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THE FIRST QUESTION to be asked about the future of trade unions is what are the possibilities and what are the limits of trade union activity? I paraphrase that question from the title of an article by Perry Anderson "The limits and possibilities of trade union action" in *The Incompatibles*. This article doesn’t get far beyond the views of Lenin, particularly of Lenin’s polemical pamphlet *What is to be Done*, and I think that Lenin and Anderson saw more clearly the limitations than the potentialities of trade union action. If unions continue to be no more than they have traditionally been throughout the 19th century, there is nothing to indicate that they possess any value of themselves as instruments of social change. If they are going to be instruments of social change they have to develop their own sets of values.

Traditionally the unions have accepted the values of the society in which they have operated — they have been in fact, part of capitalism. To use Anderson’s terms they have developed corporate values instead of hegemonic values. They have to cease merely to accept the values of the hegemonic group in a society, that is of those who own property, and they have to cease to work within those values.

This assumes that one wants to see unions as instruments of change and of course this is a big question. I believe that the trade unions can be and should be instruments of social change and that this is almost now a social necessity.

Here in Australia, basic social change is not immediately on the agenda: it’s a long-term goal. But there have to be intermediate goals too, so first of all I want to examine the narrow conception of the union, as an organisation, as an institution concerned to ameliorate the conditions of working people in capitalist society.

The traditional role of the union has been aimed at improving the condition of workers within capitalist society and of protecting workers against capitalism. Perry Anderson makes the point that the trade union in society has been a mark of capitalist society. This is a negative quality in the traditional trade union function.
Now it may very well be that there has been no better instrument devised for protection against capitalism than the American business union. I know of no union which has been able to get more for its members than unions like the United Automobile Workers, for example. At the same time they’re marked by extreme conservatism, both political and social; all too often (though not as often as the anti-union press would have) by corruption. But the American union, especially in the hands of a man like Jimmy Hoffa, for example, is not to be despised. The American experience does suggest that very many small increments to welfare, a concentration upon the daily or the weekly aim at the expense of long-term issues, don’t indeed can’t, amount to basic social change at any point — this is just the Fabian myth restated in an American context. But the immediate struggle of the union — this daily struggle — is important.

The union has to be effective in the daily struggle so that it will have members which give it political power and financial strength. We have to remember that workers of necessity are primarily concerned with this daily struggle to live. So in Australia the question is how is the union to become effective again or to remain effective?

We have to look at the setting in which unions operate in Australia. Increasingly our economic destinies are in the hands of large corporations employing a very significant proportion of workers. The multi-national corporation, usually American-based, is the instrument of modern capitalism. The scientific and technological revolution is transforming the nature of the skills that are required in industry, the proportion in which those skills are needed and the relationship of man to the productive process. The distinguishing feature of the industrial revolution was the lack of control possessed over the process by the men and women — not forgetting the children too — who worked in industry, who worked in the factory which, far more than the machine, was the symbol of the industrial revolution. There was a total acceptance among them of most of the values that were being inflicted upon them by the new capitalism of the 19th century, simply because the factory worker didn’t possess the means of devising and giving effect to his own values. It was only late in the 19th century that factory workers became organised in any large measure into trade unions.

But workers in the scientific and technological age do possess these means in the form of trade unions. Hence the first target of the union is to get, and to hold, some degree of control over the process of scientific and industrial change. This necessarily involves a greater degree of emphasis upon organisation at the plant level, the shop floor level, the factory level, the office level.

And here I’m not talking about worker control. There are two different things spoken of all too often when people talk about
worker control. Worker participation and worker control are not the same things, and all that is implied, up to this point, is worker participation. It's not possible to lay down in advance precisely how far this sort of participation has to go or all the things that it would be concerned with, such matters as design of jobs, the allocation of work, negotiation of rates, discipline on the job. These are all important, but perhaps the first two, the design of jobs and the allocation of work, are the most important, because these go to the very root of the industrial process and if unions or workers have participation in these then they've achieved a great deal indeed. These are precisely the areas in which employers are most loath to allow participation by employees.

Nor is it possible to lay down in advance precisely what sort of organisation will be needed at this level because there are so many factors that have to be taken into account. There's the existing structure of the unions involved, there's the nature of the industrial process, the kind of skills that are involved; and all these change very much from one industrial situation to another. But there are some other aspects of the problem that can be discussed more precisely. First of all relations between manual and white collar unions; secondly the structure of trade unions; thirdly, union democracy; and fourthly and inevitably in this country of course — the arbitration system.

On the question of white-collar unions and manual unions, I want to outline briefly the thesis of John Kenneth Galbraith. Galbraith is an economist, Canadian by birth, who has written a series of books *American Capitalism, The Affluent Society* — a term which Galbraith coined — and *The New Industrial State*. *The Affluent Society* in particular I think is one that everybody ought to read. It's a diagnosis or a study of the symptoms of the sickness of capitalist society, of neo-capitalist society. It has no solutions but the diagnosis is still of some importance. But what I want to refer to is his *New Industrial State*, and the relations between white collar unions and manual unions. Very briefly the proposition is this: that in the mature industrial corporation (and we have some of them in Australia like the Colonial Sugar Refinery and Broken Hill) effective control rests in the hands of the techno-structure, the people like engineers, sales executives, accountants, scientists — all those trained professional or semi-professional people who make decisions within the corporation, as to the direction, the order, the character of production.

These people, erroneously, are said by Galbraith to control society and according to Galbraith they are above trade unionism, trade unions represent substantially manual and the lower grades of white collar workers, and the role of the union is limited in the mature industrial corporation to serving the ends of the techno-
structure. This isn't quite such a load of garbage as it may sound, because to some extent it does picture the American situation. White collar unionists, the techno-structure, are badly organised in America. The position is different in Britain, to a great extent, and also in Australia. There's nothing inevitable about this inability to organise the white collar worker, or even the techno-structure, the supervisory grades that are affiliates of management though not themselves management — the engineers, surveyors, draftsmen. This is a process that is going on in Australia; and indeed the white collar unions are growing at a faster rate than the manual unions, largely because in our modern society the number of the white collar workers is increasing much more rapidly than manual workers.

It's extremely important that this process of the unionisation of white collar workers should proceed and also that there should be closer relationships between the white collar and manual unions than at present exist. There is suspicion on both sides, arising from social and economic disparities and these have to be overcome. This is part of the program for effective participation in industry.

Secondly, there is the structure of unions. Australian unionism is a product of the 19th century and the *forms* of unionism have been frozen almost though not entirely under the arbitration system. It might be a bit too simple to say frozen by the arbitration system because they have also been frozen to a great extent in Britain where you haven't got an arbitration system; but the union structure is still basically that of unions of the 19th century and particularly of British trade unions. There is a tendency, and you see it in the number of demarcation disputes that take place for example at the Newcastle dockyard, to cling to craft forms which are becoming increasingly irrelevant. There is secondly a need to avoid the sort of situation that takes place in Britain in the steel industry when negotiations go on with employers and one of the major troubles is that of getting the almost innumerable unions represented in the steel mills to come into line, one with the other. This of course is quite disastrous because if the unions are struggling amongst themselves this, obviously, is a tremendous advantage to the employer and renders the possibility of effective participation considerably less than it might otherwise have been.

You will notice that I'm not giving any answers to these problems because I don't know myself what the answers are, except in a very general sort of a way. But it really isn't the business of the academic to give the answers; he has an obligation to help if he has any sympathy with trade unions but the answers in the end lie with trade unionists themselves.
The third thing is union democracy. Australian unions are bureaucratically run in a very high measure. Whether it's an effect of apathy which is a characteristic of the trade union movement both in Australia and Britain or whether the apathy is consequent upon the lack of union democracy I'd be very hard put to say. But there are one or two American unions — the typographers and Actors' Equity — that are better than anything we've got in Australia, and that have a fierce internal democracy and a very high level of member participation. These two elements of worker participation and union democracy are essential in order to engage the minds of workers with the unions.

And then of course there is the arbitration system without which, regrettably, no discussion of the Australian situation would even start to look complete. A great many people fail to see how deeply the arbitration system has bitten into Australian society. Keith Sinclair, the writer of a short history of New Zealand, remarked that perhaps no other single statute had done more to mould New Zealand in its history than the Conciliation and Arbitration Act of 1894. This was before there was any conciliation and arbitration in Australia which was of course copied from New Zealand — a New Zealand heritage to Australia. Sinclair is probably right in what he says about N.Z.; but how much more so is it true of Australia?

It has moulded union attitudes and particularly the attitudes of leadership of trade unions far more effectively than any other single environmental factor. The arbitration system was not designed as a revolutionary influence — it is essentially conservative, concerned to conserve into the present the values of the past. And the people who are appointed to it — you look them over, from Kirby C. J. to Mr. Commissioner Winter — are not men who are prepared to overturn the state, or even to upset the applecart; they're not appointed for the purposes of social revolution, this is in the very nature of the arbitration system. It is exhibited more clearly than anywhere else in the pronounced emphasis of Commissioners and Judges alike, whether in Commonwealth or State jurisdiction, upon the sanctity of traditional employer prerogatives.

Any trade union officer who has tried to get a Commissioner to agree to changes in methods of production, manning scales for example, knows how difficult it is to get past the statement that this is something within the rights of management. This again is an essential part of the arbitration system.

This means that if you're seeking worker participation, you're running in the face of the arbitration system. There is another way too of course, which I've dealt with in an article I wrote for Outlook last year. This deals with the question of consensus, start-
ing from the book *The Incompatibles* which is sub-titled "Trade Union Militancy and the Consensus". And the Australian consensus, like the British consensus, lies in the realm of wage policy. Union and employers alike have developed through the arbitration court a concept of comparative wage justice that is quite incompatible with negotiation at plant level. This of course was shown handsomely by the decision of the Commonwealth Conciliation and Arbitration Commission in the General Motors-Holden case 1965 in which the Vehicle Builders and the various metal trade unions at General Motors down in Victoria and South Australia were seeking a £3 bonus and got nowhere. All they really got out of it was some hefty fines from the Industrial Court. Here is really the consensus; in the case of G.M.-H. an attempt was made to break through that consensus.

This is the sort of thing that Galbraith talks about, too. Galbraith says that one of the great needs of the techno-structure is stability of wage levels, and if you substitute for techno-structure the capitalist owners of industry then this is true — they do want stability and the arbitration system provides them with stability, at the expense of workers.

These are only some of the things that could be said about arbitration but there is one thing more that must be mentioned and that is of course the attack upon the penal powers, as they're somewhat erroneously called, particularly in the Federal Act. In the end nothing can happen while the penal powers can be used, or can potentially be used, in all their ferocity. All that I've said so far is the sort of program that could be undertaken without basic disturbance of the status quo. It remains, however disturbing it may seem, a program of amelioration and not of social change, and eventually I always have to come to the point of whether the union has in the long term a role in this basic social change and if so what is that role. I believe that marxists have been too prone to accept the rather negative leninist analysis of the nature and functions of the trade union. One has to remember that when Lenin wrote his pamphlet *What is to be Done* he had just translated into Russian Sidney and Beatrice Webb's *Industrial Democracy*; and I believe that Lenin was profoundly influenced by what the Webbs wrote about the nature of trade unionism in Britain. Secondly of course he was having factional warfare within the Russian Social Democratic Labour Party with the so-called Economists and *What is to be Done*, which is the basic document conveying Lenin's views upon trade unionism, shows the effect of these two influences much more than it shows the influence of Marx. Very briefly the leninist approach is of course that the trade union is capable of developing only a trade union consciousness — that its struggle will be essentially economic, it will be concerned with relatively immediate
demands of workers and, while it will undertake political action, this political action will be of a limited character. The value of the unions is as a training ground in the struggle against capitalism which will be really waged by the advanced party of the workers. That’s a massive simplification of course of what Lenin said but I think it’s not unfair. Look at this country — here there’s been a total failure of nerve and of ideology in the only mass party, the ALP. There exists no major movement dedicated to social change — that’s the first point. The second point is that right at this very moment we see trade unions, perhaps political parties working through trade unions but nevertheless the trade unions, in a political confrontation: for make no mistake this present upheaval about penal clauses is not an economic issue, it’s a political issue and this is only one of the reasons why somebody like Albert Monk will try to crawl out from under.

I’ve always believed that there’s something wrong with the socialist theory of the trade union. Perhaps this is an emotional approach but I cannot concede that the only mass groups of the workers are, as Lenin suggested, ultimately politically impotent. Nevertheless up till May 1968 I think I probably did go along with the writer Herbert Marcuse who found that the unions had ceased to be a significant, progressive force in society (he is thinking of course of the traditional 19th century trade union). But in that month of May 1968 two things became apparent.

First of all there became apparent the basic character of the social ferment that was going on in France and that was developed into action by the students; and the second thing was the capacity of workers for social action. This to me is in many ways far more important ultimately than the situation that developed among the students.

This action was nipped in the bud and the analysis of these events is still incomplete. The social malaise that became evident was connected with the intense bureaucratisation of society which is characteristic not only of France but also of all advanced contemporary societies and it was connected also with the fact that man is conceived of as another unit in production, as something subordinate to the process by which commodities and the means for producing commodities are produced.

We have become slaves of commodities in more ways than one. Workers are almost inevitably slaves to commodities because they’re regarded as instruments in the production of commodities and because their lives are bounded by commodities. Incidentally I agree with Geoff Sharp’s criticism in the latest issue of Arena of Richta’s Civilisation at the Crossroads. This I think is a fascinating
book and an exciting book but I think in the end it does fall down for the very reason that Sharp makes, that it doesn't provide anything like a sort of prognosis of the quality of civilisation and it doesn't provide anything like a program for getting out of the productive morass and this sort of production psychology in which we're immersed. But it's the question of work that comes squarely within the scope of the trade union and if we continue to believe that there is some relationship between the relations in production and society in general, then whoever strikes at that point, at the workplace, takes the very first step to strike at society at large. In spite of the Galbraithian analysis we still do live in a class society, and this is a fact that impinges upon us every day of our lives. That class structure is still based on the power to control property or the rights to property. Unlike the student in his claim to power in the university the worker in his trade union is confronting society at large. I don't think that the two questions of worker-control and student-control are by any means homogeneous. They're different kinds of things because the worker in seeking control in the factory is in fact confronting a class society. But if society is to progress not only in material terms but also in terms of the quality of life then the consensus that has characterised the traditional trade union has got to change to this sort of confrontation — a real confrontation in which to use the terms of Perry Anderson there are two hegemonic sets of values, or two dominant sets of values confronting each other. A lot of this has been said by the French marxist Andre Gorz and there is an article of his I'd recommend called "Work and Consumption", in a Fontana publication Towards Socialism which appeared in 1965. Gorz shows, and here I think he makes a basic point, that the ideal of the employer is the worker who is educated up to a level that is compatible with his employment and no further. If he's educated further this creates psychological difficulties for the worker and therefore, economic difficulties for the employer.

The first emphasis of course is on education and the quality of life, on the idea that people are complete beings and that education is a process of leading out, to assist in realising the potentialities of people. This is an ideal that has to be developed; to do this the trade union movement must have teachers within its ranks — this is of quite fundamental importance.

Gorz also points out the disparity between the formal freedom of democratic society and what he calls the despotic and authoritarian society which is industry; for industry is a despotic and authoritarian society — this is the whole history of industry from the beginning of the industrial revolution. What Gorz says is that if the working class is to realise a vocation as a ruling class it's got to attack working conditions in the place of work. It's under this
heading of the broader area that we come to the question of workers' control.

Somewhere or other Adam Smith, a much despised bourgeois economist who's really well worth reading for some of his insights, said that you can only tell the difference between a porter and a philosopher by what the porter and the philosopher have made of their capacities. This is not entirely true because in fact men are unequal — I don’t think there's anything snobbish in saying that some people are not as highly endowed with intelligence as others and that the village idiot can be a fact of life, but nevertheless the differences are not nearly as enormous as they appear. They’re not of the order of the difference between the porter and the philosopher. The realisation of the potentialities of men can only come with this education, with the opportunity in the work place to transcend this idea of being merely a productive unit and of becoming a sensate human being with all his capacities developed even if he is only doing the work of a porter. Gorz goes on with some sort of program for what he describes as counter powers. I think there’s a great deal of criticism that can be made of Gorz’s analysis but once again I would suggest that anyone who hasn’t read it should do so. His idea of counter powers is the idea of a hegemonic and a subservient group and I think this is quite wrong, I think it’s got to be the confrontation of people organised into trade unions who possess their own values, who believe in those values, who are prepared to assert them in society against a group that has traditionally always laid down the values of the society.

That of course is getting pretty well, as it were, into the realm of speculation if you consider the instant problems of Australia. But what it does suggest to me is that whether you say that the trade unions have a specifically political role or not, thinking of politics in terms of party politics, the fact is that they have got a role, a very important role, and I believe quite possibly a fundamental role in the process of social change because they attack the problem at the very point at which the modern sickness of society originates, and that is in the industrial process.

All these things that I have attempted to outline in a sort of intermediate program are essential for the realisation of any long-term program. You have to re-assert the existence of a working class by having people, white-collar unionists, manual unionists, working together. You have to destroy the arbitration system — you have to have a trade union structure that is built for the times, not for 100-150 years ago, and you have to have participation by all members of the trade union, or as many as is practicable. These things are all important but in the sort of long-term, what you might call it if you wanted to be critical, the airy-fairy future, they are instrumental only.
HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENTS in the Soviet Union, the cultural revolution in China, the Sino-Soviet conflict and the debacle in Czechoslovakia focus attention upon the structures, mores and theories of socialist society. It is asked, from the negative side, whether the divergences exhibited in contemporary socialist countries are inherent in the socialist system or even in the very theories of Communism. Socialist experience together with the complexities of modern industrial society have led revolutionaries to ponder old problems anew. To the many anarchistically inclined who desire the free society, the concept of revolutionary government in any form is incomprehensible, for revolution and government, in their view, are incompatible. Hence the vague notion “we’ll knock the old society down and then the people will build up a new one without preconceived blueprints of any kind” holds sway among many. Others maintain that complete or almost complete decentralisation and autonomy through workers’ control, student power and the like is the solution. For the Communist Party adherents, in the main, the concept of the dictatorship of the proletariat with some possible variation from the Soviet model provides an equally simplistic answer to the problem of transition to the good society.

