least equal to one's neighbor, militates against individual privacy and it is increasingly difficult to be an individual in our urban society. Hollywood and Royal personages have demonstrated by fisticuffs, water hoses and even gunshot their desires for privacy in their lives. Those with developed independent talent call on great resources of determination to attain a degree of privacy within the public relations field. A cause of
stress according to medical pundits is the lack of personal privacy in great cities. Anyone subjected to the stress of public transport and in sharing high density workplaces may agree.

An aspect of privacy affecting working people is the employment application, particularly where there are a number of expected applicants. This scrutiny is not often extended when applicants are sparse. For appointments at managerial and professional levels the extensive questionnaire of the American corporations is used. The responses are analysed by industrial psychologists and then applicants must pass prior processing through the superfluities of the growing employment agency and management consultant industry. In engaging the "lower orders" employers pry to a far lesser extent, not for reasons of sensibility, but because lower orders can be dispensed with or replaced in rapid turnover.

It is interesting to note that Religion has been dropped as a query on most employment forms. This may be due to the fact that it is recognised, in general, that Church attenders are a small minority nowadays, and stated religion affiliations are no criteria for the attitudes desired by employers — diligence, loyalty, honesty, for example. There was a time not so long ago when discrimination against Catholics was quite openly evident in the classified ads., and Catholics either overtly or covertly retaliated by barring Protestants in their establishments. Probably, this is rare today except maybe covertly in some Departments of the Public Service directed mainly against members of the Masonic Lodge or against those of the Faith.

Usually included is a query related to the private lives of individuals as to hobbies. This exercises the imagination of many a worker. As a general principle, it is helpful to pretend the adoption of a hobby related in a practical sense to the position — model trains for toy manufacturers or the railways, stock car racing for a motor mechanic's job. An insight into the leisure habits of personnel officers could help. For example, if most of them play the status game of golf, then golfing would seem a good hobby to improve one's chances. Then again there is the question of previous occupation. It is not a good thing to extend the imagination in this direction as the potential employer could well telephone a previous employer for the inside information to belie the fine reference extended the employee. These employment forms are a source of ironic amusement to applicants, a test of their imaginative skill.

In the State Public Service, at least, the progressive elements of Labor have introduced alleviating factors for reports on employees. Reports must be attested to by personal signature. One depart-
mental head answered the query concerning personality for all his underlings with the word “outstanding”, and it flattered many a one until they found it applied to all. He had a sense of the dignity of the individual. The procedure in the Public Service does not apply to bank officers, as The Australian on 2.11.68 revealed. Secret dossiers are compiled to be consulted for promotions. One officer, it was alleged, could not obtain a transfer convenient to his home as his dossier revealed that many years before he had seduced the girl next door. He had subsequently married the girl and produced a family of six children in the intervening years, but it made no difference to the evidence in the dossier.

Blacklisting of the courageous militant in industry is a threat to human rights, which not only affects the man who takes a stand for his fellow workers but visits his sins upon his family. The means of effectively defeating this practice by employers still needs to be established. The professional who takes a stand for humanity — unpopular with the establishment — may be denied the right to apply his professional knowledge, his creative abilities. Academic freedom does not extend far at the appointment level. Again another blacklisting for posterity is the credit rating system, when an individual may find himself suffering temporary hardship and unable to meet some HP debt.

Another aspect relating to personal privacy is the medical report. It is incumbent on doctors, if they do not want serious trouble, to respect the privacy of their paying patients. This means nothing to employers, who pay medical men to subject employees to medical inspection. The results are not available to the personnel examined but are passed on to their employers. On this basis workers are denied or offered employment, whether their specific condition meets the physical demand of the jobs offered or whether this is open to argument. To what extent doctors actually do, in practice, respect the privacy of their patients is a matter of conjecture. It should be recognised as a gross invasion of privacy if information by a paying patient is obtained by any other individual.

There is the question of privacy in suburbia. The increasing alienation, the competitiveness of social life, the growing emphasis on conformity, results in a number attempting to live vicariously — as it was to watch that the Joneses next door do not surpass. It is an aspect of the quality of life under capitalism. These types of individuals often have neither the means nor the inclination to compete, they have not the courage to flout conformity, or the growing authoritarianism of their jobs makes them timid in relation to really living a life of some originality. The opportunities for
community life in many suburbs offer little, unless one is sports minded (bowls, golf, tennis) or drinks or gambles excessively (hotels, clubs, etc.). Of those clubs based on charity and status such as Lions, Apex, View, Masonic Lodge, it could be queried whether they offer a basic communal aim for a community. Perhaps the P. & Cs., Progress Associations and the like are the best avenues for the development of individual sublimation, to escape vicarious living.

Big brother is still with us. Reviled by marxists, the work of George Orwell, whatever its anti-socialist motivations, gave essential warnings in this day and age in all social areas. It is clear that the attitude of “the establishment knows best”, the compilation of the dossier, not only can be used against those who would commit illegal criminal acts and who would endanger national security, but against those who might threaten the establishment in challenging the validity of particular laws; who would criticise the quality of democracy, both in respect to its formal statement and its actual practice; against those who threaten the splitting asunder of a hard shell of bureaucracy; even against those who would withhold their support, who as it were “harbored dissident ideas”.

The diversity of individuals in this complex industrial age has been related to the many skills and aptitudes demanded for a range of activities in industrial, scientific and cultural fields. It ill befits those who would call themselves socialists to think that people, as individuals, can be moulded into cast iron ideas of a conformity which fits some current or outmoded or incorrect line of political ideology. Rather it should be accepted that individuals are individual with differing talents and personalities to offer. Their talents and personalities are their own and, within considerations of maturity and development, the richest gifts they have to offer. Unless they are outright supporters of reaction, are security pimps, warmongers, neo-fascist or completely authoritarian in outlook, why should they not be accepted for what they have to offer? Dialectical theory teaches that people are not fixed and immutable. They change with environmental experience; those who cease developing are left behind at some stage or another and this is their problem.

In the sense of democracy for the individual many doubtful attitudes have been heretofore accepted by socialists. In the current ideology of certain Chinese Communists people are expected to deny their emotions, their private morality, to meet a conformist rigid line. This attitude seems to arise from an approach to marxism as a religion, a dogma, which must subordinate humanity to its precepts, rather than flexible scientific method which can be
amended or developed as the course of life alters. There was a period here when some communists would not take a step in their private lives — for marriage, separation, divorce, home ownership, employment, etc. — without consulting Big Brother official. This had the attendant dangers of disillusionment as has been illustrated, when the advice so gratuitously given did not fit the peculiarly individual circumstances of the seeker.

Privacy in the practice of morality and in the area of one's emotional life, within an accepted sphere of state legality and society writ large, needs to be delineated as broadly a democratic right. It is not the function of socialists to sit in judgment of their fellows or prescribe set laws in this sense. In any case it is relatively impossible under the confused values of capitalism. People should have a measure of privacy in their lives, solving personal problems as well they might, accepting or rejecting withal the proffered hand of sympathetic help.

Humanist thought is again running strongly through socialist theory, and is particularly stressed in the proclamations of the Czech socialists. This surge augurs well for the advancement of socialist democracy as applied to individual freedom, and in this age of alienation and anti-humanism is tremendously important in the outlook of socialists. There will always be public condemnation of the flouting of traditional morality. It is with relief that "the oldies" can see "the kids" adopting a critical view to bigotry and narrowness everywhere. Socialists should guard the rights of citizens to live out their lives with a degree of personal privacy. It is a democratic right to be fought for and preserved.
CHILDREN OF THE DESERT, by Phyl and Noel Wallace. Nelson, 64 pp, $2.95.

THIS BEAUTIFUL and moving book portrays the daily lives of the Pitjantjatara children living in the inhospitable region of the Musgrave Ranges. In a series of enchanting photographs, and a brief but equally vivid text, it captures the personalities of these children of the desert.

There is Wanungy, who at seven is an excellent bushwoman, reveling in the dry, prickly, inhospitable country that is her world; friendly little Winmati, the four-year-old, quite happy to leave his family and spend a whole trouble-free day with his friends the Wallaces; Wintjin the singer, delighted to teach the Pitjantjatara songs to his new friends, and thinking it “huge fun to hear someone trying to pronounce the words and reproduce the complicated tunes and rhythm patterns”; Kalatari who at three “was carrying her sister Rosemary on her back wherever she went and tending her like a small mother”; Litja the brave, who despite his fears, made a drawing of the dreaded Marnu, the evil spirit; and many others, engaging and lovable, like children the world over.

The book is the work of Phyl and Noel Wallace, a husband and wife team who first visited Central Australia in 1956, and in 1966 decided to work full time among the Pitjantjatara.