In the Communist Manifesto Marx and Engels advanced the vague yet inspiring outline of a society where class distinctions had disappeared and where all production had been concentrated in the hands of a “vast association of the whole nation”. Marx described his ideal as a society where the relations of everyday life “offer man none but perfectly intelligible and reasonable relations with regard to his fellowman and to nature”.

The life-process of society, which is based on the process of material production, does not strip off its mystical veil until it is treated as production by freely associated men, and is consciously regulated by them in accordance with a settled plan. (Karl Marx, Capital Vol. 1, George Allan and Unwin 1946 p.51).

The Communist revolution, claimed Marx and Engels, would constitute the most radical rupture with traditional property rela-
tions and ideas. In place of the old bourgeois society, with its classes and class antagonisms, there would be an association, in which the free development of each is the condition for the free development of all. (Marx and Engels, The Manifesto of the Communist Party).

The path to the new society, in the view of Marx and Engels, lay through a working class revolution which would aim to “raise the proletariat to the position of ruling class, to win the battle of democracy”. “Freedom”, wrote Marx in the Critique of the Gotha Program, “consists in converting the state from an organ superimposed upon society into one completely subordinated to it . . .” Between capitalist and communist society would lie the period of the revolutionary transformation of the one into the other. There would correspond to this also a political transition period in which the state could be nothing but “the revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat”. (Karl Marx, Selected Works Vol. 2, Cooperative Publishing Society 1936 p. 577).

Marx pointed out that the state is an organ of class rule, an organ for continuing oppression of one class by another, and that it maintains an order which legalises and perpetuates this oppression by “moderating” the collisions between the classes. This view illustrates a pure or classical view of the state stripped of all complexities.

Historically the bourgeois state has existed, according to Marx, for the sake of private property and provided a “form of organisation” which has the aim of safeguarding the property and interests of the bourgeoisie. The degree of democracy extended to the working people depends on the level of the struggle they wage for democracy and on the democratic requirements necessary to “moderate” the class struggle and to ensure the stable control of the capitalists over society.

Discussing the advanced bourgeois-democratic states of his time Engels observed that, in them, wealth wields its power indirectly yet all the more effectively. In a later period Gramsci pointed out that in such countries having a long tradition of bourgeois rule, that rule did not rest on the open repressive force of the bourgeois state. “Rather it rested on the bourgeois hegemony of political consciousness, that is, on the fact that in hundreds of different ways it had secured the adoption of its own world view by the whole populace”. (Alastair Davidson, Antonio Gramsci The Man, His Ideas, Australian Left Review Publication 1968 p. 39). Referring to Australia John Playford argues that capitalism in countries like Australia (or neo-capitalism to use Playford’s term) “is not maintained by force of arms or by a repressive state apparatus but because the majority of the people believe that it is the natural
form of socio-political organisation and that it satisfies human needs and provides for the full development of individual talents and capacities”. (John Playford, *Neo-Capitalism in Australia*, Arena Publishing Association 1969 p. 50). Playford goes on to advocate that “one of the big tasks of socialists is to break this ideological hegemony”.

Engels, Gramsci, Davidson and Playford are undoubtedly correct in the point they raise. Yet the force of the bourgeois state remains. Ideological hegemony, or naked oppression (to which the democratic bourgeois state reverts when seriously assailed) the rule is exercised by or on behalf of the capitalist class — *in this sense a dictatorship irrespective of the degree of electoral democracy which may prevail*. Despite whatever political democracy exists a class dictatorship underlies our whole system.

The dictatorship of the bourgeoisie in the modern capitalist state is veiled by the existence of parliaments, political parties, electoral procedures and the like. The ruling class itself usually operates more than one political party. Such parties pursue sectional interests and frequently conflict on even important issues of advancing the interests of the wealthy.

Discussing the views of Marx, Engels and Lenin on how to overcome the problem of the state and the need for a transitional state E. H. Carr interprets their conclusions as follows:

In the long run, the traditional socialist view of the state as an evil in itself, a product of contradiction and an instrument of oppression, which can have no place in a communist order of the future, was maintained in its entirety. In the short run, it was argued that the proletariat, having destroyed the bourgeois state instrument by revolutionary means, would need to set up a temporary state instrument of their own — the dictatorship of the proletariat — until such time as the last vestiges of bourgeois society had been eradicated and the classless socialist order firmly established. A working distinction was thus drawn between the eventual communist society, when all inequalities between man and man would have disappeared and the state no longer exist, and what came to be variously known as “socialism” or “the first stage of communism”, when the last vestiges of the bourgeois order were not yet eradicated and the state took the form of a dictatorship of the proletariat. (E. H. Carr, *The Bolshevik Revolution* Vol. I, Penguin edition p.242).

Hence the theoretical concept of *the dictatorship of the proletariat* as opposed to bourgeois dictatorship was proposed for the long transitional period to Communism, as the direction through which class divisions would be eradicated and the state eventually would die away.

Marx and Engels made only a few references to the dictatorship of the proletariat. It was Lenin, in *The State and Revolution, The Proletarian Revolution and The Renegade Kautsky* and other works who developed what is now known as “the theory of the dictatorship of the proletariat”.
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By dictatorship of the proletariat Marx and Lenin meant rule of the working class in contradistinction to rule by the bourgeoisie. The concept envisaged direct democracy, the great development of democracy, eventually leading, after the crushing of the power of the old rulers, to the withering away of the state and all authoritarianism. In *State and Revolution* Lenin wrote that the mass of the population would be raised to independent participation not only in voting and elections but in day-to-day administration. He argued that under socialism "all will administer in turn and will quickly become accustomed to nobody administering".

Thus the dictatorship of the proletariat referred to the type of society and originally did not formulate concrete ideas as to the form of government this would entail. Neither in Marx nor in Lenin did ideas of obligatory censorship, denial of rights of political association or monopoly of power by one party, emerge.

*Form of the Dictatorship*

Ideas regarding a precise form of government under the dictatorship of the proletariat were developed with the Russian revolution and took the form of the Soviets. The October revolution saw the establishment of the power of the Soviets.

The Soviets are a new state apparatus which, in the first place, provides an armed force of workers and peasants; and this force is not divorced from the people, as was the old standing army, but is very closely bound up with the people. From the military point of view this force is incomparably more powerful than previous forces; from the revolutionary point of view, it cannot be replaced by anything else. Secondly, with the majority of the people, so intimate, so indissoluble, so easily verifiable and renewable, that nothing even remotely like it existed in the previous state apparatus. Thirdly, this apparatus, by virtue of the fact that its personnel is elected and subject to recall at the people's will without any bureaucratic formalities, is far more democratic than any previous apparatus. Fourthly, it provides a close contact with the most varied professions, thereby facilitating the adoption of the most varied and most radical reforms without red tape. Fifthly, it provides an organisational form for the vanguard, i.e. for the most class-conscious, most energetic and most progressive section of the oppressed classes, the workers and peasants, and so constitutes an apparatus by means of which the vanguard of the oppressed classes can elevate, train, educate, and lead the entire vast mass of these classes, which has up to now stood completely outside of political life and history. Sixthly, it makes it possible to combine the advantages of the parliamentary system with those of immediate and direct democracy, i.e. to vest in the people's elected representatives both legislative and executive functions. Compared with the bourgeois parliamentary system, this is an advance in democracy's development which is of world-wide, historic significance. (V. I. Lenin, "Can the Bolsheviks Retain State Power?", *Collected Works* Vol. 26, Progress Publishers 1964 pp.103, 104).

**Isaac Deutscher comments on the early Soviet position:**

In the Soviets the propertied classes were not represented: they were to be disfranchised in the way in which the old ruling classes are disfranchised in any revolution. (This did not necessarily mean that they should also be deprived
of freedom of expression). The Soviets were to combine legislative and executive powers, and the government was to be responsible to them. The electors were entitled to revoke, to change their deputies at any time, not merely during periodic polls; and the Soviets would at any time depose the government through a vote of no confidence. The existence of opposition and the continued contest of parties within the Soviets were taken for granted. That the ruling party alone should be entitled to form public opinion did not enter anybody's mind. *The Prophet Armed*, p.318).

There followed a tremendous upsurge of direct democracy, public debate, mass meetings and ideas for workers' control, in which the Soviets were the centre of virile revolutionary activity. At the same time there occurred the civil war, the invasion of fourteen armies of intervention and the struggle for the very survival of the Soviet state. This struggle was successful in the military sense only shortly before Lenin's death in 1924.

Following its formation the Soviet Government had not only to organise the defeat of the Whiteguards and the expulsion of interventionist armies but also the industrialisation of a backward country. Hostile surroundings following the defeat of the revolution in the West made the problems all the more stupendous.

The implication is that the "forced marches" dictated to the new Soviet republic created the material or objective conditions out of which developed the apothesised marxism later presented by Stalin and the theoreticians trained in his orbit. "Rectilinearity and one-sidedness, stiffness and petrification, subjectivism and subjective blindness — voila the epistemological roots of idealism". (See V. I. Lenin, *On Dialectics*). Out of the by-ways forced on the Soviet comrades grew the caricatures and dogmas which were presented as marxism in the era of socialist revolution.

In 1919 Lenin declared: "In Russia the dictatorship of the proletariat must inevitably differ in certain particulars from what it would be in the advanced countries, owing to the very great backwardness and petty-bourgeois character of our country". (Economics and Politics in the Era of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat, *Collected Works* Vol. 30 p. 108). Obviously true! However Lenin goes on (and proves that despite being probably the greatest revolutionary planner in history he was still a mortal human being) — "But the basic forces — and the basic forms of social economy — are the same in Russia as in any capitalist country, so that the peculiarities can apply only to what is of lesser importance". This statement cannot be sustained. Russia was overwhelmingly a peasant country with a correspondingly agrarian, peasant economy. In our country and many other capitalist countries there are no peasants and only small numbers of farmers. Lenin in the same article stated that "the whole essence of socialism" (Lenin's emphasis) lay in demarcating the working peasant from the peasant owner, the
peasant worker from the peasant huckster, the peasant who labors from the peasant who profiteers”. Such a problem does not arise in Australia and similar countries (which is not to say there are not other problems) and if Lenin was right about it being the whole essence of socialism in Russia it certainly is not so in Australia. Lenin frequently emphasised that the supreme principle of the dictatorship of the proletariat was the building and maintenance of the alliance with the peasantry. Hardly so in Australia.

From these few examples alone it surely must be recognised that much of Lenin’s writings and polemics applied with main force to the peculiarly Russian situation and cannot be taken as “gospel” for all times, places and conditions. It is tiresome to repeat this but it is still more tiresome that many in the Communist movement internationally and in Australia attempt to force upon us especially that section of Lenin’s writings. It is an irony of history that such canonising distorts and obliterates the revolutionary side of his doctrine, its revolutionary soul, an approach which Lenin himself repeatedly pilloried.

Not long before his death Lenin, in commenting that a workers state is an abstraction, went on to define Soviet Russia as “a workers state with bureaucratic distortions” with the added peculiarity of a predominant peasant population. It is interesting, yet pointless, to imagine how Lenin would have defined the U.S.S.R. in Stalin’s heyday or even now! For the revolutionary dictatorship of Lenin’s time gave way to the totalitarian dictatorship of the Stalin period and then to the bureaucratic, hierarchical institutionalism of today.

Did the dictatorship of the proletariat operate during the Stalin era in the U.S.S.R.? That it obviously did not has been revealed by Soviet Communists themselves because there existed, for a long period, the virtual dictatorship of one man. When the dictatorship of one man did not operate there has tended to be the rule of the Communist Party because of the omnipotence of the party in Soviet society. From the early thirties Communist Party leadership was effected in all spheres of political and social life — in the sense that no decision of major importance in any sphere could be taken without the endorsement of the Party, its leading circle or, most often, its leader. One may call this exercising of the dictatorship of the proletariat through the proletarian party or the dictatorship of the party or whatever, but it certainly was not evidence of the proper or extensive operation of socialist democracy where the working people were masters of their actions and destinies; more particularly when that party was of the most highly centralised, monolithic character with little or no freedom for real ideological debate or right for dissenters and minorities, where in fact dissenters and critics were eliminated on a vast scale in a most arbitrary and brutal fashion. Was the Soviet Union under Stalin a million times more
Lenin's views on democracy and on the dictatorship of the proletariat have held sway in the Communist movement for generations. Many regard Lenin's works as being the last word on the whole subject. Unfortunately the happenings in socialist countries since Lenin's time indicate the tremendous theoretical and practical problems remaining. So that the subject is not a "closed book". It is one which must occupy the attention of socialists on a wide canvas both summing up the experiences of the past 50 years in relation to the socialist countries, the developments of bourgeois and "third world" democracy AND to a re-examination of the various marxist writings on the subjects with the use of an exceedingly critical eye.

In the minds of many Communists the concept of proletarian dictatorship conjures up pictures of establishing the rule of the industrial workers (only one section of the proletariat) through the complete and absolute domination of the Communist Party. This in their minds is not only for the purpose of building a socialist economy and defeating bourgeois opposition and backlash but also for the purpose of crushing opposition, criticism, alternative methods and ideas of building socialism advanced by any section of workers or intellectuals, of crushing any deviation from the line of the traditional Marxist-Leninist Party. Such constitutes a caricature of the whole concept (particularly with the re-structuring of the proletariat in modern society) and has led or will lead to the direst consequences eventually wherever it is practised. For those who hold such views in Australia it can only mean eternal isolation and failure, fully deserved.

An Elusive Concept

What is the dictatorship of the proletariat? As one examines the development of the theory from Marx's time to the present it's like chasing a mirage — one can never quite get to it. Certainly in practice, it is, at very least, extremely doubtful whether the dictatorship of the proletariat has been ever accomplished. Lenin described the dictatorship of the proletariat as working class rule replacing capitalist class rule. He further indicated its great democratic character; the overwhelming majority of the population would rule over the previous exploiting tiny minority instead of vice versa as in all previously existing societies. The rule of the working class would represent the last act of class society as its purpose would be the elimination of all classes and exploitation of man by man. A number of obvious queries arise. In almost all the countries where socialist revolutions have occurred the working class was NOT the majority of the population but very
much a minority — a sea of workers in a great ocean of peasants as it were. Therefore could the present rule existing in Mongolia, China, Vietnam, Korea, Cuba, Albania, Rumania, etc. really be the dictatorship of the proletariat and subscribe to the general theory? In 1917 Russia’s rural population numbered 82 per cent, so that the working class there also constituted only a small percentage of citizens.

Furthermore Lenin claimed the dictatorship of the proletariat was an alliance of the working class with the peasants and other middle elements of the population. So the question again can be posed “what is the dictatorship of the proletariat?” “It is power in the hands of the working people, led by the working class and having as its aim the building of socialism” answer the Soviet theoreticians. (Fundamentals of Marxism-Leninism, Foreign Languages Publishing House p. 625). So therefore it apparently isn’t simply the dictatorship of the working class but of the working people led by the working class!

In the People’s Democracies of Eastern Europe we are informed that people’s democracy performs the functions of the dictatorship of the proletariat. Therefore apparently it isn’t exactly the dictatorship of the proletariat but performs those same functions! Many other examples could be given to illustrate the verbal and theoretical gymnastics which plague this whole question. When coupled with the practical application of the theory to date, one certainly becomes more than a little perplexed and resolves to take the advice of the Irish poet William Butler Yeats given in another context, to lay aside the patter built up for years and “seek the brutality the ill-breeding, the barbarism of truth!”

Today Soviet theoreticians claim “the state of the whole people” has replaced the dictatorship of the proletariat, but if this is so why the harsh censorship, the insistence on the authority of the party in most spheres of Soviet life, and the great fear on the part of the leadership of the influence of bourgeois, “revisionist” and critical ideas? The concept of the “state of the whole people” implies completion of the lower stage of communist development and nearness to the higher stage — the stage of greatly developed human freedom and abundance — certainly not within immediate sight in the Soviet Union despite the claims of Krushchev and others since his time. It also implies, at very least, a lessening of internal state operations, rather than their strengthening.

The ill-fated Rosa Luxemburg in her German prison cell in 1918 whilst giving unstinted praise to Lenin and the Bolsheviks made serious criticisms of the infant regime of which the following long passages are but important examples:

But socialist democracy is not something which begins only in the promised land after the foundations of socialist economy are created; it does not come as
some sort of Christmas present for the worthy people who, in the interim, have loyally supported a handful of socialist dictators. Socialist democracy begins simultaneously with the beginnings of the destruction of class rule and of the construction of socialism. It begins at the very moment of the seizure of power by the socialist party. It is the same thing as the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Yes, dictatorship! But this dictatorship consists in the manner of applying democracy, not in its elimination, in energetic, resolute attacks upon the well-entrenched rights and economic relationships of bourgeois society, without which a socialist transformation cannot be accomplished. But this dictatorship must be the work of the class and not of a little leading minority in name of the masses, it must be under their direct influence, subjected to the control of complete public activity; it must arise out of the growing political training of the mass of the people.

Doubtless the Bolsheviks would have proceeded in this very way were it not that they suffered under the frightful compulsion of the world war, the German occupation and all the abnormal difficulties connected therewith, things which were inevitably bound to distort any socialist policy, however imbued it might be with the best intentions and the finest principles . . .

. . . Everything that happens in Russia is comprehensible and represents an inevitable chain of causes and effects, the starting point and end term of which are: the failure of the German proletariat and the occupation of Russia by German imperialism. It would be demanding something superhuman from Lenin and his comrades if we should expect of them that under such circumstances they should conjure forth the finest democracy, the most exemplary dictatorship of the proletariat and a flourishing socialist economy. By their determined revolutionary stand, their exemplary strength in action, and their unbreakable loyalty to international socialism, they have contributed whatever could possibly be contributed under such devilishly hard conditions. The danger begins only when they make a virtue of necessity and want to freeze into a complete theoretical system all the tactics forced upon them by these fatal circumstances, and want to recommend them to the international proletariat as a model of socialist tactics. When they get in their own light in this way, and hide their genuine, unquestionable historical service under the bushel of false steps forced upon them by necessity, they render a poor service to international socialism for the sake of which they have fought and suffered; for they want to place in its storehouse as new discoveries all the distortions prescribed in Russia by necessity and compulsion . . . (Rosa Luxemburg, The Russian Revolution, Ann Arbor Paperbacks 1967, pp. 77, 78, 79).