Though they are in contact with mission and welfare settlements, and numbers of the children go to school, the Pitjantjatara still lead nomadic lives, wresting a precarious existence from the desert. It is thus a vanishing culture which is the background to the Wallace's book, but it is a culture which has developed the most valuable human qualities—resourcefulness, courage, endurance, social responsibility, artistic ability and many others; and it is one of the great virtues of the book that it brings home to us so vividly the human attributes of these remote and little known people.

The first impact of the book is made by the photographs. They are confined almost entirely to the children, and some of the portraits are quite breath-taking in their beauty and vivacity. Many of the group scenes are in colour, with the vast spectacle of the desert as a background. The attractive format (13" x 10") permits the reproduction of some superb panoramic shots.

However, the book is much more than a collection of attractive photographs. These are accompanied by a text deceptively brief and consisting chiefly of sketches of individual children, though some sections such as Kalu (school) and Maku (witchetty grubs) deal with group situations. Phyl Wallace has used this simple framework to make us aware of the most significant aspects of the life of the people. Many of the sketches show that “the hunt for food is a constant and desperate necessity”, so that “even the youngest child digs for food”. Some show how the children acquire traditional skills as in the fascinating section “Kulata”, where a group of boys show the Wallaces how spears are made; some sections reveal the admixture of cultures taking place—the rifle side by side with the hunting spear: the plastic bucket alongside the digging dish; the ancient car or truck drawn up beside the camp. There is a memorable section on “Cave With Drawings” in which an
old man of the tribe shows the Wallaces how the drawings were done; and there are sections dealing with corroborees and walkabout. Incidentally, the Wallaces explode the commonly held belief that walkabout is simply a restless meaningless movement from one place to another, and emphasise that there is "always some serious tribal or inter-tribal reason for the journey — "perhaps a meeting of relations for some vital ceremony or ritual that will benefit or affect them all".

One of the most delightful features of the book is the reproduction of the children's drawings. Drawing in the sand comes naturally to desert children, and the change-over to drawing on paper or blackboard is easily made. They revel in the bright pastels, and display acute powers of observation in reproduction details of scenes or events. Thus Mulayangu, after a visit to a shearing shed, reproduced every detail of the scene in his drawing, from the man sweeping the floor to the counter shaft, gear boxes and driving arms to the shearing heads.

Probably the most valuable section of the book is that dealing with education. Phyl Wallace indicates the main difficulty in the opening sentences: "Roaming the dusty vastness of the desert is no preparation for settling down into a formal school situation. The desert children enter a strange new world when they step into a schoolroom, and at first its restrictions must be agonising to them. There is so little in our school activities that relates to their traditional background".

She illustrates this in relation to number: "Springing from a culture that has no need for mathematics, the children find our number system difficult to comprehend. They never hoard any objects that need to be counted, so they have managed comfortably with words for one, two and three, and from them they build, with repetition, four and five — after that the word "tjuta" following a noun suffices to pluralise". Is it any wonder that the children have difficulty with mathematics?

Language is a little easier, because the Musgrave Park Settlement, followed the example of Eurabella Mission in training teachers in the Pitjantjatara language, so that for the first three years children are taught in the vernacular; but even so there is still an abysmal gap between the children's traditional way of life and the white man's school.

This is charmingly illustrated in the story of Mutata, the truant, too long to reproduce here, but one of the highlights of the book. Despite the best efforts of his father, who, though without any education himself, recognised its necessity for his children, Mutata refused to stay at school, until one morning he turned up when "a particularly intriguing mess of handwork, paper tearing and pasting was in progress", and Mutata joined in with zest. "Later on he discovered we were doing some rather dull things on the blackboard with chalk — so departed for the rocks."

However, Mutata had discovered that some interesting things do go on at school, and after that he often dropped in when the school bell rang. Phyl Wallace concludes "... it is possible that if school can be related to the special background of these special children, if it can be made interesting, attractive and unrestrictive enough, the Mutatas of the tribe will finally want to bring themselves to school every day".

The authors do not pose any questions about the future of the desert children, but readers of the
book will find them inescapable. Though much of their traditional life still remains, these children are already living between two worlds. What is to be their future, as the old life vanishes? Fringe dwellers on the outskirts of towns and settlements?

It is unthinkable that such precious human material should be wasted in this way. But what can be done to prevent it? To help the people adapt to a rapidly changing world? How can Governments be forced to adopt enlightened policies on these vital issues? What can we do to preserve the dignity and self-reliance of these people? These are some of the questions provoked by this stimulating book.

Gloria Laird

ABORIGINAL HABITAT AND ECONOMY, a thesis by Roger Lawrence.

Was the environment of the Australian Aboriginal basically responsible for the nature of the economy at the time of European contact? Did environment stimulate the Aboriginal to a high degree of inventiveness? To what extent was Aboriginal life, economic and cultural, modified by outside influences? Readers seeking answers to these and allied questions will find in Roger Lawrence’s Aboriginal Habitat and Economy a well-documented collection of facts. Agreement with conclusions drawn, however, will vary considerably.

Mr. Lawrence’s bibliography is in itself a useful reference list. In it he lists over 300 sources from which he has drawn material — 19 of them records of European impressions of Aborigines prior to 1800; the rest records, collated material and results of organised research to as late as 1966. From this historically wide range the author has described environment (topography, climate, vegetation, animal life) and economy (food and food-gathering, shelter, population fluctuations). He does this with a view to elucidating the problems of the role of environment, in the promoting of various forms of economic and cultural life. At the end of each chapter are detailed tables under such headings as: food type, equipment and technique employed, nature of activity (individual, joint or communal) source of information, area, tribes in area. In general the areas studied are Central Australia (arid environment), Murray-Darling (rich aquatic), South-East coast (choice of marine and land food), and Cape York (environment open to influence from North). Explanatory maps and diagrams are clear and informative.

There will be little qualification of praise for Mr. Lawrence in his collection and collation of material. With conclusions reached there will be less unanimity of opinion.

In the book full credit is given to the Aboriginal for close observation. For instance, the Aboriginal observed accurately the movements of ducks and so could net them on the wing; he observed accurately their instinctive responses and so whirled bark to simulate the flight of a hawk. Similarly in inland Australia he observed the seasonal fluctuations of river levels, and on the coast the daily tidal fluctuations. This knowledge he utilised in movable brush fences, stone fence weirs with alignment of walls and pockets corresponding to the longshore movements of the fish of the area.

So too credit is given the Aboriginal for “his decisions as to which method and equipment could most profitably be used” (p. 239).
Less credit is given him for adaptation and modification of equipment or hunting methods "its importance was not great" (p. 237). Indeed, Mr. Lawrence goes so far as to say:

"the major differences in Aboriginal culture appear to have been due mainly to cultural contact with more advanced technologies and the subsequent diffusion of these traits through part of Australia" (p. 237).

Mr. Lawrence supports this conclusion by the distribution of such economic features as netting techniques and the use of harpoons, outrigger canoes, fish hooks, etc.

So too with food. Here again Mr. Lawrence places great emphasis on technical change brought from Northern cultures into Australia.

"the greatest effect the habitat had on the diet of the aboriginal was that it provided a range of possible food sources within which the economic system operated... However, other factors were perhaps of equal or greater importance" (p. 223).

Illustrating the food range Mr. Lawrence points out that the primary animal diet of tribes living in the mountain country of Central Australia was kangaroos, wallabies, emus; in spinifex country lizards, rats, mice, possums; in the Port Jackson area fish. Illustrating the role of the advanced technique brought from the North into Australia, he cites the methods of one tribe in hunting the dugong which enabled them "to capitalise on the potential of their environment to a far greater extent than did the tribes to the south whose technology was less developed."

The following extracts are indicative of Mr. Lawrence's viewpoint:

"the material culture shows no close relationship with the environment" (p. 98).

"The role of the environment was not such that it stimulated local invention of any radical nature, nor did it promote any great change in the nature of the economy. The Aborigines came to Australia with a hunting and gathering economy and through the duration of their stay it remained so" (p. 239).

"The most significant differences resulted from cultural borrowing rather than from invention prompted by environmental stimuli" (p. 193).

Nevertheless despite contentious conclusions, this careful marshalling of facts makes the book a valuable addition to the library of any student of the Aborigines.

Jean Bailey

BLACK POWER, by Stokely Carmichael and Charles V. Hamilton.
Jonathan Cape, 198 pp, $5.15.

THE AUTOBIOGRAPHY OF MALCOLM X, with the assistance of Alex Haley.
Penguin, 512 pp, $1.45.