It is all too easy to dismiss this critique as failing to appreciate the hardships and difficulties of the times or of lacking a realistic estimate and of the ruthlessness of imperialistic capitalism (as evidenced by her own brutal murder a few months later). The fact is that her criticisms were ignored and her fears were proven justified, for Stalinism did eventuate and in that period socialist democracy and "proletarian" rule became a horrible mockery. Her comments in the same pamphlet about what would happen if socialist democracy was not rigorously promoted proved amazingly accurate. Public life she claimed would fall gradually asleep, a few dozen party leaders of inexhaustible energy and boundless experience would direct and rule. Among them she declared only a dozen outstanding heads would do the leading and an elite of the working class would be invited from time to time to meetings where they
would applaud the speeches of the leaders and approve proposed resolutions unanimously — at bottom then, a clique affair a dictatorship to be sure, but not the dictatorship of the proletariat (ibid., p. 72). This is precisely the problem that arose only in worse form than she predicted. The most extreme features have been overcome but an enormous legacy remains and is tackled less than half-heartedly by the leading circles. (The observations made here emanate not from a desire to “knock” the Soviet Union, or from lack of appreciation of the positive achievements and role of the Soviet communists past or present. They are made as a contribution towards an understanding of the phenomenon of Stalinism and its aftermath which has grievously harmed the cause of the socialist movement and of the Soviet Union and from concern at the degree of unthinking acceptance and advocacy of only national variants as a universal model).

It has been alleged that Bukharin shortly before his trial and execution maintained that the growing deformities of socialist principles were due to a single mistake — the identification of the Party with the state. While this may be an oversimplification it is undoubtedly a major aspect of the problem as implied above. As indicated by E. H. Carr the one-party monopoly of the Bolsheviks cannot be laid fairly at their door for no opposition party of the time was prepared to remain within legal limits. (E. H. Carr, The Bolshevik Revolution Vol. 1, Penguin edition p. 190).

Yet contemporary Soviet writers approach this matter dogmatically and again advocate their experience as good for every socialist revolution. A recent article “The Origin of the One-Party System in the U.S.S.R.” by P. N. Sobolev (reprinted in Marxism Today, April 1969) is most interesting and informative on the Bolshevik coalition with the Left Socialist Revolutionaries and its failure which resulted in only one party in the country. It is hard, indeed, to see how the Bolsheviks could have acted other than they did in the circumstances. However Sobolev writes: In examining the multi-party system in the Soviet Union it must be borne in mind that it is not identical with the multi-party system in bourgeois states. One of the main conditions of the existence of a multi-party system in a socialist state is recognition of the leading role of the working class and its Party by any Party which helps in governing the country. (My emphasis).

Let it be appreciated firstly that Sobolev is not speaking here of the Soviet Union only but of “a socialist state”. Secondly Lenin and the Bolsheviks did not lay down that the Left Socialist Revolutionaries (representing sections of the peasantry) in 1917 should recognise the leading role of the Party. They called, correctly, for the L.S.R’s to support the decisions of the Soviet Government as expressed in the Decrees on Land, Peace, etc., to recognise the necessity for ruthless struggle against counter-revolution, to recognise the Soviets as the sole source of power and to submit to the
majority within the Soviets — quite another question! Thirdly it would seem ludicrous to call on another party to recognise the leading role of the Communist Party i.e. for complete submission. If they did then why exist at all as a separate party? Fourthly such an approach entirely excludes that there ever can be more than one party which represents the working class, a circumstance denied by the facts in many countries. Fifthly Sobolev confuses the issue of parties maintaining a legal existence and parties being represented in the Government — two quite different matters. A multi-party system does not necessarily mean a multi-party government.

Such dubious theories were not formulated by the Communists of 1917 but the Communists of a later stage in order to give theoretical justification to the Soviet experience as a universal model. So it is that while allegedly multi-party systems exist in most of the socialist countries today, based on the above theory, the other parties are in effect the shells of parties. For example in Czechoslovakia under Novotny it has been said that if the Communist Party sneezed the other Parties caught cold! What is their function if they merely give the rubber stamp to each and every decision of the Communist Party? Issue is not being taken here with the tactics of the Bolsheviks in 1917 nor with the description by Sobolev (and Carr) as to how the one-party system arose in the Soviet Union, neither is a call being made for a multi-party system to be introduced in the U.S.S.R. But issue is taken with the kind of theoretical advocacy which would, if implemented, virtually mean a one-party system in all countries taking the socialist road. This advocacy distorts the whole question of proletarian rule and socialist democracy.

The Italian Communists call for a pluralistic socialist society in their country.

... The participation of a plurality of forces in the struggle against monopoly capitalism is an essential condition if socialist society is to be a pluralistic society with a rich democratic structure, a society that is not centralised, not controlled by bureaucracy and not identified with the power of a single party. (From the Preparatory Theses of the 12th Congress of the Italian Communist Party", Marxism Today, April 1969, p.120).

Australian Communists in their draft Charter of Democratic Rights advocate that after the Australian bourgeoisie have been deprived of their economic power and their control of the state and mass media, citizens should have the freedom of political association including engaging in election activities and political campaigning provided that the new socialist constitution and laws are observed. Notwithstanding that advocacy, Australian Communists should not see such propositions as holding good for the Communists in other regions of the world where different conditions apply.
Tentative Conclusions

One of the huge theoretical and practical problems confronting the communist movement and all socialists is: what sort of society in the transitional period between capitalism and communism? After the elimination of bourgeois rule and the bourgeois state, what sort of governmental and state apparatus? The answer may only be provided by the people faced with the concrete task but the concept enunciated by Marx on the revolutionary transformation necessary to achieve the transition from capitalism to communism and its correspondence to "the dictatorship of the proletariat" seems generally correct so long as it is treated like all other theoretical prognostications — as a guide and not a dogma — and providing a number of things are remembered.

Firstly Lenin commented that a workers' state i.e. (in his terms) the dictatorship of the proletariat, is a theoretical abstraction. Therefore it would be hard to achieve in pure form. He also pointed out that the "dictatorship of the proletariat" was "a Latin, scientific, historical — philosophical term".

Secondly there is no model in existence clearly representing a state of proletarian dictatorship. Practical life emphasises strange lessons. Even with wide departures from the theoretical principles the fundamentals of a socialist economic base can be built and achieve high degrees of advance without a proper socialist political system existing. Experience demonstrates that this has happened and can be maintained at least for a lengthy period but requires a harsh, authoritative political system to enforce it. In this connection it should be recalled that the capitalist system in the advanced countries took from two to the three hundred years to mature. There should be no dogmatic copying of the forms of rule existing in present socialist states.

Thirdly the proletariat, the class of modern wage workers and their families constitutes the overwhelming bulk of the population in Australia (unskilled, semi-skilled and skilled manual workers, clerical and sales workers, professional and technical workers comprise 86.5 per cent of the workforce). Furthermore in such countries the technical and scientific sections are rapidly growing.

When Marx spoke of the proletariat as the revolutionary class of bourgeois society he had in mind the modern wage worker as distinct from the shopkeeper or the lumpen-proletarian for example, or from the peasants, artisans or other groups more typical of the period of feudalism. He was not, in this context, distinguishing between manual and mental wage workers, or production and clerical or sales workers, categories which were, incidentally, by no means so large then as they are today. He was speaking of the "collective laborer" in which he saw changes according to changes in production e.g. from hand manufacture to machine production. Today this is the view prevailing among Marxists, though contrary opinions are not lacking... and the practice of many more is to take the "leading role of the working class" as referring to the manual

Lenin claimed that only the "urban and industrial workers in general" could lead the struggle for the overthrow of capital. He thus distinguished between "industrial" workers and other workers in my opinion because of the class composition of Russia at the time.

Fourthly the essential requirement seems to be the rule of the working people (as opposed to the rule of the capitalist class) which eventually becomes the rule of mankind "when the curse of class distinctions from our shoulders shall be hurled" (*The Internationale*) and where, as Marx indicated the state is converted into an organ *completely subordinated to society*. Such a situation would constitute a big step on the road to a communist society.

If one leaves aside the problem of the people who look at existing socialist states through rose-coloured glasses there is the additional phenomenon today particularly among the more anarchistically (in the philosophic sense) inclined on the so-called new left. Idealistic dreamers aplenty dismiss the problems of transition to the free society as being capable of taking care of themselves. Come the revolution we'll wake up one fine morning to a gargantuan feast of mass meetings with the populace flocking to participate in running the P.M.G., General Motors and the local council etc. The only problem however is that great numbers of the "masses" may prefer to study the form guides, dig the garden or lie on the beach!

Lenin was extremely optimistic on this question at the time of the Russian revolution, but he found great problems in achieving this aim and in his last years acknowledged the difficulties (and the utopian approach) involved, in his writing on the growing bureaucracy emerging in the Soviet Union. In 1921 he wrote

> Can every worker know how to administer the state? Practical people know this is a fairy tale . . . The trade unions are a school of communism and administration. When they (i.e. the workers) have spent these years at school, they will learn, but it progresses slowly . . . How many workers have been engaged in administration? A few thousand all over Russia and no more. (Quoted in E. H. Carr's *Bolshevik Revolution*, Penguin edition p.254).

L. G. Churchward writes that Soviet authorities today claim that activists involved at the local government level represent one in six of the population. He continues:

> My own view of the matter, based on a careful reading of a wide range of material over many years and some direct investigation of the problem during 1965, is that the Soviet system has achieved considerable success in its development of mass participation, especially in the countless petty tasks of local government. This has enabled a substantial reduction of paid officials but it may not have reduced Soviet bureaucratism. The Party has been directly
responsible for much of this development so that the so-called "voluntary organisations" are not voluntary in the full sense of the term. Furthermore, Party control, while it has often encouraged new activities and organisations, has sometimes curbed local initiative and enthusiasm. (L. G. Churchward, Contemporary Soviet Government, Routledge and Kegan Paul 1968 p.271).

From a slightly different angle Radovan Richta discusses these problems:

There is nothing to be gained by shutting our eyes to the fact that an acute problem of our age will be to close the profound cleavage in industrial civilisation which, as Einstein realised with such alarm, places the fate of the defenceless mass in the hands of an educated elite, who wield the power of science and technology. Possibly this will be among the most complex undertakings facing socialism. With science and technology essential to the common good, circumstances place their advance primarily in the hands of the conscious, progressive agents of this movement — the professionals, scientists, technicians and organisers, and skilled workers. And even under socialism we may find tendencies to elitism, a monopoly of educational opportunities, exaggerated claims on higher living standards, and the like; these groups may forget that the emancipation of the part is always bound up with the emancipation of all. Government under socialism belongs to all working people and not to the professionals alone. Yet the working community cannot "govern" in a truly socialist manner without the aid of professionalism, of science. Ultimately the only solution will be to make professionals of us all (while simultaneously abolishing by degrees the need to govern at all). Every step in this direction will facilitate further progress. And when the goal is set in these terms, the coincidence of the scientific and technological revolution with revolutionary social changes is essential. (Civilisation at the Crossroads p.215).

Such problems indicate the necessity of some form of governmental apparatus and state machine for a long period after the ending of bourgeois rule.

Discussion of all these problems needs to be developed within the left in order to overcome conceptions that emphasise, onesidedly, the coercive aspects of proletarian political power. For advanced capitalist countries Marcuse has expressed ideas for their revolutionary transformation through an interim educational dictatorship of high minded intellectuals, of philosophers preparing the free society. Personally I regard this with just as much disfavor as dictatorships by Stalins, Novotnys or Mao Tse-tungs. Preferable would be, it seems, the view advanced by Engels in 1891 in his criticism of the Erfurt Program, that the workers can only come to power "under the form of the democratic republic" and that this would be "even the specific form for the dictatorship of the proletariat ...". Rather than rule by high minded philosophers or Communist presidentums or benevolent or paranoic dictators why not a working peoples' democratic republic which sets out not only to eradicate the vestiges of exploitation, class distinction and possessive individualism but also seeks and establishes facilities for the widest participation of its citizens in running society and their own lives in which there exists freedom of operation for various parties and groups existing within popularly agreed laws?
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DISCUSSION:

FRENEY CONTESTED

I CAN ONLY SAY in reply to Denis Freney's comments on workers' control in the ALR of June-July that his general approach is too dogmatic for my liking, on two points.

The first point relates to his approach to the tactics to be used in struggle. In my previous article, I said that I considered that he moved too quickly in advocating to railwaymen such an advanced form of action as to run the railways themselves. I suggested that it would be better if he consulted the railwaymen first as to whether they thought it was a good idea.

Yet Denis now compounds his first sin by asking if it is ridiculous to advocate to bus and tramway workers that as a protest against fines imposed on their union they should run their vehicles but refuse to collect fares. If he is asking me that question, I say that I just don't know, and suggest again that only those concerned would really know whether it is ridiculous or not. So Denis should have a chat with them to find out.

I do know it is ridiculous, unwise and undemocratic not to consult and listen to those who will have to put into effect some course of action. It even smacks of stalinism. This defect in his approach is significantly revealed in his closing comment that "I don't think quoting 'ordinary workers' proves much". Yet it is the thinking of ordinary workers that is going to determine whether workers' control is to be achieved or not. Consequently anyone who closes his mind to such thinking limits his usefulness to the workers.

Incidentally, he claims to be able to quote workers who support his point of view. So why not get one of them to make a contribution to the debate? Readers must be getting tired of just he and I bickering on the subject.

Another thing that concerns me about the approach of Denis is that he is too committed to preconceived ideas of what forms struggle should take, and to the mechanical adoption in Australia of forms that have been used overseas. I would be the last to say that overseas experience should not be studied and perhaps adopted in forms acceptable to Australian workers. But I consider that the main concentration should be on evolving forms of struggle that are appropriate to the objective Australian conditions.

What I put is, could it not be that the road to workers' control in Australia, like the road to socialism, might be somewhat different from that taken in other countries? Bearing that in mind, while the matter is as fluid as it is at the moment, should we not be careful not to impose on it forms that could be foreign to its specifically Australian development?

The second point of difference is in relation to his conception of the relationship of the trade unions and bodies formed to struggle for workers' control. And again I consider that
Denis is too dogmatic in his approach to this.

He apparently has a “thing” about bureaucracy and regards all trade unions as bureaucracies. So he holds that even though bodies formed to fight for workers’ control can have friendly relationships with the unions in their industry they “... must be independent (his emphasis) of the union structures and hierarchy — left, right or centre. Otherwise they run the danger of becoming just another sub-committee under the control of the union hierarchy...”

Now I am with him in his dislike of bureaucracy in trade unions. In fact, when one looks at ones such as the Australian Workers’ Union, one is almost led to believe that they invented the word! But I am not with him in his assumption that all trade unions are so bureaucratic that the official apparatus has to be avoided like the plague.

This is true in some cases, so the rank and file will have to have their own forms of organisation. But there are unions in which workers’ control exists as a reality. This not only strengthens the union, but also strengthens job organisation. It is for this reason that it is just because such unions are tightly organised that one finds in them the highest level of Shop Steward and Shop Committee organisation.

Incidentally, a striking testimonial to the value of union apparatus was given in the action of the million workers who stopped work in protest against the jailing of Clarrie O’Shea and the penal powers. A demonstration on such a scale, spread over different States, could only have been brought about, given the militant mood of the workers, by detailed organisation by a number of unions.

Jack Hutson.

SHOP COMMITTEES AND WORKERS’ CONTROL

SHOP COMMITTEE and job organisation has been a way of life in the power industry since the 1930’s, and represents a long history of struggle to improve the lot of the power worker. These bodies were not set up as an alternative to the official trade unions, but to assist and strengthen the unions by maintaining a constant and vigilant stand at job level in the interest of the workers. Where the shop committees, shop stewards, delegates and workers have had differences with their unions and the Labor Council, this has been necessary to impress upon them that action was essential to win a certain just demand. This has eventually been accepted as a correct course, and united action of shop committees and workers with official trade union leadership in comradely unity has been successful in winning the issue.

In the power stations, eight, ten or more shop stewards, each representing his union, form the Shop Committee and this body has been able (through the holding of mass meetings) to convey to management, trade unions and Labor Council, the feelings, wishes and demands of the workers.

In the war against fascism the power stations were flat out extracting the maximum energy from the plant. At Bunnerong and other stations, the workers toiled under the most uncomfortable and adverse conditions, including long hours during the day and night. After the war, in 1945, the Sydney County Council endeavoured to introduce mass maintenance shift work round the clock. This was repugnant to the workers, they refused to accept it, and a strike of seven weeks’ duration took place. The Shop Committee led the strike, when the majority of the official trade unions opposed it, contending that it was premature as industry had not yet re-established itself
after the war. Nevertheless, the workers of Bunnerong and Pyrmont went on to gain a form of shift work that was acceptable to them. Tremendous rank and file activity took place during this dispute, led by the Shop Committee which called for and formed an enlarged Disputes Committee. Protest marches took place, rank and file deputations went to Parliament House, Sydney County Council headquarters, the Labor Council, trade unions and other organisations, as well workers spoke at and called for financial support from shops and factories all over Sydney. Prolonged sittings with the President of the Industrial Commission took place, some extending late into the night, and on one occasion proceeding by candle light.

Shortly after winning this battle another strike took place at Bunnerong, to secure the establishment of a canteen to supply a reasonable midday meal, as well as facilities for shift workers. This was also won and inserted in the then S.C.C. Award.

Following these important victories and after considerable discussion, the Shop Committee was given official recognition by the S.C.C., the Trades & Labor Council and the trade unions. A Charter and Constitution were drawn up and agreed upon.

In this turbulent period disputes continued to flare up over many matters with which the power workers were dissatisfied, with the result that a so-called “Better Relations Conference” took place. This extended over many weeks and involved the Chairman of the S.C.C., the Councillors and Management of S.C.C., the Shop Committee and trade unions. A number of improvements and gains were made from this conference, including a special fare allowance to Bunnerong.

In 1950 the NSW Government passed legislation to set up an Electricity Commission. Bunnerong and Pyrmont Power Stations, along with Port Kembla, were transferred to the Electricity Commission in January of 1951 and 1952. The Railway Power Stations followed in 1953. Other small stations were gradually absorbed, with the Balmain Company joining in 1957.

The ex-Railway power station workers (White Bay, Ultimo, Zara Street) were very active in the Shop Committee movement. White Bay, in fact, is credited with having formed the first Shop Committee in the whole Railway industry. These workers had been covered by the Metal Trades Award and were well in the struggle of the metal trades campaign for increased margins.

From these activities the need for some form of combined job organisation was apparent. As a result a series of meetings took place, attended by delegates from all power stations and sites, etc., that had been taken over by the Electricity Commission. These combined meetings discussed the formation of a combined delegates’ organisation for the whole of the power industry, and working conditions at the various plants.

During 1956 the Combined Delegates appointed a committee to prepare a log of claims for a new industrial agreement. When it was completed, this was presented to the Electricity Commission by the Broad Committee, a sub-committee under the auspices of the Trades and Labor Council, composed of a representative (mainly union officials) from each of the 26 unions with members working in the E.C.

In the meantime the Combined Delegates Committee (ECCUDO) which had adopted a constitution and elected officials, developed into a powerful rank and file organisation and was responsible for initiating and leading the workers in the power industry in campaigns for improved wages and conditions despite continued attacks from the Electricity Commission, and some-
times with opposition from the trade union organisation itself.

Various forms of struggle were used and are being used right up to the present time: rolling strikes, stop work meetings, deputations to the Electricity Commission, to Parliament, to the Labor Council — these and many others forms of action were developed by the ECCUDO. In the main and at different periods of struggle, the Combined Delegates have had a very good relationship and degree of cooperation with the Labor Council and trade union officers. The shop stewards were included in many official delegations and Labor Council officials on many occasions sought out the Combined Delegates to have a frank exchange of views and ideas.

During 1956 the unions were informed by the E.C. that, due to the bringing into operation of new modern power stations on the coalfields, there was a surplus of workers in the metropolitan area. This touched off the workers' campaign for full employment in the industry we had helped to develop, based on a 35-hour week and four weeks' annual leave. This was one of the most intensive campaigns waged by the Delegates' Committee and the workers. It continued for many months, involving diverse forms of struggle. We were on the streets of Sydney and all over the place. The Labor Council worked with us and assisted in producing pamphlets for public distribution outlining the power situation and the workers' case. A number of stoppages took place, and a large mass meeting was held in the Town Hall. At a conference with the Chairman of the Commission the delegation was told that 250 unskilled and semi-skilled workers would have to be retrenched. The strength of the campaign prevented this from taking place. The Commission agreed to pay one week's wages for every year of service to anyone leaving the Commission. It agreed to give three months notice to the unions before a plant was closed down, and payment for at least six months of travel and removal expenses for workers transferring to the country power stations. These were some of the concessions won by the campaign.

The delegates and workers of Wangi Power Station demanded a site allowance to compensate for the expense involved in travelling the long distance between Wangi Power Station and their homes in the Newcastle area. They prepared a very good and well documented case and arranged an inspection tour of the area. Action backing their claim included several strikes by Wangi workers. Later a deputation met the Premier seeking a 35-hour week and four weeks' annual leave. The Premier said the Government had set up an Automation Enquiry and advised the unions to submit evidence to it. The Australian Railways Union, on behalf of all the unions, accepted the responsibility for preparing material to support the case. This they did with great credit and ability.

In 1961 a struggle took place around the proposal to change the agreement (industrial) to one of a Consent Award. A vigorous fight against this change was waged, but a majority decision of the Broad Committee accepted it.

There have been many issues that we have struggled around since then, including a wage increase in 1964. In 1966 the $2 case was put before the Court by the trade unions. The main advocate presenting the case was from the Electrical Trades Union. A very thorough case was presented, backed up with evidence from others. The Combined Shop Stewards' Committee organised a sustained attendance each day of workers from power stations and sites from all over N.S.W. These filled the public gallery, backing up the unions' case. At the present time negotiations are still in progress re the general conditions.
The Automation Enquiry referred to above lasted for years. The Judge appointed by the Government visited power stations and sites throughout the State; he also travelled overseas extensively. But did this futile inquiry solve the pressing problems of power house workers? Lasting more than two years and culminating in a voluminous report now gathering dust in the archives of Parliament House, this inquiry offered nothing to the power workers by way of improved conditions nor, even more importantly, anything by way of job security.

During 1955 in a tragic accident at Bunnerong Power Station, one worker was killed and two seriously injured in a blow-back on a boiler. This sparked off one of the most intensive campaigns on safety that we had ever seen. Great changes were demanded and agreed to by the management following a deputation to the Chairman of the Commission. Numerous discussions took place between the Shop Committee and Power Station Management and practical measures were devised and agreed on to make working on boilers in particular safer for all. Modern first aid rooms were built, staffed with qualified nursing sisters, and with a medical officer attending at set times. Emergency rescue apparatus was also installed throughout the station.

Today power house workers face great technological advances in the industry, which raise entirely new problems and aggravate old ones. What does the future hold for power house workers? Rapidly advancing automation (and nuclear energy possibly in the next decade) means less workers, new training and a hundred other unanswered questions. What stake have the workers in this future? Have they a right to know or more importantly have they a right to a say, in what is to happen to them and their families in the future?

The history of the activities of our job trade union organisation shows that the workers can intervene, that they can assert their rights in an industry that they helped to build and now run. And what of this job organisation which has been built up over many years and has such a proud record of struggle on behalf of power house workers? Does it fulfil the needs of a changing industry? Does it measure up today to what is required to make it an even stronger organisation in the future?

Obviously not. It must be plain to all that the whole structure of our work force in the industry has changed. The number of workers in the wages division has fallen by half, whilst on the other hand the salaried division has grown. Many of those in the salaried section only yesterday were in the wages section. Now they are technicians, operators, etc., and their needs and problems, the pressure facing them, are identified with the wages section. This is revealed in the fact that the salaried section has had several struggles lately and is spearheading the campaign for the 35-hour week, five weeks' annual leave, payment for annual leave at average weekly rate during the year, and increase in penalty rate for shift work up to $2 per shift.

The present constitution of our job organisation (E.C.C.U.D.O.) keeps us apart. Obviously this must be rectified as quickly as possible and the utmost unity and confidence established between wage and salary workers.

We require today flexibility and organisational unity between the workers and job organisation, the Shop Committees, Trade Unions and Labor Council, so that the whole structure conforms to and facilitates the utmost democratic expression and unity of all workers in the power industry. Only then can the workers and their organisation assume an offensive role, so that, in this period of far-reaching
changes affecting all the workers, their voice can be heard in the industry in which they earn their living. It raises the vital question of whether the workers can have a say in their destiny.

As stated earlier, the question of nuclear power stations is now very much on the agenda, with reports that one will be built in N.S.W. in the early 1970’s. What’s in this for Power House workers? Is our security to be even more uncertain? We want to know now, and demand that the trade unions be consulted and informed.

Strong job organisation, not in opposition to the established trade union organisation and centres of leadership, but complementing them, is essential, as this record shows. This is the best way of ensuring the democracy of the rank and file, allowing them to participate in decision making as well as in carrying out decisions.

**Harry Webb**

For twenty years, before his retirement in 1968 Harry Webb was President of the Bunnerong Shop Committee, and for fifteen years the President of the combined delegates organisation which covers all shop organisation in the power houses in NSW. A member of the Electrical Trades Union he was made a life member (a rare honor) by the Federal Council of the Union on his retirement. As a young electrician he was active in the British General Strike in 1926 and after a period of unemployment went to sea for about nine years. During this period he joined the Communist Party in London (1936). He migrated to Australia in 1938.

**AARONS’ VIEWS CONTESTED**

**Laurie Aarons** at the Left Action Conference in Sydney at Easter outlined his program of action for the Left.

Firstly, he says, the point of his program is to destroy one social system and to replace it with another. Secondly, it is necessary to do this because only a different kind of society can apply “the scientific and technological revolution” to the material and spiritual needs of man.

But in fact he does not properly develop either of these arguments so that in the end the model society he describes is, besides being unclear, not radically different from present Australian society in several key ways.

For example, in attempting to define “truly human relations between men in production” he opts for cooperation and self-management rather than exploitation or authoritarian bureaucracy. But he is unable then to define what he means by co-operation and self-management. It is unhelpful to speak, as he does, of “a new balance of central planning and local initiative”. What new balance? More central planning than at present, or less? It is difficult to tell.

Similarly, when he speaks of the second element in the proposed new balance — i.e. local initiative — his radical alternative is expressed only as “direct control over decision making”. Again, what direct control? By mass participation (if so, how?) or by elected representatives?

It is only when Laurie Aarons comes to discuss the first element — central planning — that a political theory is revealed.

Here, he identifies central planning with what he calls the “democratic state”. Centralised planning would enable the setting of the framework, targets and priorities in production. All national policies would be decided through “conviction”. What does this last term mean — referendum, election, representative democracy, majority decision? The lack of clarity in the
notion of central planning carries over into the conception of the other functions of the democratic state. These include direct election and free access to the mass media. The last concept is extremely vaguely expressed, and the old worrying doubts about any alliance between the socialist state and the mass media are not considered or dispelled.

The first concept — direct election — is crucial. While it is perfectly true that proportional representation would be more democratic than the present electoral system, putting "direct" in front of the usual term "election" does little to make it more revolutionary. Essentially what is being offered is a liberal democracy with state owned and controlled industry, with little more than a nod at local initiative and self-management. Laurie Aarons says that his democratic state, in contrast to bourgeois liberal democracies, would aim from the beginning to wither away. But why would this state, which seems to have a theory not significantly different from the theory of the Australian state at the moment, except in its greater (or is it?) role in economic planning, why would such a state decide to wither away more than any other state has ever done? Laurie Aarons merely hopes it will.

The political theory emerging from this is the reaffirmation of the value of elections at all levels as a practical mode of individual self expression and control. Laurie Aarons tries to counter attacks on socialism by attempting to place socialism within the liberal-democratic framework. But the future lies not with liberal democracies, necessarily failures, but in the development of relations which obviate the necessity for elections, relations in which the control of a person can never be taken from him, by any elected representative. Whatever these relations are, elections, whether in the context of a capitalist economic system or not, never produced self management or free expression yet.

The second theme underlying the speech is the significance of the scientific and technological revolution. This process will, he says, "determine the world wide struggle for social change" as new social tensions are created. But although this idea is repeated many times, and one discerns a search for a modernised version of the contradictions of capitalism theory, these new tensions are not at all elaborated in any way that makes them particularly "new". Earlier, in outlining a model society, he had stated what was morally desirable, and his emphasis on the scientific and technological revolution is meant to indicate that this moral objective ("truly human relations between men in production") is in sight; in fact, is "determined".

It is an old Marxist trick, and here the usual doubts are seen, for having seen the determinism in his "contradictions" theory, Laurie Aarons immediately states that the process must be helped along. All this could easily be dispensed with. Clearly technological change brings with it social changes, which should be analysed, but the possibilities are various and even by Laurie Aarons' own analysis of capitalism, pessimism is at least as warranted as optimism, and the moral choices must be made without the aid of the forces of history.

The moral ideal is doubtful, the social analysis unclear. What of the strategy? Here I shall consider just one point — his advocating that all sections of the left should support the election of a Labor Government, regarding the defeat of the Liberal-Country Party Government as an advance. This point came under fire at the Conference itself, and should be seen as arising from the theoretical belief in the electoral process formulated earlier. For example, he says the
Left, during the elections, should campaign for proportional representation to improve the electoral system.

Laurie Aarons does not spend a great deal of time, understandably, in defending this position. But it is defended in detail, although not specifically, by Denis Freney in *International No.* 7. His argument, too, falls down.

Denis Freney's essential argument is that the Left must advocate the election of a Labor Government "so that we can go through that experience with the workers, and be in a position to offer a viable alternative". But this very old theory, that the workers will understand the true nature of reformism once Labor is in power, has been too often disproved in Australia. Disillusionment with a reformist government tends to result in a swing further to the right than to the left. And even if the latter occurred it is the task of the revolutionary left to consistently offer its alternative, and not submerge itself in the aspirations of a party with which it does not essentially agree. What counts is the growth of a revolutionary left, and this does not depend on whether there is a Liberal or Labor Government in power.

Both Aarons and Freney are advocating a blurring and diluting of the program for the left. Because of the sanction it gives to the parliamentary system, I doubt whether candidates should be supported at all. This does not exclude political activity directly related to the elections. But if candidates should be supported, they should be left, non-ALP candidates.

Finally, Laurie Aarons has attempted to put forward a program for the left which synthesises most of the current ideas floating around in left wing circles — self management, democracy, confrontation, the effects of the technological revolution. The vagueness and repetitiveness of his language reflects a desire to generalise, to encompass as many trends as possible, to keep up with the times. But in fact these concepts have not even welded into a total analysis or coherent program.

**ANN CURTHOYS**

**DISSOLUTION OF SDA**

LAST APRIL Brisbane's Society for Democratic Action (SDA) announced its dissolution. In a newsletter (28/4/69) Mitch Thompson explained: "At the last general meeting of SDA held at the University a decision to dissolve was overwhelmingly accepted. So, what began as a protest movement towards the end of 1966, has died less than two and a half years later. SDA as an organisation no longer exists. Those people who feel the need to continue protest will do so, but the time has arrived, for many of us, to pass from a protest organisation to a radical or revolutionary movement. A movement to challenge the structures of this Society".

The ensuing reaction in southern states was interesting. One newspaper said that SDA had gone underground (*The Australian* May 16), whatever that meant. Some radical students saw the dissolution as proof that Brian Laver's leadership and socialist revolutionary position were faulty and incorrect. Students for a Democratic Society (SDS) took the opportunity to move in leading cadres to take over the Brisbane student scene. However few saw SDA's decision as a courageous, imaginative and adult move, something that once more puts the Brisbane activists in the van of the Australian revolutionary movement.

Before I elucidate upon this it is necessary to sketch in the history and achievements of SDA.¹ Formed in 1966 on the campus of the University of Queensland, it consisted of a small group of students concerned about the Vietnam war and hindered by unde-
mocratic State government legislation which effectively frustrated the holding of demonstrations and the distribution of pamphlets in Brisbane's streets. However this was not the only issue as interest was also expressed in conscription, education, Aborigines, conservation of natural resources etc. During 1966 and 1967, as a result of direct action, organisational experience and intellectual activity, it became apparent to SDA's student members that these issues were not unconnected aberrations of the system but parts of a whole, in fact they formed an interrelated indictment of the system.

Accompanying this awareness was an insight into the nature of Australian society, that power is in the hands of a few socio-economic groups which decide the direction in which society shall develop, whilst on the other hand there are 'minority' groups confined "to working for the system rather than participating in or controlling it".2 This in turn led to the realisation that in order to effect social change links had to be forged with all these groups. One result was that political activity amongst secondary students was developed; and before the events in France during May 1968 the concept of a student-worker alliance was initiated, one manifestation being the FOCO Youth centre, established in Brisbane's Trades Hall.

By the beginning of 1969 SDA was characterised by the following: 1 Support of social revolution in the third world. 2 Advocation of student-staff control of universities in order "to capture university education for the development of individuals rather than the efficient perpetuation of the social and economic goals of the status quo".3 Further it advocated, in line with this, worker control in all centres of production — in factories, in schools, in the public service. 3 It sought also "structural involvement with the forms of under-privilege in our society, whether it be social, educational or economic".4 This was indeed a marked development amongst students who had come together a couple of years previously for the purpose of protest.

Coupled with this were other developments; the articulate and sensitive SDA student cadres had, by the end of 1968, either "dropped out" or graduated. During the latter months of that year energy was directed to creating off campus quarters, together with a bookshop and printery. Ideologically SDA had moved far ahead of the general student body. The SDA leadership had recognised the "moral obligation", as Baran and Sweezy put it, "to devote ourselves to fighting against an evil and destructive system which maims, oppresses, and dishonours those who live under it, and which threatens devastation and death to millions of others around the globe".5

Then in March Queensland university's student paper *Semper Floreat* (17/3/69) stated that revolution, worker control, participatory democracy and other concepts "have ceased to have any meaning or relevance to anybody outside the (SDA) leadership". The article went on to observe that what "was attractive about SDA in former years was the fact that they articulated in forceful and idealistic language, the bourgeois myths about freedom, justice and equality which everyone believed in..." In short the article suggested that SDA should remain bourgeois oriented and perpetuate the bourgeois myths in order to reach the level of consciousness of the majority of students.

Underlying this bourgeois oriented analysis of the *Semper Floreat* article was the conception of student movements as pressure groups "designed to secure the advancement of their sectional interests within an accepted status quo", something that they are not.6 It failed to realise that SDA
had gone beyond being a student movement trying to reform society by protesting in the streets, that is attempting to bring about social change by marching, getting arrested etc. and showing the government in a dramatic way that some people do not agree with certain decisions made in their name.

Dan O'Neill, an SDA theorist and activist, pointed to the fallacy of thinking real social change can come through exerting pressure on the state; this he said was completely naive. "It is a concept of power that Gramsci has exposed as completely useless to radical action in an advanced society. This is because it suggests that the state is the main power in the society when, in fact, it has become increasingly evident that the state is simply one agency among several agencies, several great institutional orders of society, through whose reciprocal relations the final status quo of power is maintained". Because of the integrated and sophisticated nature of this society "change must be introduced first in the function and scope and organisation of all cultural, ideological and formally and informally educational structures in this society". This means that wherever men "acquire their notion of what social reality is, their notion of the nature of man, what is customary, what is not customary; what is evil, what is respectable", there socialists must work to present and argue the ideas that expose and refute the bourgeois concepts, to point to the realities and alternatives.

In an elementary way this is, in effect, what SDA has done. The dissolution has meant an end to protest, not radical or revolutionary politics. What is envisaged is the formation of "Action Committees at whatever level we may be working or studying — from job levels to colleges, from specific educational institutions to faculties, from the public service to the under-privileged. All those radical people who are actually concerned enough, beyond just the psychological need of belonging to the organisation, can no longer rely on SDA to carry out radical work. The movement must be decentralised. Each person should consciously be working towards the building of a group (Action Committee), even if only two at the beginning, in whatever area or issue they are involved. Agents such as regular weekly newsheets (jobsheets etc.) could be of great importance".

Thus wherever former SDA members find themselves, whether it be on the factory floor, in the professions, on campus etc., there they will seek to isolate, describe, and refute the ideas upon which the status quo depends, and in their place pose the socialist alternatives.