WHITE AUSTRALIA, isolated, intolerant and smug in its solutions to racial conflict (give the immigration policy another name but discriminate anyway), would be barely interested in the views of American black militants. Whatever interest has developed from the reading of a few emotional news stories and one or two reasoned articles (notably by James Baldwin in The Australian) a reading of Black Power by Stokely Carmichael and Charles V. Hamilton and The Autobiography of Malcolm X would probably confirm the worst nightmares for those who believe that the darker a man's skin the less human he is. Both these books spell out clearly that the days when a black American was forced or condi-
tioned to accept any white man as his superior are over.

If the reactions of racists are predictable what then of humanists, liberal thinkers, revolutionaries? Unfortunately there is much evidence here and, more particularly, in America that the essence of black militancy is misunderstood or ignored while the admitted vagaries of the movement come in for close scrutiny. Those who caution black militants to take care, to use only legal, peaceful, non-violent means, those who, with good intentions, rush south or north to organise the oppressed and those who talk of class solutions, particularly of the white working class as friend and ally may feel that such books make uncomfortable reading but given a little objectivity such readers may learn even as they are upset.

*The Autobiography of Malcolm X,* written with the assistance of Alex Haley is not always satisfactory and yet is one of those rare moving documents that reaffirm the ability of down trodden human beings to rise up and be men. It seems clear from Haley's informative preface that much as he grew to admire and respect Malcolm X he could not identify with him and because the book was written while Malcolm X was changing and maturing and remained unfinished when he was shot down the latter sections leave too many unanswered questions. The political development of Malcolm X is the most unsuccessful portrayal but why he became a militant is very clear.

The next time someone regrets the "inverted racialism" of some black militants thrust this book into his hands. One quarter of the life experience of Malcolm X, his father's death, the prejudices of school days, his youth as junkie, pusher, hustler, robber, his years in jail and one quarter of the realisation that those who killed his father, hounded his mother, stifled his ambitions, contained him, distorted him and incarcerated him were all white men should provide enough understanding of the fact that hatred of white men (the devils of Elijah Muhammad's misnamed "Black Muslims") was a logical step towards self respect.

The dangers in this view are obvious but if development takes place these dangers may be averted. Malcolm X developed and came to criticise Elijah Muhammad's theories, but he never denied the achievements of the "Black Muslims" which have often been spectacular and human. Dope addicts kicked the habit, men develop pride in themselves and their history. They acted. Their faces turned out to the world of anti-colonial struggle.

The religious dogmas of Elijah Muhammad and more particularly of Malcolm X responding to his visit to Mecca after his break with the "Black Muslims" may seem childish, even ridiculous but if their basis is less than sound the same must be said for the Christian orientations of much of Europe's revolutionary history.

Towards the end of his life Malcolm X was "too militant" for some and "too moderate" for others as he sought to build militant organisation. At least the revolutionary readers may ponder the truth that in this sphere of politics there is no discrimination.

His aim, hardly started at the time of his death, was to force recognition of Black America as opposed to integration on white terms, to piecemeal reforms, to containment. He saw the need to build a society where all are recognised as human. He thus rejected his former total hatred of whites and saw not the reactions in society but society itself and yet he never forgot, and neither should we, that "the burden to defend any passion should
never be put upon the black man because it is the white man collectively who has shown that he is hostile towards integration and towards intermarriage and towards these other strides towards oneness.”

By comparison the life experience of Stokely Carmichael and Charles V. Hamilton is that of a privileged new generation. As young intellectual activists they develop out of a period of action by men like Malcolm X, they tell a similar story but from a different angle in a new developing situation.

It is clear to them that action for black liberation in America is in a world setting of peoples demanding an end to oppression. They consider the various efforts towards liberation, those within the established political parties, the efforts to mobilise black voters where they constitute a majority, the efforts to overcome the centuries old trend that if you “wash up, clean up, get an education” the white society will accept you.

They reject the goal of assimilation into “middle-class America” because the class society of America is anti-humanist and perpetuates racism. They seek a society of “free people” not “free enterprise”. To them “black power” is self identity and self determination. They deny that it is a racist concept since racism seeks to subject people and “black power” seeks “full participation in the decision making processes affecting the lives of black people, and recognition of the virtues in themselves as black people.”

They do not deny that the white working class may be an ally but experience teaches them that while organised white workers aspire to the values of present day American society they will contribute to the continuation of racism. They do not encourage violence but they accept that it may come.

They recognise that elements of black racism may persist but they act against this trend while saying persuasively that white racism may not expect any guarantees from them. For those white men who profess a belief in the rights of all men they spell out a role that is “educative, organisational and supportive”. They ask for massive white organisation against white racism for the preaching of the non-violent creed to the violent whites. They demand that white civil rights workers organise the poor whites in the south so that they are not hostile to black demands but hostile to those who keep black and poor white in their inferior positions. They welcome the support of white aid so long as it is free of paternalism.

Understanding the rules of American society they reject them and argue that a necessary condition for new rules and new forms is the creation of consciousness “to achieve dignity, to achieve their share of power, indeed to become their own men and women — in this time and in this land — by whatever means necessary.”

Thus incomplete ideas of Malcolm X are worked over and developed and the message comes through clearly that nothing short of freedom will now succeed in buying off oppressed people anywhere.

Mavis Robertson

KIKI: Ten Thousand Years in a Lifetime, by Albert Maori Kiki.
Cheshire, 187 pp, $3.50.

THE DUST JACKET tells us “This remarkable book is the first autobiography, in fact the first important book ever to come out of New Guinea.” This itself is an indictment on Australian control, but the book also lifts the coconut curtain draped
around this last monument to colonialism. We not only see it we also feel it as we enter Maori Kiki’s life experience.

This book is very readable. The reader in fact feels he is listening to a good storyteller. There are small patches, especially in the closing phases, when the wording stiffens and Kiki’s voice disappears. This coincides with areas of political sensitivity and is no doubt traceable to the fact that Albert Maori Kiki is also secretary of Niugini’s major political party — the Pangu Pati. (‘Niugini’ is the name for Papua and New Guinea recently adopted by the Pangu Pati.)

Perhaps the three outstanding sections of the book are Kiki’s description of his early childhood, his partly completed tribal initiation, and his student days in Fiji. Kiki’s political position however adds interest of a different sort to other parts of his book. We have to read between the lines in these parts, fill in the gaps, sense the moral dilemmas this man has faced.

The literary and political aspects strike a very difficult co-existence in the seventh chapter — “The Buku Affair” — the longest in the book. The logic of Kiki’s development would make us suspect this chapter contains its climax. If this is so it remains hidden and Kiki only later relaxes to recount a series of dramatic incidents which perhaps partly follow in its wake. The only two reviews so far sighted — George Farwell’s SMH 28.12.68 and Percy Chatterton’s Pacific Islands Monthly, Dec. 1968 — both ignore this chapter.

This “affair” achieved headlines in March 1962 when members of the Hahalis Welfare Society on Buku Island in protest at lack of Government spending refused to pay the ‘head tax’ imposed on all Niuginians. When four hundred extra policemen were flown in to reinforce the one hundred and fifty held at bay by the Hahalis people, Kiki went along as part of a medical team. The two leaders of the Society, Francis Hgai and John Teosin, were arrested and placed in Kiki’s tent.

“So now the crowd was without a leader and nobody spoke. They sat there silently in the rain from ten o’clock in the morning to about five o’clock in the afternoon. Then the women were sent away and told to bring food for the men and the men were handcuffed in long lines of about thirty and were put up in a number of sheds. John Teosin and Francis Hagai were made to squat next to my bed.”

Why were these two men placed in Kiki’s tent? What passed between them? No doubt Maori Kiki’s earlier experiences with the administration created a bond which later incidents strengthened.

We see Kiki and his wife Elizabeth ordered out of the European club in Sohano where they had been invited by the producer to view a film that featured Elizabeth prominently. The executive of the club included the local District Officer, the Co-op Officer and the District Education Officer.

We see Kiki back in Port Moresby, still a public servant, glaring across the desk at the District Commissioner, refusing to retract critical statements made in the local press and advising the D.C. to speak properly or be prepared to receive a chair on his head.

Albert Maori Kiki had journeyed a long way from the densely forested hills of the Upper Purori, but there he returned after his defeat in the 1968 House of Assembly elections. In his mother’s village he found his maternal uncle Haure still alive. “He put his hand on my forehead, he placed it on the very spot where he
had tied the shell band many years ago when I was to be initiated during the Koreave festival. Only one's maternal uncle can use this gesture which symbolises the transfer of power from the old generation to the young one."

Perhaps Kiki's initiation was completed now — in a new way. Those who read his book will look forward to its sequel.

LAK.


JUST AS LENIN observed in 1915 that "Absolutely everybody is in favor of peace in general including Kitchener, Joffre, Hindenburg and Nicholas the Bloody", so we find today that everybody is in favor of industrial democracy. The term has been emasculated by many people to such an extent that it is less an objective still to be attained than an achievement which must be preserved.