The final point to make is that the dissolution of SDA helps answer the question "What does a student radical do when he is no longer a student?" Some observers reason that current campus radicals will, upon graduation, enter the ranks of the professions and become part of the status quo. This is a reasonable expectation, for students are mostly middle class kids snared in a bourgeois controlled institution, which churns them out as candidates for manipulative careers within a bourgeois society. Perhaps some campus radicals will end up this way. Yet on the other hand perhaps they will go from a position of militancy within the university to a similar one within society as a whole, "will ask exactly what the point of their education was, and what use it could be towards making a socialist society". Certainly the dissolution of SDA and the concept of Action Committees gives reason for believing so.

R. J. Cahill

1 For details of SDA refer to my Notes on the New Left in Australia published
by the Australian Marxist Research Foundation, 1969.
4 ibid.
8 loc. cit. p. 9.
9 ibid.
10 SDA Newsletter, April 28, 1969.

WORLD YOUTH FESTIVAL — ANOTHER VIEW

I AM WRITING this as a participant at the World Youth Festival who saw none of the preparations, only the results as they affected the 15,000 participants. The reaction of many western delegates, including many Australians, was surprise and disgust at the program and the running of the official “discussions.” The program included several things which I considered to be of secondary importance to ones not included. The official “discussions” were ones which limited discussion and prohibited expressions of differing views.

The developments in Czechoslovakia are amongst the most important ones of this decade; they raise the question of markedly differing forms of socialism and are relevant to the whole world.

It should have been possible to discuss them at the Festival but they were ignored by the International Preparatory Committee (and this was prior to the invasion). The inclusion of a day devoted to women’s rights, while being important, seemed absurd when such things as raised in Miss Burgoyne’s article (student-worker relationships, etc.) were neglected. Another point which greatly annoyed many Australians, was the “day for solidarity with the Arab peoples, victims of Israeli aggression.” While the question of the Middle East warranted inclusion in the Festival program, it is hardly as open and shut an issue as this. The Arabs have made mistakes too and the whole issue of the Middle East needs discussion. What sort of a discussion could be held under a heading like that!

A member of the Australian delegation returned from a meeting with the East Germans. Her reaction summed up the whole tone of the Festival, as imposed from above: “The attitude of the East Germans is that they’ve done everything now; their country is perfect and there’s nothing left to do.” I.P.C.’s attitude (as we saw it) was one that no discussion was needed on socialist countries — they’re perfect!

The Festival was for “Solidarity, Peace and Friendship”. Because of the attitude of the Soviet Union and its allies, the Festival failed to achieve this. Before solidarity can be achieved differing points of view have to be discussed until common ground is found. Even the solidarity meeting with the Vietnamese demonstrated the lack of solidarity within the Festival. A mass demonstration was organised by I.P.C. as a counter to one the West Germans (S.D.S.) had organised. There is no solidarity, peace or friendship with dictatorship and here the I.P.C. was trying to dictate both ideas and actions.

Mr. Supple (ALR No. 2) emphasises “imperialism” and “exploitation”. In
fact, the only imperialism "discussed" was U.S. Any attempt to discuss other aspects of imperialism (and there are others) or other questions concerning the relationships between states was successfully disrupted. For example, one of the main questions for western youth (and many eastern youth, too) is, is Soviet socialism only aiding or sometimes retarding the struggle for peace and freedom? This is directly related to the Czech issue. Of course, it wasn't discussed officially.

Mr. Supple also claims that Sofia was "the world centre of progressive young people... to advance their rights, to propose." The point is, that our rights were severely limited. Propositions were restricted to propositions about capitalism. The only socialist countries which engaged in self-criticism were Yugoslavia and Czechoslovakia and only Yugoslavia dared suggest that one had the right to criticise aspects of the Soviet Union.

I agree in part with Mr. Supple, that international meetings are as important, if not more so, now, than in the past, but they must not be like the Festival. As capitalism and socialism become more complex, it is very necessary to discuss them on an international basis. But, as the Festival was organised, it was virtually useless: only the initiative of some western groups saved it. It is no longer necessary to demonstrate that we can get 15,000 people in one place and if such gatherings can be manipulated to make it appear that all present give uncritical support to the Soviet Union, in fact they are harmful. It is necessary to have open discussion, even if it means socialist countries may be criticised.

It seems obvious that one's views on Czechoslovakia will be reflected in one's attitude to the Festival. After all, they stem from the same basic principle. I am objecting to the stifling of discussion. In part, so did the Czechs. I ob-

ject to the imposition of ideas — so did the Czechs.

The Festival demonstrated one positive fact: that socialist ideas will continue to develop despite efforts to contain discussion just as, I believe, freedom in many forms will develop no matter what conformity is currently demanded by leaders in socialist countries.

N. Mortier

LENIN'S INTERNATIONAL—AND STALIN'S

JUST OVER fifty years ago, the Third International was formed. In view of current discussions on the nature of international relations of communist parties, it may be useful to look at these relations in Lenin's time, and the alterations in their form in the period shortly following Lenin's death.

In Lenin's time, the International consisted of the free association of several completely autonomous parties. A general concordance of views was ensured by each party, on admission, agreeing to a certain set of views.

However, this did not cut across the concept of complete sovereignty of each party, not only in regard to "internal affairs", but in deciding its attitude to world problems.

Certainly, there was no "unofficial doctrine" of the leading role of one party, no matter how much admiration the various parties had for the success of the Bolshevik party.

Within the guide lines of accepted ideas, four congresses, marked by lively debate and differing viewpoints, took place in Lenin's lifetime.

The congresses most relevant to present conditions were the third and fourth (1921, 1922). The first declared for the United Front policy and the latter continued this policy. It was
thus the last congress to express Lenin's views. (It is remarkable that historians of the Third International almost completely ignore the fourth congress, but already, at that time, very serious consideration was being given to the remarkable differences in various countries in which the United Front policy was being developed).

Much has already been said of the 1928 Sixth Congress of the International, the sectarian line of which in one important expression (the attitude to social democracy) was admitted by the Communist Party of the Soviet Union openly in 1963.

Almost as important, perhaps, was the Fifth Congress (June 1924) in which a whole number of organisational changes were made which effectively converted the previously sovereign parties into sections of a single world party, with the application of global democratic centralism, proliferation of agencies and those measures which imparted a rigidity to the organisation, and ultimately did great harm.

Instances occurred in which entire sections were dissolved (e.g. the Polish Party in 1938) and serious consideration was given to dissolving others—and all this from "above".

Where sectarian extremes of the International's policy were opposed on a national scale, fiat in the form of telegrams from the Executive Committee of the International were sufficient to ensure their replacement by those who shared the sectarian views of a leadership which was ultimately that of Stalin.

The magnificent repair work of Dimitrov and others in the mid-thirties (and Stalin's belated second thoughts) were insufficient either to repair the damage of the previous period or to avoid later, basically sectarian, mistakes, punishments, dissolutions.

The positive achievements of the International are well known. But in weighing the balance of the period a sober consideration of the negative examples can also assist in forming one's attitude to the current debate on the basis of internationalism in the present period.

SEX DISCRIMINATION

CAPITALISM has long been noted for its ruthless exploitation of women and although modern capitalism no longer adopts the more blatant methods such as cheap female labour in mining and heavy industry, it still relies heavily on the source of cheap labour made available by the existence of unequal pay.

However, I am more concerned at the moment with the more subtle forms of exploitation and discrimination which are features of the type of society that capitalism breeds. Women have the right to develop themselves to their fullest capacities, but this is not being done at present because although few legal disabilities against women still exist there are grave social disabilities which prevent them from developing themselves. I refer to the obvious discriminations which are practised against women in terms of job opportunities e.g. the difficulty of becoming a headmistress in a co-educational school, or the difficulty of making much progress in community affairs.

Now, I think that it is important to realise that women constitute a common factor in all the major institutions of society. In this respect they provide a link between workers, students, intellectuals and even the capitalists themselves. But in addition it should be borne in mind that all women suffer some discrimination because they are women regardless of their class. Thus the lowest paid fac-
tory worker and the wife of the factory owner suffer some common discriminations, at least at the social level.

If it could be pointed out to all women exactly how much they are discriminated against, two results are likely to follow, depending on the backgrounds of the different women. Some, belonging to the working class and other similar social classes could be expected to actively seek a change in the basic structure of the society which causes such discrimination.

On the other hand, whilst it could not be expected that women from the capitalist classes would actively work for such a change, it would not be unreasonable to expect that they would be at least less hostile to such a change and to that extent the reactionary forces would be weakened.

There are many structures which help to support the existing capitalist system and in which women could work to at least reduce the effectiveness of such a structure as a bulwark of capitalism.

However such an awareness of their condition is not likely to become evident to all women at once. What is necessary is a long campaign to bring out just how extensive is the discrimination against women. Such a campaign would have to be mounted by all those who wish to change the society.

Particularly important is the role of men in such a campaign. On every occasion that discrimination was detected it would be necessary to use every possible tactic to expose the situation. For example, a black ban on any firm or government agency which advertised a job position for a male only when either a male or female would have been suitable would be a step in the right direction.

However whatever action was ultimately decided upon it would have to be integrated with other action designed to bring about the same change in society. Probably a national conference along the same lines, but on a different scale, as the recent Left Action Conference, would provide a point of focus for those who are interested in tackling the problem of our present society from this angle.

LYLE T. CULLEN

MORE PROTEST ON ‘CIVILIAN MILITARISTS’

I HAVE just returned to Australia after some months overseas, and been given a copy of your issue of December 1968, containing an article ‘Civilian Militarists’ by John Playford. I was interested to find so much of Dr. Playford’s article devoted to the Strategic and Defence Studies Centre at The Australian National University, and to my own writings and lectures. Some of Dr. Playford’s points are correct, or justifiable interpretation. He is certainly entitled to hold the views he does, to quote Tribune in support of them and, in our kind of society, to express them. But his article contained so many errors of fact, incorrect or even improper inferences, and so much use of the techniques of guilt by association and smear by irrelevant juxtaposition that I feel I must protest through your columns. Much of what he says is not true, and this includes references to my own career which, had he so wished, he could so easily have checked with me.

On errors of fact: it has never been proposed that the Centre should have access to classified material. Dr. Playford’s account of the formation of the Centre bears almost no relation to what occurred. He relies for his ‘evidence’ on a second-hand account by a journalist who, on his own admission, did not
have access to relevant information. Sir John Crawford has never ‘adamantly denied rumours of financial assistance from the Ford Foundation.’ On the contrary, at all stages since 1965 in the process of establishing the Centre, Sir John has made clear, within the University and publicly where appropriate, that some assistance from Ford would be welcomed. What Sir John did deny was that funds had been promised or received from Ford before they were in fact promised or received. When the grant to this and many other projects was announced in 1967 (after the Centre had been established), this was widely publicised. The Centre did not have in December 1968, nor does it now have, a ‘current interest in the techniques of counterinsurgency warfare.’ I have never addressed the Defend Australia Committee. I have never lectured in military history at Dunroon. I am not a ‘Professional Fellow,’ whatever that may be. Dr. Playford’s assessments thus involve serious inaccuracies and misrepresentations, which call into question the purpose no less than the validity of his article.

May I say a few words about the Centre. It is an activity of this University, subject to the same requirements of academic discipline and propriety as any other activity. Its participants include people of widely varying academic and political interests. It does not have views: it provides facilities where views can be expressed and research undertaken freely. It seeks to raise the level of university and public knowledge and debate on strategic and defence matters, and if Dr. Playford would like to make use of it, he has only to ask. He might then become rather more informed about it, and about questions of defence, than he now appears to be.

T. B. MILLAR,
Professorial Fellow.

A REJOINDER

IN THE LIGHT of claims that the Australian National University’s Strategic Studies Centre has established a solid reputation for relevance and objectivity, it is rather interesting that Dr. Millar should begin his letter by pointing out that in “our kind of society” I am entitled to hold certain views, including the right to quote from Tribune. (It is also interesting to note that “Civilian Militarists” contained several scores of references of which only one came from the dreaded source referred to by Dr. Millar.)

Let me turn now to minor “errors of fact”. Dr. Millar was advertised to speak at a meeting sponsored by the Defend Australia Committee. He may not have lectured on “military history” at Dunroon, but he has lectured there on other subjects. The description of him as a “Professional Fellow” was a typographical error for which I was not responsible.

As for the question of Ford Foundation finance — regarding which I plead guilty to relying mainly on the “second-hand account” by the respected Canberra journalist Maximilian Walsh — we must seem to be in danger of forgetting that in the second half of 1966 the Centre must have believed it highly probable that the grant would come through although it was not officially announced until 1967.

Finally, let me repeat that critics of strategic studies institutes are not impressed by the fact that strings are not formally attached to funds from the Ford and other foundations. As Professor Hans Morgenthau and many others have pointed out, these grants do exert an influence upon the objects, results and methods of research — and it would indeed be very odd if this were not the case.

JOHN PLAYFORD.
SOON, the Communist Party of Australia will be 50 years old. If we make a very sweeping generalisation, we could say that the first 25 years were, with exceptions, years of growth, while the second 25, again with qualifications, have been marked by decline. What do the next 25 years hold? What are the main trends of today, the deeper processes going on in Australia and the world which have to be taken into account and understood if we are once again to advance? These are questions which revolutionaries such as we are must have the courage to look squarely in the face as a precondition for the elaboration of a viable revolutionary strategy. Similar questions face the whole Left, though in different ways, and it is by boldly tackling the problems we see facing ourselves that we can make the most effective contribution to the advance of the Left as a whole.

Consciousness of the depth of these problems already began to develop in the period leading up to our 21st Congress in 1967 partly as a response to the mass stirrings of the early 60’s. Since that time these have grown into powerful spontaneous movements of many millions of people throughout the world. Without such mass spontaneous movements, which express the fact that deeply felt aspirations and needs are stirring the minds and tugging at the hearts of people at the grass-roots, revolutionaries face little but tough slogging. But once such movements begin to reveal themselves, revolutionaries, provided they understand their sources and springs, have the possibility of influencing them in a revolutionary direction. But if this is to occur much study is essential both of revolutionary theory and the experience of the mass movements, as well as their interaction. But often, and over quite a long period, we have been held back from this necessary effort by a conceit that we really “knew it all,” by a static or dogmatic understanding of the valuable insights we had which negativized even those, turning them into their opposite; or we have taken the “easy” way out of
following others instead of accepting the responsibility of making our own analysis and thereby not only advancing our own activity, but also helping to enrich the world store of revolutionary knowledge from which we could in turn draw sustenance. Here I wish to advance some views to help in the process of solution of these problems.

It seems to me that four main features of the world we at present live in have particularly to be taken into account. They are related and interact of course, and are presented separately only for purpose of exposition. They are:

The transition from the monopoly capitalism described by Lenin to what is variously called State Monopoly Capitalism, neo-capitalism, or post-industrial society.

The onset of the scientific and industrial revolution which is associated with the above.

The sweep of the national liberation movements.

The existence and powerful influence of a socialist sector of the world.

In Australia it would be necessary to add such particulars as the great industrial and mining expansion, the extensive migration, and the enormous influx of foreign, particularly United States capital, and our rather special position in the world vis-a-vis Asia with all this implies concerning policies and attitudes. I do not intend to try to deal with these here, and will concentrate mainly on the first two of the four points outlined above.

Lenin placed the period of transition from 'free competition' capitalism to monopoly capitalism, or imperialism, in the last decade of the 19th century. While certain features of this new stage of capitalism were noted and taken into account from then on, it was roughly 20 years before the substance of these changes and their meaning for revolutionary perspective and strategy were theoretically summed up (Lenin's *Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism* was written in 1916 and published in 1917). Even so, this was only a little over 30 years after the death of Marx; it is now 45 years since the death of Lenin, and during that time even bigger changes have taken place than in the previous period, and are happening at an accelerated rate, but they have not been similarly grasped theoretically by the communists, and new young left ideologists (recall how young Marx and Lenin were when they conceived the germs of their main ideas) have been more sensitive to the new needs of new times, undeveloped though many of their ideas are.
Some of the main features of this modern stage of capitalist development have been described in more recent years (locally, see for example the article by Bernie Taft in the first issue of Australian Left Review, June 1966, and the paper by John Playford at the Left Action Conference). They include the almost complete dominance of monopolies in the economy (and the accompanying relative decline in small enterprises and an enormous absolute reduction in the number of farmers); the qualitatively new and higher level of State intervention in the economy and in social life generally; the enormous growth in the military; the increasing interchange in personnel between industry, government and military; the more or less complete transition from individual entrepreneurs to managers; great expansion of production and, despite recessions and other economic problems, the avoidance of world-wide and deep crises such as that of 1929. The size of enterprises and institutions of all kinds has grown as a consequence, while the nature and use of the mass media has also reached a qualitatively new level. It is a complex and highly integrated society, "one bloody lump", in which the individual members and even whole groups feel their remoteness, powerlessness, lostness, alienation. And now, after a period of "adjustment", these features of modern society, despite a general rise in material standards often quite considerable, are impelling increasing numbers in diverse spheres of life into dissent and rebellion, particularly on issues which may be broadly described as of a democratic nature.

Now let us turn to the scientific and technological revolution, with which these developments are intimately bound up. The question to be answered about this revolution is whether it is but a continuation, even though at a much higher level, of the process of mechanisation which has been a feature of capitalism for over a hundred years following the industrial revolution, or does it mark something qualitatively new? I think we must answer the latter. In my opinion, by far the most profound analysis of this question is contained in the book Civilisation at the Crossroads written by the Czech philosopher Radovan Richta in conjunction with a large research team, and published in Australia by ALR. Very briefly their thesis may be summed up as follows: from the rise of capitalism up to the onset of the scientific and technological revolution, the main feature and mainspring of development has been in the mechanical side of the productive forces. In the period of hand manufacture, the various processes previously performed by the one craftsman were divided up into separate operations performed with hand tools by unskilled or semi-skilled labor. These processes were then mechanised to continually higher degrees, but the labor remained basically unskilled and semi-skilled (for example, the modern assembly line). There was a growth in the number
of skilled workers and technical personnel, but these remained quite ancillary to the main trend of a growing number and “weight” of machines attended by an unskilled and semi-skilled work force.

Basically, what is different about the scientific and technological revolution is that this introduces and makes essential a change primarily in the human factor which for centuries had remained virtually unchanged. Today science (basic research, applied science, technology) is becoming the essential factor not only in production itself, but also in services, administration etc., few spheres of social life remaining unaffected. The leading character of basic research is shown in one aspect in the calculation of a Soviet scientist that every rouble invested in such research yields annually, on the average, a surplus of 50%. And increasingly the possibility and need arises for man to stand outside the direct production process instead of being tied to it in the (often brutal and dehumanising) way he previously was.

The mass development and application of science in all its aspects means a large scale and deep transformation of the human factor in production and social life generally. And such revolutionary changes cannot but create new tensions and intensify some old ones, when they are introduced into a society where the power of capital, with its authoritarianism, its bureaucracy, its exploitative and essentially anti-human ethos, holds sway.

Education in these circumstances develops its own contradictions, with revolutionary potential, if understood. I pass over such important questions as the material or financial needs of education which deeply move many people of all ages when future prospects of individuals depend so heavily on the availability of education, to still deeper contradictions arising from the education process itself. An education which has to produce developed, rational and creative human beings cannot but have a certain humanist content and, despite the best efforts of establishments to imbue education with their own class values and rear super-skilled conformists, they send forth growing numbers of people in greater and greater contradiction to the social realities of our society. Many may be integrated into the existing society, but this does not entirely remove the contradictions, and a growing minority of the dissenting and rebellious are to be seen. When this stream flows into and meets the intensified contradictions generated within state monopoly capitalism as outlined above, the possibility of revolutionary social explosions is created. Particularly to be found is a new emphasis on the “old” democratic rights, and the rise of new democratic demands, whether for “workers’ control”, “student power”, “black power” or other forms of demands for the recognition of the rights of national minorities, of the exploited and oppressed. The strength
of mass response to the jailing of Clarrie O'Shea over the penal clauses issue is one expression of the spontaneous and potentially revolutionary sentiment which is being generated within modern society (nor should it be forgotten that two other democratic issues — the Communist Party Dissolution Act and Referendum, in 1950-51, and the amendments to the Crimes Act in 1960 — also generated two of the biggest struggles of the post-war years).

The scientific and technological revolution has yet another dimension in that it is the means by which an abundance of material wealth is created. There is already a relative abundance compared with pre-war for example, and it is already clear that if there is not an absolute abundance today, there surely can be tomorrow. This poses quite new possibilities, perspectives and moral imperatives. For example, if the causes of tuberculosis are not known or no cure is available, deaths from the disease are terrible and tragic, but no moral question arises. But if the causes are known and the cure is available but is not provided to those suffering from the disease, this is not only terrible and tragic, but has the new dimension that it is morally wrong, and cannot but arouse growing indignation. Likewise with poverty and deprivation. In a poverty-stricken society it is better to have shared poverty, rather than having rich and very poor. But poverty as such will be inevitable. But when, as is the case today, we have or clearly have the potential for adequate provision for all, to have about a million poor in Australia is a crying injustice and completely immoral. Similarly it is entirely wrong for children of workers to be deprived of higher education, for Aborigines to be forced to live as they do, for pensioners and many who fall sick to suffer as is the case today.

The question of wage rates for the vast majority of workers also takes on a new aspect in these circumstances, which is expressed in embryonic form by the growing demand for a real living wage, in place of the cheese-paring calculations and demands which are measured in a few miserable dollars. The union movement, working class political organisations and all workers should re-structure their approaches to make a decent living wage in accordance with today's possibilities, a recognised priority call on the national product.

Other questions too need to be looked at anew in the same light. For example the new President of the Australian Academy of Sciences has declared that pollution of the environment is a greater menace than the population explosion, and similar warnings of possible disaster are echoed in a recent report of the United Nations.

But is this unavoidable? Is it right? Have we not already the
possibility that the needs of the development of human beings should be put in first place in public policy? And on the other hand, does not the character of the scientific and technological revolution briefly described above also demand that they be put in first place? When the creativity and allround development of human beings is becoming the main condition of economic and social advance, are not losses in the human factor the most costly losses of all? Not only capitalists, but many others have been conditioned to look at such questions in a purely economic way. Thus when it becomes a question of mining mineral sands on the beaches, the loss of so many million dollars of output is put in the forefront, and the warnings of conservationists and others that this may destroy natural beauties, wildlife and the ecological balance are dismissed as being of secondary importance, or even as idealistic sentimentality. But if such activities lead to reduced human potentialities and development through an adverse effect on the environment, in the new conditions of today this could result in many times the economic losses that would result if the project were rejected.

This may seem to be putting economic losses in the first place, but this is done only by way of illustration. The real point is that the scientific and technological revolution, which makes possible the solution of man's economic problems by the creation of abundance, is rendering the old way of looking at things quite outmoded. Humanism — the placing of the needs of human beings in the first place as the foundation of society and social policy and the development of the individual to the full for his own sake — has been for thousands of years the dream of the greatest thinkers and visionaries. Today, the possibility is within our grasp for the first time; and furthermore, those societies which pass over or reject this possibility will fall behind, because to give priority to the needs of human beings is the new necessity for bringing the scientific and technological revolution to full fruition.

Thus each particular issue arising in social life under capitalism, whether it be concerned with wages, pensions, health services, education, town planning, control of the environment, democratic rights and in particular the elimination or at least drastic reduction of alienation by ensuring that in factories, institutions, educational establishments localities etc., the people involved have the power of control over their own activities and lives, can and must be related to larger questions of the social structure, to the question of the imperative need and moral urge for the revolutionary transformation of society.

This linking of particular and immediate issues arising spontaneously in life with the social structure as a whole and the need for
its transformation, in association with mass action has always been the key to the development of revolutionary consciousness. It is not that this has exactly been forgotten by communists and other revolutionaries in the past period, when socialist consciousness has tended to decline, but rather that the way in which this had been more or less effectively done in the past was no longer working as before because it was no longer in accord with conditions, and the new conditions had not been subjected to an adequate marxist analysis.

For example, speaking very generally, up to the post war period the actual poverty of the vast mass of people was a central fact of existence. This was partly due to, and compounded by, the permanent unemployment rarely falling below 8-10% and in the depression of the 'thirties rising to 30-40% for years on end. Thus the directly economic issues were stark, were quite easily related to the wider social questions and the issue of revolutionary transformation. It was not that the issues were purely economic; on the contrary, they were economic, political and moral all at once. But the readiness with which the transition could be made from consciousness of them as economic questions to a considerable degree of socialist consciousness obscured deeper questions — alienation for example — so that, when these other aspects began to emerge to the forefront this was "foreign territory" for many, and the failure of the old formulas led to loss of elan and orientation.

Somewhat similarly, in the pre-war period the violent, repressive and bestial nature of capitalism was starkly manifestd in the worldwide phenomenon of fascism. While this is still to be seen, and by no means to be discounted as a possibility anywhere, what has been described as "repressive tolerance" has been more common: a stifling conformist sense of powerlessness to change anything, supplemented of course wherever necessary by direct repression. Once again, the old formulas were no longer adequate for the raising of socialist consciousness, and their inadequacy contributed to the faltering in morale and loss of orientation mentioned above. When to all this is added the fact that the socialist alternative as presented by the Soviet Union was "purer" and appeared more attractive than it did later with the revelations concerning the Stalin period, and the continued problems of the advance of socialist democracy, the new tasks of developing revolutionary consciousness became great indeed.

These problems, particularly the first, have also I believe been a main source of the current difficulties of the trade unions whose importance and value was more directly seen and more deeply felt in the earlier period. Today the trade unions need to expand their understanding, their vision and the scope of their activities to
meet the new conditions of life under state monopoly capitalism in the throes of the scientific and technological revolution. Unfortunately the trade unions' conservative side, which was a problem even before, is far more prominent than it was, and the consciousness of the need for overcoming it and the means for doing so was not sufficiently realised, including by communists and other forces of the Left in the unions.

Similar considerations apply in the case of reformism, which is clearly suffering a continually deepening crisis all over the world. Reformism seldom has displayed any depth in its understanding of capitalist society, but this did not matter so much in the starker conditions of the earlier period, when an absolutely small improvement in wages, conditions or social services was relatively quite significant. Today, when masses of people are feeling new needs, or old ones in a new way requiring a deeper understanding of social life and a more revolutionary approach if they are to be satisfied, and when various reforms and a certain increase in living standards may occur anyway, even under conservative governments, reformism becomes increasingly ineffectual and unattractive.

As I have said above, we need not feel too superior; we also have much to criticise in ourselves for having been so slow to realise the nature of the problem we face, even though the problem is basically different since our revolutionary disposition and marxist theory contains the elements for transforming our situation.

The Model of Socialism

One of the questions here is the model of socialism we project. This has become a matter of contention in recent times, when many claims have been made that there is "only one socialism", (which can only mean the one we've got, the one that exists). But that this is not so will become clear from considering some of the main tasks which practically all the socialist revolutions up to date have had to concern themselves with:

Elimination of the remnants of feudalism; land and freedom to the peasants (in a number of cases, of course, feudalism was more than a remnant).

Concentration of the main means of production — quite small in extent — in the hands of the state; concentration of the small surplus from agriculture and industry in the hands of the state for further expansion in the means of production; in general a great expansion of the role of the state in social life.

Bringing about a change from the predominance of small
production, trade etc., by nationalisation, co-operation and collectivisation.

On the basis of the above to gradually reduce or eliminate the endemic poverty.

But compare these tasks with the problems we face, as does any developed capitalist country today:

We have no feudalism, no peasants to free, the land question is quite different.

There has already been a great expansion of the role of the state in social life, and while the main means of production will initially have to be taken over by the state in all probability, the main question will not be the centralisation of state power, but rather its decentralisation as a part of self-management.

The mass of small agricultural producers has already been eliminated, and the remainder form a very small and still diminishing proportion of the population; other small producers and traders have also been reduced absolutely, and even more in their weight in the economy.

Instead of grinding poverty there is relative abundance, and the possibility of rapid elimination of the poverty and deprivation which remain.

It can readily be seen that these circumstances pose quite new tasks of economics, politics and organisation compared with what had to be tackled before. I have already mentioned that in a number of fields at least the task may be to reduce rather than increase the power of the state in favor of decentralisation, development of self-management and autonomy. Certainly the “all-powerful” state is no longer either attractive or necessary. Changes here would entail a modified role for a revolutionary party or coalition — certainly all power would not be concentrated in its hands —, authoritarian decision on ideas (censorship of ideas and information) would be increasingly out of place, and the development of dialogue and the ferment of ideas would replace tendencies to a congealed system of doctrines.

The above are some of the considerations which, it seems to me, must enter into discussion of the problems of socialist strategy.
Peter Kapitsa

Peter Kapitsa is one of the leading Soviet physicists. He made the speech printed below at a meeting of the Presidium of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR on February 28 this year.

The article of Academician A. D. Sakharov to which he refers is a letter sent to L. Brezhnev and A. Kosygin in June 1968. This letter has been published by Andre Deutsch under the title Progress, Coexistence and Intellectual Freedom. A roneoed version is available through ALR on application. (20 cents plus postage 5 cents. Post free to ALR subscribers.)

I LISTENED with interest to the report of Comrade Froloff about the perspective for work for the magazine Questions of Philosophy, because of his well timed question of the future development of the ideology underlying our socialist society. I think that we in the Academy of Sciences insufficiently value the significance of the philosophical questions of our era.

The future historian will, no doubt, examine our century as a struggle between two systems of organisation of society. This struggle is taking place in several fields; economic, political and ideological. The development of our state for half a century following the October revolution has shown that the socialist system of society is fully viable. Comparing it with the most highly developed capitalist system, the USA, one can affirm with complete objectivity, that in the basic fields of material and cultural development, for example, in public education, in the development of science and defence capacity, both countries have now achieved approximately identical levels. The only field in which we still lag behind is that of industrial-technical developments. Fundamentally, this is caused by the fact that the productivity of labour in the USSR has still not reached the level of the USA. In any case, in studying the direction towards higher levels of our industrial production, the similarity of the two systems — socialist and capitalist — as bases for the development of the material culture of society, now becomes obvious.

In such circumstances the question is now more and more a struggle between the ideological fundamentals on which these two systems are developed. Philosophy defines these ideological principles as they are expressed between the individual and society. As is known, at the foundation of the ideology of capitalist society lies, in the first place, the ambition of the individual for material welfare. At the foundation of socialist ideology is the aspiration
to develop all society in its entirety, and the all-sided development of the personality appears as a necessary condition for this. Therefore in socialist society, creative and aesthetic qualities of the personality are highly valued and society aspires to develop them. The contradictions in the attitude to the individual in both forms of society are the essence of the ideological struggle of these two systems. Thanks to the current scientific-technical revolution, both societies are now able to achieve full material welfare, irrespective of the principles on which public economy is developed. In these circumstances that social structure will be the more progressive where the spiritual qualities of the individual develop most fully; to the extent that this is the basis for man's fullest existence.

It is well known that in recent years a revolutionary movement of a mass character has grown up in capitalist countries, especially among young people.

This movement is developing in all the most advanced capitalist countries and students appear as its leaders. The forces giving rise to this movement are still not fully understood, but it is already established that this movement is not sparked by dissatisfaction with the material conditions of the individual in society. It is directed towards a change in those ideological conditions in capitalist society with which the individual has to contend in his life and work. By such means, the advanced forces in capitalist countries without any influence from outside, spontaneously pose the question of the need to re-examine the ideology on which capitalist society is based.

Along what path will this re-examination travel? Who will create that program of reconstruction which the advanced part of society will accept, and which will lead it correctly to the progress of humanity? Obviously, it will be decided in the process of ideological struggle between various philosophies — a struggle which has already begun and is quickly developing.

Must we take part openly in this struggle? What must be our role in this struggle? Doubtless the ideas and principles underlying the construction of communist society, as presented by Marxism, are the only ones which can direct this struggle in the right direction.

This is now admitted by the advanced section of humanity. At present a search is going on for the concrete ways to most effectively develop this revolutionary movement. This search occurs in the process of struggle between the ideologies of new formations, such as for example, Marcuse. Trotskyists take part in the struggle and Garaudy and others who are ideologically closer to us.

We must not be frightened to admit that we are ideologically isolated from this revolutionary process, and that in practice, our
influence is absent. This is not normal. It stands in contradiction to the fact of the very successful existence of our socialist society that the example of our society cannot influence this revolutionary movement.

How can we most effectively take part in these revolutionary processes, taking place in capitalist society? Why has this isolation occurred? Apparently, it happened because, during all these years, our fundamental efforts were concentrated only on the introduction of the principles of socialism through the development of our public economy and not also on the necessary development of our ideology. This has led to stagnation, which has already been discussed more than once. Now, in order not to lag behind in the development of advanced thought, and taking into account the repercussions of the current world-wide scientific-technical revolution, we must raise the level of our social sciences.

Therefore, we in the Academy of Sciences must value highly the aspirations of the editorial staff of the magazine *Questions of Philosophy* in promoting the development of philosophy, and in particular of having the aim to exert an influence on the development of the social thought of the now current revolutionary movement in capitalist countries.

But in order to exert this influence, we must take part in the ideological struggle occurring there. In this struggle, our philosophers will have to perform on an equal footing, the same as our sportsmen do. It is necessary to say that our ideologists will lose the privilege which they have in our country, where the censor preserves them with care from contrary views. In the impending struggle, this will not be so. There all will be judged by open criteria.

As is well known, the clash of views is the basis of development of any creative work. An example of the fear of our social scientists of this clash is their attitude to the well known article of academician A. D. Sakharov. One of the question raised in this article touches on those principles on which the mutual relations of capitalism and socialism must be founded in order that nuclear war, which would doubtless end in a world catastrophe, will be avoided.

This question is exceptionally important in present conditions, because its correct solution will determine the possibility of existence of all humanity. It is known that Sakharov's article was thoroughly analysed abroad in the most diverse strata of society when both supporters and opponents of his proposals made the question of the mutual relations of the two systems a matter of public discussion.

It is obvious that only in the process of discussion can a vital solution be found to the questions posed. In the circumstances it
is quite understandable why our ideologists, up to this time, have ignored an examination of the questions raised by Sakharov but only by having a clear-cut and well-grounded solution to these questions can we exert an ideological influence on the revolutionary development of society now beginning in the capitalist camp. Otherwise from being an advanced country we will return to the position of a backward one.

I therefore propose that the presidium support the program advanced by the new editorial staff of the magazine *Questions of Philosophy*, to the extent that this program has the aim of raising its international influence, and the presidium of the Academy of Sciences should make available more time for the consideration of philosophical questions central to the ideological basis of the building of socialist society.

At present, on the presidium, this theme is in practice absent from our scientific reports. It is necessary to change, and I consider it expedient to start with the examination of the basic questions posed in the article of Academician Sakharov.

**FROM THE SAKHAROV LETTER**

**THE DIVISION** of mankind threatens it with destruction. Civilisation is imperilled by: a universal thermonuclear war, catastrophic hunger for most of mankind, stupefaction from the narcotic of “mass culture,” and bureaucratised dogmatism, a spreading of mass myths that put entire peoples and continents under the power of cruel and treacherous demagogues, and destruction or degeneration from the unforeseeable consequences of swift changes in the conditions of life on our planet.

**THE SECOND BASIC THESIS** is that intellectual freedom is essential to human society — freedom to obtain and distribute information, freedom for open-minded and unfearing debate and freedom from pressure by officialdom and prejudices. Such a trinity of freedom of thought is the only guarantee against an infection of people by mass myths, which, in the hands of treacherous hypocrites and demagogues, can be transformed into bloody dictatorship. Freedom of thought is the only guarantee of the feasibility of a scientific democratic approach to politics, economy, and culture.

But freedom of thought is under a triple threat in modern society — from the opium of class culture, from cowardly, egotistic and narrow-minded ideologies, and from the ossified dogmatism of a bureaucratic oligarchy and its favorite weapon, ideological censorship. Therefore, freedom of thought requires the defence of all thinking and honest people. This is a mission not only for the intelligentsia but for all strata of society, particularly its most active and organised stratum, the working class. The worldwide dangers of war, famine, cults of personality, and bureaucracy — these are perils for all of mankind.
An analysis from a marxist standpoint of Marshall McLuhan's theory of the mass communication media by a lecturer in Psychology at the University of Sydney.

MARSHALL MCLUHAN proposes a socio-historical theory of communication media, that is, a theory which purports to explain the transformations undergone by societies of all kinds throughout all previous epochs up to and including the present, in terms of the historically transforming powers of the media of communication.