Fortunately, in developing a strategy of advance towards socialism, a significant section of the European Left has taken a new interest in industrial democracy and workers' control. Many socialists now argue that the demand for workers' control should be the central strategic axis, to which all other reforms and demands must be related. Writing in The Socialist Register 1964, the Belgian marxist Ernest Mandel saw workers' control as the first step towards workers' management of a socialised economy and towards industrial democracy. The demand for it, he continued, would give the essentially defensive strategy of the trade union movement (against wage restraint, and for freedom of bargaining) the necessary militant and positive character without which the working class would be fighting a losing battle against the technocrats and the controllers of neo-capitalism.

Two of the main architects of the new movement for industrial democracy in Britain have been former miner Ken Coates and Tony Topham, both of whom are university lecturers in industrial relations. In the first book under review they have brought together an excellent selection of readings on the subject going back to the turn of the century. Some of the best pieces of polemical scholarship are to be found in the section on the contemporary debate that has been going on since the "New Left" rediscovered the idea of workers' control several years ago. One of the most impressive is Royden Harrison's beautiful demolition job on Professor Hugh Clegg, the Wilson Government's favorite expert on industrial relations, in which it is shown that social ownership is indispensable to industrial democracy, not irrelevant as Clegg and other Fabians have argued. Coates and Topham, however, are perhaps excessively severe on some critics of the tradition of workers' control, particular the Webbs, as Royden Harrison has argued in his review of the book in the Oct.-Dec. 1968 issue of the Political Quarterly.

The second book under review contains some impressive studies of conditions in specific industries, and a paper on student power by Terry Lacey, one of the leading spirits among the "red guard" of the Young Liberals. There is also a lengthy and very useful contribution from Michael Barrett Brown who lucidly explains that the concentration of economic power is firmly established in property rights.
The key decisions in advanced neo-capitalist societies today are made by a small group of controllers whose power is removed from popular control. As Coates and Topham put it in their Introduction to *Industrial Democracy in Great Britain*:

“In every significant sense, the term ‘wage-slavery’ has lost none of its meaning in Britain, however considerable the improvement in living standards might have been. Slavery is not synonymous with poverty, but expresses a relationship between people, in which one will is subordinated to another. Domination may have found polite and decorous descriptions under which to lurk in the past years, but if anything the gulf between controllers and controlled has widened rather than closed: the concentration of scale, technique and power in modern industry has tightened the elite into a more exclusive, more elevated grouping at the same time that it has unleashed new possibilities for manipulation of the increasingly disenfranchised mass.”

Yet these developments have stimulated not only opposition, but also counter-policies, including explicit demands for workers’ control. Indeed, the pressure for industrial democracy within the trade unions themselves may well be the most significant growth point in the British Labor movement.

Unfortunately, similar developments have not yet taken place in Australia. The idea of workers’ control has not been of prime concern to the local Left for almost half a century. It once exercised a powerful influence on Australian socialists, just after the First World War, and the interest was reflected in the 1921 Socialisation Objective of the ALP. However, it was not long before the emphasis on workers’ control was changed and there developed a vacuum. The subject was avoided not only by reformist trade union bureaucrats but also by Communist Party militants, although recently the Left has vaguely begun to realise that not only students or radical priests should be interested in “participatory democracy”. And it is to be hoped that local Communists will avoid the kind of attack on the New Left put forward recently by Bert Ramelson, CUGB industrial spokesman, in which he referred to the “well intentioned” and “glib talk” about workers’ control coming from socialists who have lost faith in the political road to socialism and who “retreat to the old and long-forsaken syndicalist and guild socialist ideas of the militants of half a century ago.” (*Marxism Today*, October 1968).

Of course, there is “glib talk” in some quarters and the enormous magnitude of the problems involved in implementing workers’ control must not be underestimated. The British New Left, however, has shown in the two books under review that it can come up with highly technical and sophisticated proposals. It will be many years before we produce work of comparable quality. The only consolation is that the idea of workers’ control in Australia appears to have a good chance of being rescued from limbo.

**WHAT IS HISTORY,**

THE EMINENT Soviet scholar and historian Professor N. I. Konrad in a recent work says: “These are extraordinary times. They are unquestionably one of the crucial turning points in world history. The future will probably show that they are even the most important of all that mankind has lived through so far. It is only
natural that, at times like these, as at all other major turns in history, thinkers ponder on the substance of history."

This is what Professor E. H. Carr does in this collection of six lectures he delivered at the University of Cambridge.

In his view the present social revolution is only just beginning, "But it is advancing at a staggering pace to keep abreast of the staggering technological advances of the last generation."

More than ever before Marxists need to study this revolution to keep up to date with the staggering amount of new data. The theory of history assists one to see the changes in correct perspective, to summarise past experience and to visualise the future.

Professor Carr employs the scientific method of thinking which is becoming more and more recognised for its universality and the book is worth reading alone, as a study of the method of dialectical and historical materialism. In addition, he considers many of the problems with which mankind today is grappling: the individual's relation to society; the interconnection of history, science and morality; as well as history as progress and the expansion of education and reason.

It is full of food for thought and despite its weighty content, it is written in a wholly stimulating, simple, often humorous and readable style.

Professor Carr deals with the relationship between the historian and his facts.

He says "The facts speak only when the historian calls on them; it is he who decides to which facts to give the floor and in what order or context."

He is critical of those historians who maintain that an "ultimate history" can be written by the accumulation of facts. He opposes the sceptics who say that since all historical judgments involve persons and points of view, one is as good as another and there is no 'objective' historical truth. Instead he regards the historian and his interpretation of the facts as necessary to one another.

History cannot be correctly interpreted if individuals are seen as distinct from their times and their class position in society. "Society and the individual are inseparable, they are necessary and complementary to each other; not opposites."

The historian, himself, is influenced by society. There are signs that suggest even in the western world where individualism has been the ideology of social change since the Renaissance, that this period of history has reached its end. This affects the historian. "It is not merely the events that are in flux. The historian himself is in flux." The historians of a declining society, hitherto optimistic of history's purpose and progress, turn to the view that there is no general pattern in history at all.

He summarises: "The facts of history are indeed facts about individuals but not about the actions of individuals performed in isolation and not about the motives, real or imaginary, from which individuals suppose themselves to have acted."

He describes the admittance of history into the scientific sphere since Darwin's era. "It is recognised that scientists make discoveries and acquire fresh knowledge, not by establishing precise and comprehensive laws, but by enunciating hypotheses which open the way for fresh enquiry."

He therefore sees a close affinity between the methods of science and history believing both to have the "modest hope of advancing progres-
sively from one fragmentary hypoth-
thesis to another, isolating their facts
through the medium of their interpre-
tations and testing their interpreta-
tions by the facts."

Such a view is very close to the
marxist theory of knowledge, which
emphasises the need to see socialist
theory, not as a set of fixed laws and
dogma, but as a guide to action which
tests all theory by practice.

He denies the view of theologians
that history is the result of divine
purpose and adopts a materialist posi-
tion. "Personally I find it hard to
reconcile the integrity of history with
belief in some super-historical force
on which its meaning and significance
depend."

Historians, Carr believes, should not
be required to pass moral judgments
on the private lives or public actions
of individuals, since judicial and
moral standards are constantly chang-
ing.

However, interpretation of historical
facts presupposes moral or value judg-
ments and comparison, in the case
of past institutions, events and poli-
cies. What is 'progressive' generally,
may in some cases be the cause of suf-
fering for some, since inequalities are
an integral part of the historical
struggle.

The moral stand of the historian
affects his outlook. "The serious his-
torian is the one who recognises the
historically conditioned character of
all values, not the one who claims for
his own values an objectivity beyond
history."

He deals with history as "a study
of causes" and rejects distortions which
emphasise, unduly, determinism and
chance. "The fact is that human ac-
tions are both free and determined
according to the point of view from
which one considers them."

Historians committed to a declin-
ing society deny that history is pro-
gress, but Professor Carr avers that
history is progress through the trans-
mission of acquired skills from one
generation to the next.

Man does not set himself a definite
end but generally strives for greater
freedom, for a progressive develop-
ment of human potentialities, with
each succeeding period giving rise to
what the content of history should be.

The modern age is the most histori-
cally minded of all ages, with man's
earlier efforts to understand his en-
vironment extended to include his at-
tempts at greater understanding of
himself.

Professor Carr sees the possibilities
of man being able to order his social
life, at present lagging behind the
technical and scientific revolution, for
this revolution gives rise to a progres-
sive increase in the numbers of those
who learn to think, to use their rea-
son.

What is History? contains much
more than this. It has probably al-
ready been read by many, but for
those who haven't read it, it is a use-
ful addition to understanding history
and the modern world.

Jim Moss
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