This theory is perhaps best summarised and synthesised in McLuhan's Understanding Media: The Extensions of Man. He presents his theory in "mosaic" rather than "linear" form, that is, he operates somewhat in the manner of a television news documentary producer building up, bit by bit, a graphic, visual, almost "tactile" picture of some segment of historical reality; not in the manner of an author developing a carefully reasoned verbal argument in terms of facts and figures. Like the film producer, McLuhan takes for granted all sorts of propositions which would first of all need to be thoroughly documented and argued out before one could go along with his impressionistic style of communicating his version of the history of social communication and of the socially transforming powers of the communication media. For example, nothing much is said by McLuhan of the relative merits of his own theory, which more or less writes off the questions of ownership and control of these media as issues of little importance.

Although McLuhan is an irresponsible and adventurist romanticiser of social history, with as little concern to distinguish the factual from the facetious as the most cynical Madison Avenue huckster, he may yet nevertheless, whether he cares or not, sometimes be saying some things about the social role of media history which are both new and true, and which may explain his impact on, for example, elements of the New Left, who are by no means suckers for the Madison Avenue line.

Essentially McLuhan argues that throughout human history to date successive expansions of the production bases of societies have been comparable to an extension of the musculature of mankind.
However, the effect on mankind itself of increasingly standardised production methods and commodity-based cultures has been "fragmenting", "de-tribalising", and "explosive". It has ended in fact in a virtual elimination of communal consciousness and in the alienation of man from his own subjective choice possibilities (he no longer has the capacity to propose projects to himself which will be meaningful to him). It has alienated him from his objective role in society (he does not see the point in what he is doing and may as well stop doing it as continue) and from society itself (he does not see any pattern in his society, he does not see it embodying any values, he does not see it as going anywhere, he does not care if it is — he is normless, drifting, listless, powerless).

McLuhan goes on to argue that the increasingly frenzied drive towards higher levels of production has taken on a dialectically antithetic quality which could only be re-synthesised by the advent of electronic technology (computers, automation, television, etc.). If he were a marxist he would say that this stage is precisely that of negating the contradictory thesis of fragmentation, de-tribalisation and "explosion". As he expresses it we are now in the stage of synthesis, wherein the continuation of such technological and social progress begins to assume the form of an extension of man’s nervous system, including the sense organs. This new, synthesising stage, McLuhan would say, arrived with "instant" technology, that is, with the discovery and practical application of physical processes which take place at the speed of light. Early, and relatively simple, examples of this would be the discovery of electricity and magnetism, the development of a formal theory of electromagnetism in physics, and the invention of electrical lighting, telegraphic communication, telephony, and so on.

During this phase of "neural extension", the assembly-line standardisation of work, fragmenting and alienating the worker’s personality, begins to yield to the flexibly programmed routines of automated processes which in this final phase — negation of the negation — will progressively develop the synthesis of Man given back to himself as "integral" Man, whose consciousness is in tune with, but not dominated and controlled by, the production processes of his work. At this stage the worker no longer has to enter into relations of production in the role of servant to the machine, which his master owns, but as partner in a process of integrated control of information flow. The control of the means of production could be centralised in the hands of a rich and powerful few, but not control of the means of communication. Thus because of the altogether transformed nature of the relations of production brought about by the revolutionary qualitative change on the capital equipment side of the forces of production, the worker is no longer seen as exploited and alienated in his
work, but involved in some universally recognised form of collective ownership and control (a newer and higher stage of the “managerial revolution”?)) with the totality of his society in the production of wealth and abundance.

But not merely that. Abundance brings the ready satisfaction of sheer material needs to such an extent that Man’s consciousness is no longer dominated by the “hot” motives of competition for scarce resources; his involvement, becoming more “transcendental”, “oriental”, and expressing his true existential possibilities for being, no longer the being of a sheer beast of burden, takes on a detached, patterned, “cool” quality, which McLuhan takes to be more characteristic of oriental modes of consciousness. (Inside North Vietnam? Amongst the Chinese comrades or the Red Guards?) It is more likely that when McLuhan says “oriental” he is thinking of phenomena such as Flower Power, the later Beatles, the Maharishi, etc., in a context of quite advanced — and commercial — occidental society. This is the sort of simplistic inexactitude that McLuhan indulges in. But that does not mean we can dismiss the underlying idea that he has here.

Materialism gives way to formalism, grim social realism to a form of “fun romanticism”, not merely in the work and market relations but in relations throughout the whole of social and personal life. With the freeing of Man’s intellect from the fetters of material needs, consciousness in-and-for itself comes to transcend action and develop towards the “psychedelic” norm of “cool”, “orientalised”, but re-vitalised and “re-tribalised’ involvement with his own and others’ lives. This stage of increasingly rapid resynthesis of man’s nature and personality with his social world is McLuhan’s “implosion” stage, heralded after many millennia of mechanical “explosion” of society and personality by the discovery of a totally new form of production base, electronic technology.

Thus, to summarise, the original long-drawn-out phase of “explosion” of man’s consciousness and social relationships corresponded to the historical necessity of continuous increase of industrial production through accumulation of industrial capital, and later finance-capital. McLuhan treats the concept of money quite intelligently as developing new forms and tendencies with the advance of society, indeed as evolving towards the form of a silent communication and control system influencing and transforming to an increasing extent the nature and directions of flow and processing of material goods in the world. Firstly money was of necessity just one other form of material commodity; later as “credit” it began to exert something like mechanical power, that is it increased the resources immediately within the grasp of the entrepreneur; finally for the modern industrial magnates and finance-capitalists
it has become a very highly refined and subtle behind-the-scenes communication-control system which affects the lives of us all in ways which McLuhan thinks resemble the "cooling" effects of television. In the affluent society money — or lack of it! — is a less than tangible phenomenon, he argues. McLuhan then goes on to argue, however, that this development of intangibility amounts to a substantial dilution of capitalism! He seems to have the idea that because big businessmen can go merrily on writing dud cheques without being pulled up for a long time, and then only mildly, the rest of us are in this happy position too. Clearly McLuhan has no conception of the existence of class, and simply does not realise that dressing up the money values and commercialised standards of commodity capitalism in communication-control jargon does not by any means banish the spook of class exploitation. Like the ghost of Banquo, this blood-stained spook simply refuses to leave the merry revellers' feasting table in response to a cheery pat on the back from a bourgeois apologist like McLuhan.

However, there is quite some discernment in the notion that the long-drawn-out phase of "extension of musculature", that is, increase in economic production capacity by means of sheer mechanical power, brought "explosive" effects — internationally, in the form of capitalist wars, psychologically in the form of alienation of the workers, fragmentation of their personalities, and indeed of their very lives.

The more rapidly developing phase of "implosion" (that is, concentration and integration) of man's consciousness and social international relations, corresponds to the "negation of the negation" of man; that is, the re-synthesis of man, brought about by the necessity to increase production beyond previous physical limits by the exploitation of automated control processes, in other words, by a phenomenon tantamount to an extension of man's nervous system and sense organs. (When McLuhan says "The medium is the message", he appears to mean that the message for the modern generation in any society is this change in emphasis from "means of production" to "means of communication", or media, as the fundamental source of different possible life-styles and life chance.) McLuhan sometimes hints at an ultimate phase in which new contradictions arise and are involved in a new, but this time positive explosion of man's creative forces. For this time the "explosion" will be purely one of creative consciousness. That is, it will transcend all considerations of material production, these having now become irrelevant to the achievement of dignity, wisdom and happiness, because machines now do the hackwork for the brain, not merely for the muscles of man. This stage would also spell the "end of ideology" since all economic systems
would be perfectly flexible and there would be no more point in the exploitation of man by man.

"Or would there?" one is prompted to ask. The advent of electronics and automation processes may speed up man's productivity to unimagined levels, but this does not necessarily bring about qualitative, or even marked quantitative, changes in the forms of this production, or the share of the masses in it. Thus, industrial productivity, along with mankind's total material wealth, increased enormously between the invention of the potter's wheel and the invention of the steam engine. Were the workers caught up in the Industrial Revolution, together with their families and children, substantially better off therefore than the slaves who toiled to build the Pharaohs' pyramids? McLuhan may therefore be justly criticised for the tendency to envisage historical change as occurring of itself in a positive and progressive way.

The point remains that "implosion" notwithstanding, the problems of ownership and control, and hence of exploitation of man by man, remain to haunt the "electromag" society and its relations of production. The speed-up in productive efficiency and especially the flow of social communication through the media, does not necessarily enforce a more egalitarian sharing of profits. In fact, as the present writer suggested in a report to the Australian Psychological Society, the mass media monopoly tendencies of capitalist societies actually introduce qualitatively different methods of extracting surplus-value, by the exploitation of man as consumer.

In this article the currently orthodox sociological theory that the mass media leadership in a capitalist society does not wield any powerful politico-economic influence was challenged on a number of grounds. For example, both laboratory and field studies have shown that under appropriate conditions even non-monopoly propaganda and persuasion can be exercised effectively. In any case, the notion that mass media control in a capitalist society is non-monopolistic and publicly responsible is quite fallacious. It is merely that great pains are taken by the mass media spokesmen to project such an image.

A model of social learning was suggested to explain the mechanism by means of which nowadays the increasingly privatised individual is manipulated to adopt reflexly and unconditionally the values of capitalism. According to this model there are basically three stages to the process of persuasive indoctrination: (a) exposure-conditioning, (b) conformity-inculcation, (c) material-reward motivation. The response-sequences to be learned by the consumer are, correspondingly: (a) novelty and arousal-seeking, (b) norm-conformity rehearsal, with "denial" of conflicting stimuli, (c) purchasing-consummation.
This model implies a re-application of the surplus-value theory in the context of relations of distribution. Instead of a rake-off going to the capitalist primarily in terms of a legalistically enforced garnishee on the worker’s wages, the process now involves a permanent, systematically applied short-changing of the consumer. But in fact worker and consumer are one and the same individual; hence nothing fundamental is changed under “liberal” capitalism; it is merely that community resources are surreptitiously tapped off from a different stage in the exchange cycle.

In Australia, a semi-planned Keynesian economy merely holds the most obvious abuses of capitalism in abeyance for the time being. However, the capitalist has found, in the mass persuasion of the individual as consumer in this century, a more convenient substitute for the now altogether too explosive strategy of mass coercion of the individual as worker. This is possible because the capitalist has finally succeeded in formidably centralising the means of social communication, over and above the means of distribution — and, of course, production. The same old expansionist and exploitative goals are still relentlessly pursued by the capitalist, but he now pursues them, for preference, by exploiting his massively centralised means of social communication to ensure that the individual in society learns behaviour patterns which reward the individual a little, and the capitalist a great deal more. The privatised, unorganised consumer is exploited quite cynically, like an obligingly lifeless puppet, yet comes to obtain absolutely no insight into this process because his social alienation has proceeded far beyond that of the nineteenth century worker, who was at the very least aware of the existence and grosser effects of antagonistic class relations.

The method of manipulation is murderously simple and effective. All lines of social communication are straddled by the capitalist press and its adjuncts, with a resulting fractionation of the intelligentsia, the means of production of free expression being withheld at pleasure from all except the capitalist’s own hirelings, spokesmen and stooges. Free speech in the community is thus much more seriously endangered than it would be by attempts at blatant political proscription. Yet the above may overrate the degree of solidarity and infallibility of the architects of mass persuasion working through media both “cool” and “hot” on behalf of power factions in the ruling class.

McLuhan’s concept of “implosion”, or the contraction of man's social world today to the dimensions of one big village, was dramatically exemplified by the support for the leadership of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia by controlling and supporting elements of the mass media in that country during the recent very regrettable phase of armed intervention by the Warsaw Pact powers.
Much of what McLuhan has to say is sound enough if taken on this large scale. In detail, however, he makes up his own history to suit himself, and this is no light fault.

Also, writing from his privileged, disengaged, almost facetious point of view, he continually gives the impression that he thinks ideas, not men, make history. In this way he is tacitly as subjectivist and anti-realist as Hegel himself. If Marx stood Hegel on his head, as he said, then McLuhan has stood Marx on his head in interpreting the social role and history of social communication and its institutions in an array of clever half-truths and subjectivist speculations. Indeed, one would be tempted to say that McLuhanism is marxism rewritten as farce. There is a sense in which this would be no joke, but a simple, literal truth. At the same time, to look on the positive side, much of what McLuhan has to say will make much better sense if we mentally "stand McLuhan on his head", in his turn.

For what McLuhan is saying, really, is that the present epoch is one of potential (McLuhan himself would say "inevitable") resynthesis of man's personality. He assumes that this process of "implosion" cannot fall short of uniting mankind peacefully.

In fact, McLuhan is saying implicitly that the sheer existence of electronic media (television, computers, automation processes, etc.) enjoin upon elites the necessity to upgrade the level of social and technical training granted to the masses. For example, the mass media owners have had to support, and indeed encourage, policies of educating the masses to adequate levels of not only alphabetical but also social literacy. Nowadays they are obliged to seek constantly higher levels of "consumer-readership-listenership-viewership" training, just as the earlier capitalists were obliged to train the workers to at least minimal levels of basic trades skills — thus in both cases inevitably raising the levels of potential social awareness, and finally of political and historical consciousness.

With this increase in levels of social awareness, McLuhan reasons, man's involvement in social problems becomes "cooler" (that is, less emotional but more intellectual probing) and more of a "mosaic" kind (that is, more precisely patterned, less ideologically fixed but adhering more closely to personal, social and material reality). That is, he comes to see social problems in a more complex way than the industrial working class did a century ago. This is indeed objectively necessary for him, inasmuch as not only relations of production but all social, economic and political relations have developed to higher levels of complexity in the intervening years.

It does mean, though, that undifferentiated emotional appeals and slogans are now anachronistic and inappropriate. For the industrial worker of two, three, four or more generations ago, the
realities of social exploitation and class antagonisms were simple, harsh and stark. To agitate the masses during that phase it was of first importance to concentrate on the broad general outlines of the mighty problems which loomed ahead of the proletariat and their leaders at that stage of the class struggle.

Nowadays, however, a great deal more logical detail, strategic planning and tactical finesse is necessary — or so most would agree. So McLuhan is saying something correct and important when he interprets historical processes as radically transformed in the age of electronic communication. So that old slogans and catch-cries do not grip with, say, hippies or New Left elements — or thinking people in the community generally — simply because objectively things are just not that simple any more. This truth is also reflected subjectively in the political consciousness of potentially vanguard elements. They want, no less than did the industrial working class a century ago, justice, equality, and the liquidation of all forms of privilege and exploitation. But they know, partly because of school and technical training and partly also because of their training as mass media consumers, that the most sincere, honest and impassioned repetition of progressive slogans suitable to a previous epoch is no substitute for realistic analysis and planning for progressive action.

Thus the increased flow of communication and information tends to project new possibilities for progressive social change and structural reform, to heighten the level of consciousness for resolution of social contradictions, to widen the scope of struggle for human freedom and dignity. It is true that McLuhan does not see all these implications of his theory, or does not choose to comment on them. His conception of history is not one of struggle at all, whether class struggle or otherwise, but rather that of a mere game, and indeed a game wherein oneupmanship repays the best dividends. But what is important is that those who wish to link consciousness with action should consider McLuhan’s concept of “implosion” more deeply in relation to the changing parameters and necessities of the class struggle today. “Implosion” almost certainly does introduce new contradictions of a fundamental kind in all societies, but the mere existence of these will not, as McLuhan seems to think, automatically bring into effective being re-tribalised society and integral man. It is necessary for progressive elements to organise new forms of action to take advantage of these “implosive” possibilities. As remarked earlier, to make effective use of McLuhan one has to stand him on his head first. For McLuhan accepts quite complacently the old subjectivist view that ideas make history. For a marxist, this must be McLuhan’s basic weakness, since ideas in fact do not and cannot make our history for us.

We must make it ourselves.
E. H. CARR is best known for his *History of Soviet Russia*, the first three volumes of which have been published by Penguin, but he has also written on the philosophy of history. In 1961 he gave the George Macaulay Trevelyan Memorial lectures at Cambridge University on the theme *What is History?* In these lectures Carr placed great stress on the importance of historical causation. Some historians and philosophers consider causation of little importance in history. R. G. Collingwood, an important philosopher of history, for instance, regards the essence of history to be the thought that lies behind events and that to discuss this is sufficient to explain what happened in history.¹ Herbert Butterfield, Professor of History at Cambridge, has said that all an historian can do to explain events is to amplify the detail in order to establish greater concreteness.² On the other hand, Carr asserts that causation is the very basis of history: “The study of history is a study of causes.”³

In this article there is an examination of Carr’s model of historical causation and its relevance to one of the central issues dealt with in his *History of Soviet Russia*: the factional struggle of 1923-4, which might be referred to in a short-hand way as the Stalin-Trotsky struggle. This is a point of some interest; it lends itself to a consideration of Carr’s methodology, in particular the degree of success he achieved in putting theory into practice in a specific historical work. Carr’s presentation of the causes of the intra-party struggle offers a suitable test of his ideas on historical causation.

Carr’s views may be expressed thus. He attaches great importance to causation in history. Man’s actions are not pre-determined; nor is anything and everything possible in human affairs. Human actions have a cause or causes, but an individual is morally responsible for his or her personality. It is the historian’s task to uncover the causes of what happened in the past. In doing this the historian works through explanation hypotheses, but the final test of the validity of a hypothesis is an empirical one. In considering possible causes the historian will consider a multiplicity of
causes; he will, however, rank them in some sort of order of importance. In doing this he will be governed by an end-in-view which will be largely influenced by the values he brings to the subject matter under consideration. The historian will seek to reduce the complexity of history to order and he will seek to simplify his explanation — to fix on the major cause. Historians do not assume that events are inevitable, but they are principally concerned with explaining why one particular course rather than another was taken. "Accident" or "chance" affect history but it is the historian's task to examine the causal sequences rationally and pick out the causes which provide a basis for fruitful generalisation and for the drawing of conclusions.

It can be said immediately that Carr's practice does not measure up completely to his theoretical model. As G. R. Elton has observed, in a rather hostile treatment of Carr's views, Carr's history of Soviet Russia is largely a narrative one; it is difficult at times to find the causal thread.4 The party crisis at the end of 1923 in which Trotsky and the opposition were defeated is not dealt with separately and at no time does Carr offer a full explanation hypothesis. Partly this arises from the nature of Carr's history. It is a mammoth enterprise, and is at the one time a history of the Russian revolution and its development, a history of the Russian Communist Party, a history of Soviet Russia's relations with the world and a history of the international communist movement. Carr himself admits, more than once, that it has got out of hand, and yet there is a rationale for each topic which is included.5

Carr sees Russia at the heart of a world revolution so he feels obliged to write a history of Soviet Russia in this way. At the same time he has created difficult methodological problems which he hasn't solved successfully. In order to grasp how Carr sees the factional struggle of 1923 it is necessary to range over the three volumes of The Bolshevik Revolution 1917-1923, The Interregnum 1923-24, and Socialism in One Country 1924-1926, volume I, and it is only in the latter volume that there is what one feels is an adequate attempt at an explanation sketch of the political struggle inside Russia. Nevertheless, scattered through the other volumes there is quite a deal of causal analysis in which Carr offers an explanation of events.

For the purpose of this article attention is mainly on the situation up to and including the thirteenth party conference which began on January 16, 1924. Carr believes this to be the crucial turning point and holds that the thirteenth congress four months later only completed Trotsky's rout and confirmed the bankruptcy of his platform and the eclipse of his authority in the party.6 The struggle against trotskyism continued through 1924 and 1925 and eventually Zinoviev and Kamenev found themselves at odds
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with Stalin and they joined the opposition; but the main implications of the political struggle, which by the end of the decade engulfed Bukharin, Rykov and Tomsky too, had become apparent by the end of 1923. So it is on the defeat of Trotsky and the opposition in 1923 that we must concentrate.7

Carr’s account suggests a great number of causes. For convenience they can be divided into groups. There are causes which can be described as historical, that is, they arose from the specific Russian milieu: such things as the backwardness of Russian life and the peculiar social differences of Russian society. Apart from numerous scattered references Carr brings these causes under notice in two chapters of *Socialism in One Country*, Vol. 1: “The Legacy of History” and “Class and Party”. He states that the Russian historical pattern had three important consequences: first, a chronically ambivalent attitude to western Europe; secondly, development rested on the conception of “revolution from above”; and thirdly, a pattern not of orderly development, but of spasmodic advances by fits and starts. These factors influenced the development of social differences. Russia was now more sharply than ever divided between “a society” which solaced itself for the backwardness of Russian life in the contemplation of western ideas and the enjoyment of the trappings of civilisation, and the “dark” mass of the Russian people plunged in the immemorial Russian tradition of poverty and ignorance.8 The hot-house-like development of Russia, particularly its industry, produced the industrial manager, who from the first was “the administrator, the organiser, the bureaucrat,” and the greatest proportion of the new generation of industrial workers, who were still peasants in factory clothes. The small proportion of more urbanised and sophisticated workers was dispersed by the exigencies of revolution and civil war, and the balance was further upset by the early period of the New Economic Policy (NEP) under which heavy industry, in which the worker’s outlook and status diverged most from the peasant, was neglected. Above all, there was the huge peasant mass which gave its characteristic qualities to Russia. Russian society had a highly self-conscious intelligentsia, but it had no counter-part to the western middle class.9

Carr sees the difference between the “westerners” and “easterners” as a basis of deep division. The Mensheviks were “westerners” and the Bolsheviks “easterners”. The Mensheviks, including Trotsky, attacked the Bolsheviks as slavophil Marxists. After 1917 the same division affected the Bolsheviks and tended to be reflected in the differing emphasis given to the claims of agriculture and industry. At the time of the “scissors crisis” in 1923, the majority were eager to maintain the status quo and let the future wait; the revival of heavy industry must be postponed until more propitious times. But
the minority, soon to be the “opposition”, approached the “scissors crisis” from the standpoint of industry. On this view, the primary cause of the crisis was the failure of the revival of industry to keep pace with the revival of agriculture, and the remedy could only be to come to the aid of industry, and primarily of heavy industry as its essential base.10

Carr traces this element in the principal characters. Trotsky was the most “western” of the Bolshevik leaders and the least specifically Russian. He idealised western Europe; ‘above all the Russia against which Trotsky reacted was the peasant Russia of his youth. The mature Trotsky was wholly urban’.11 On the other hand of all the early Bolshevik leaders Stalin was singular in the absence of significant “western” influence. Alone among them he had never lived in western Europe, and he neither read nor spoke any western language. Those who stood closest to him — Molotov, Mikoyan, Kaganovich, Kirov, Voroshilov, Kuibyshev — were as innocent as himself of any western background. As a polar opposite of Trotsky, Stalin, in spite of being a Georgian, was not merely non-western but distinctly “Russian” in the narrower sense. Not only was he the most “Russian” of the early leaders, but he was outstanding in his low rating of the local nationalisms of the former Russian Empire and he was one of the engineers of the forced bolshevisation of his native Georgia.12

Not at all unrelated to the western-eastern question lay a cultural difference which Carr emphasises as an important causal factor in the split of 1923. Ever since 1917 Trotsky had championed the cause of the specialists. Lenin generally gave his support. They both asserted that the use of ex-officers in the Red Army and technical experts and managers in industry was inescapable. In spite of demands for workers’ control and the proletarian dictatorship, the importance of one-man management in administration was upheld. Lenin constantly deplored the lack of culture in the handling of business affairs. However, in 1922, 65 per cent of the managing personnel were officially classified as “workers” and 35 per cent as “non-workers” (only one in seven of these being party members); a year later these proportions had been almost exactly reversed, only 36 per cent being “workers” and 64 per cent “non-workers” of whom nearly one-half were now party members.13 This was a result of NEP and a policy of encouraging former bourgeois managers and specialists to join the party, i.e. to become “Red managers” or “Red industrialists.”

In April 1923 at the twelfth party congress, Trotsky presented the central committee report on industry and underlined the role of “the director who strives for profits.”14 Theorists were well represented in the opposition and they included some of the best
economic brains in the party. Most of the important early Bolsheviks and Mensheviks, with the exception of Stalin, and perhaps Zinoviev, were pre-eminently intellectuals and they were uneasy about any course of action which could not be justified by theoretical argument; in this respect Trotsky had a remarkable facility and for sheer force of intellect could hardly be matched. On the other hand, for Stalin doctrine was subsidiary to strategy and tactics. Trained in a Georgian seminary for the orthodox priesthood, he showed a marked distrust of too imaginative an approach to matters of policy.¹⁵

The position of the working class in this setting is a paradox. In a negative sense, Carr sees "the disintegration of the working class" as a cause of the split. The Russian working class was a new working class, small in relation to the total population and a fairly fragile social formation. The stress of revolution and civil war depleted the working class dramatically. By 1921-2 it had fallen to half its 1913 numbers; and the wastage was heaviest among skilled workers. By the end of 1920 Petrograd and Moscow had lost about half their population.¹⁶ Not only did the proletariat decline in numbers but it lost its distinctive character. "In 1923 heavy industry, before the war the main occupation of the skilled and class-conscious worker, had still scarcely risen above the record low levels of 1920 and 1921."¹⁷ The opposition urged the majority to rectify the neglect of heavy industry without which an advance to socialism could not occur, but they saw the problem as one of economics — resources, finance, planning, efficiency, management. They did not seek allies in trade union circles and the workers' opposition groups, who approached the problem as one of employment, wages and trade union influence in management. In particular the trade unions suspected Trotsky, who was the one potential leader of an "industrial" opposition, because of his record as the protagonist of the militarisation of labor under war communism, and as the champion of the "statisation" of the trade unions. In the heat of the trade union controversy in December 1920 he rallied to the defence of bureaucracy on the score of the low political and cultural level of the masses; and there was a wide gulf between his convictions as a centraliser and a planner in economic organisation and the quasi-syndicalist views of the "workers" groups. At the twelfth party congress in April 1923 Trotsky not only looked forward with relative equanimity to increased unemployment resulting from the rationalisation of industry and the dismissal of redundant workers, but condoned the continuous downward pressure on wages as a necessary contribution to "socialist accumulation."¹⁸ It was because of Trotsky's stand on these issues that Stalin was able, at the thirteenth Party conference, to stigmatise Trotsky as the "patriarch of the bureaucrats."¹⁹
The backwardness of Russian life rested on poor technological development and low economic achievement. In this lay a general economic cause. Added to the general backwardness was the great cost to the economy of the abnormality from 1917 to 1921. With the introduction of NEP in March 1921 economic policy became an issue around which opposition crystallised. Differences on many points — finance, trade, prices, employment, wages, management etc. — tended to revolve around the state of heavy industry. Agriculture, rural and artisan industry, even the consumer goods industries, revived but capital goods-producing industries remained stagnant. Opposition party criticism of economic policy was concerned with the adverse effects of NEP on heavy industry, and sought first and foremost to mitigate these effects through an extension of state subsidies — if necessary by curtailing the benefits which NEP had conferred on the peasant by increasing the burdens on him. Trotsky, in the winter of 1922-23, became the spokesman of industry in the Politburo, where he more than once pressed the demand for a more generous credit policy. This was the situation in which the so-called "scissors crisis" developed. Carr treats it as an immediate cause of the intra-party struggle.20

At the twelfth party Congress in April 1923, in the course of his report on industry for the central committee, Trotsky produced a diagram which had the appearance of an open pair of scissors. From a point of parity with 1913 prices in September 1922, industrial prices and agricultural prices had increasingly diverged until they reached, in March 1923, 140 per cent of the 1913 prices for industrial prices while agricultural prices had sunk to 80 per cent. This situation had come about because of the priming of the consumer goods industries with commercial credit and the drive for profits by the industrial syndicates with a resultant rise in prices. The economic picture was complicated by a currency reform which set out to replace depreciated roubles with gold-backed chervonets. Under the impact of NEP unemployment rose rapidly from a half million in September 1922 to a million and a quarter at the end of 1923.21 Although at first largely confined to "Soviet workers" (i.e. clerical workers or other workers dismissed from Soviet institutions), and the unskilled casual labor of semi-peasants, it eventually spread to the factory workers as unsaleable goods piled up. An additional factor contributing to the economic and social crisis of 1923 was the uncertain real value of money wages which fluctuated due to currency manipulation. Associated with this were defaults in wage payment. The total effect was a wave of strikes in the summer of 1923.22

The planning controversy can be looked at as a cause of the split, either economic or political or a bit of both. It can be related immediately to the state of heavy industry and the argument about
finance for industry; more especially it involved the debate about the organisation of Gosplan — the state planning commission. Planning was considered part of socialism and the Bolsheviks argued about its application to Russia. Various arrangements which were made had implications for the development of a planned economy. In February 1921 the government set up Gosplan. In August Trotsky, who had been increasingly occupied with economic questions since the end of the civil war, put forward a plan for an autonomous Gosplan with large powers. At first Lenin resisted Trotsky, especially his proposals that Gosplan should have legislative powers and that a deputy president of the council of commissars should become president of Gosplan. Then at the end of December 1922, when Lenin was becoming increasingly concerned about several problems about which, while recuperating from illness, he had had second thoughts, he suggested meeting Trotsky's proposals half way. However, Trotsky had no other supporters in the Politburo and the reform of Gosplan was shelved. At the twelfth Party congress in April 1923 both Trotsky's report and the resolution presented bore clear signs of an uneasy truce on fundamental issues of economic policy.\(^{23}\)

7. The Politburo elected 2 June 1924 after the 13th party congress had seven members: Kamenev, Trotsky, Stalin, Zinoviev, Rykov, Tomsky and Bukarin; of this group, by December 1930, when Rykov was expelled from the Politburo, only Stalin remained. Leonard Shapiro, *The Communist Party of the Soviet Union* (London, 1962), pp. 606-7.
9. Ibid., pp. 16-18.
12. Ibid., pp. 179-80.
14. Quoted, ibid., p. 46.
20. Ibid., pp. 3-17.
22. Ibid., pp. 68-78.
IN THE UNFORTUNATE yet perhaps unavoidable processes of fragmentation and re-alignment now taking place in the world revolutionary movement, perhaps none are so tragic as those in the Latin American movement. Perhaps no nation or continent needs revolution, and therefore a united and strong revolutionary movement, as much as the twenty-one nations of this brutally exploited continent, in which 200 million human beings act out a tragedy whose main elements are starvation, underdevelopment, degradation of the human spirit and a miserable existence for the vast majority of the people.

Carlos Fuentes, a young Mexican novelist, has described Latin America as a "collapsed feudal castle with a cardboard capitalistic facade". The facts are often quoted, but Fuentes gives them an added impact — he lists the following factors:

Continuous monoprodutive dependence — in most Latin American countries one primary product accounts for more than 50 per cent of exports.

A continuous system of "latifundio" whereby, in Venezuela for instance, 3 per cent of the population owns 90 per cent of the land.

Continuous underdevelopment — under its present systems, Latin America cannot increase production or use natural resources at the rate required by the population growth — in 1960 for instance, there was no increase in per capita production.

Continuous political stagnation — the continuing feudal structure, backed by armies paid for by the US, denies the masses access to education and concentrates power in the hands of landlords and city capitalists.

Continuous general injustices e.g. 4 per cent of the Latin American population receives 50 per cent of the combined national income.

Continuous dependence on foreign capital — a large part of the Latin American economy does not serve its own development, being merely an extension of foreign economies, particularly that of the US, and benefiting only those economies.
In a remarkable piece of writing, Fuentes goes on to show that more and more Latin Americans see revolution as the way out of their problems — they are tired of the alliance for progress and the meaningless mouthings of the US establishment.

Revolution, yes! Don’t be deceived, Americans. Open your eyes. Ask the Peruvian farmer who chews coca (a drug—B.A.) and eats rats, if he wants fake elections or revolutions. Ask the Chilean miner who crawls through the tunnels of Lota if he believes in free enterprise or in revolution. Ask the northeast Brazilian farmer, if he wants capitalism or revolution. Ask the student castrated by the Peruvian dictator if he wants Straissner’s free press or revolution.3

Fuentes is neither the first nor the last in a long list of people who have pointed to the terrible conditions of Latin America and to revolution as a means of solving them (read for instance John Gerassi’s excellent book4).

Throughout the whole post-conquest history of the continent many of those who started by wanting progress ended by fighting revolutions. Thus a revolution in Mexico in 1810 began in a rural village where the parish priest, Father Miguel Hidalgo y Costilla, “roused the Indian peasants with the appeal: ‘My children, will you be free? Will you make the effort to recover from the hated Spaniards the lands stolen from your forefathers three hundred years ago?’”5

The tradition of revolution and wars of liberation in Latin America goes back a long way, from the earliest wars of the Incas and Aztecs against the Spanish invaders in the early sixteenth century, through the wars of national independence led by Simon Bolivar in the early 19th century, to the numerous eruptions against autocratic regimes of the 20th century. Yet none of these revolutions, except for the Cuban revolution of 1959, have achieved true liberation for the majority of the people. And in 1969, four and a half centuries after the first clashes between the conquistadores and the Indians they slaughtered and later conquered, revolutionaries in South America face a situation where the condition of the overwhelming majority of the people is probably worse than ever before, while only Cuba, one of the smaller nations of the continent, has achieved anything like permanent liberation.

Against this backdrop there is taking place in the revolutionary movement of the continent a full scale and often bitter debate over how the revolution is to be won in Latin America. Most see the coming revolution as inevitably socialist in character, but there are wide divergences of opinion over how this revolution is to proceed. There are many different positions, and as many groups (or more) as there are positions, but roughly speaking there are two major lines. Both positions see armed revolution as likely, if not necessary, but one, held apparently by many communist
parties, sees peaceful political work amongst the masses as a necessary condition for the beginning of armed struggle, while the other, advocated by Castro and espoused by many of the newer movements, says that part of the work amongst the masses must be the waging of guerilla warfare, and therefore planning for this must begin immediately.

Into this debate has come a young French intellectual — Regis Debray. In a work of great theoretical importance — Revolution in the Revolution — he has given the Left a point of departure — a concrete theory of revolution in South America on which to base the current debate. He has posed sharply and clearly the problems which face the revolution in Latin America and has provided an answer which, if it is not the correct one, is at the very least a stimulating challenge for those who disagree to come up with something of equal quality. Moreover, he has questioned many of the shibboleths of the world revolutionary movement, and much of his work has an indirect relevance to revolutionaries everywhere, if only in that it must make them rethink some of their own strategies for revolution.

It is hard to say how much of Debray's essay is his own thinking and interpretation and how much is the thought of Che Guevara and Fidel Castro. In two earlier essays Debray outlined the problems of the various Left movements in South America and undertook a political analysis which provides the basis for Revolution in the Revolution. It is clear in these that his main ideas are derived from discussions with militants in the various nations he visited — in particular he had long discussions with Castro and others in Cuba in 1966 about the experiences of the Cuban revolution. In this, his last work before he was jailed by the Bolivian authorities, he has constructed a more theoretical model, some of which is probably his own.

Leo Huberman and Paul Sweezy, editors of the Monthly Review which published the first English translation of Revolution in the Revolution, suggest that the essay is "a comprehensive and authoritative presentation of the revolutionary thought of Fidel Castro and Che Guevara," and many facts seem to bear this out. On the other hand, in a book of essays by various figures in the world Left on Debray's work, one of the most trenchant criticisms of his work is made by two Cuban revolutionaries, Simon Torres and Julio Aronde. Probably the truth is that Debray has presented the essential core of the "Fidelist" theory, but that some (though certainly not all) of his own extrapolations from this would not be agreed with by the Cubans. At the very least, his work is regarded in Cuba as of major importance, as witness the fact that 200,000 copies of Revolution in the Revolution were printed in the first edition in Havana.
In the space available I cannot make a detailed assessment of a work such as this. *Revolution in the Revolution?* needs to be read line by line, for even in his accounts of seemingly trivial incidents, Debray has a gift for generalisations which add to the body of revolutionary theory and which contain important implications for revolutionaries everywhere. For instance, in a criticism of the policies of some South American Communist Parties, he points out that the long lists of dead and imprisoned militants “almost all . . . Party members” is not a proof of the correctness of the Party’s policies.

“. . . sacrifice is not a political argument and martyrdom does not constitute proof.” In the hard school of revolution this is a bitter yet inescapable fact. We might all do well to remember it. (In fact, this very quotation was used against Debray, in a reply to him by the trotskyist Livio Maitan.11)

The central point of Debray’s essay is an outline of the Fidelist theory of how the revolution is to be made in Latin America. This theory says that the necessary condition for successful revolution in Latin America is the establishment of the *foco* — a guerilla base in which the revolutionaries can secure themselves against the enemy, and wage a two-sided war of military operations against the army and ideological education of the people. In the *foco* the two aspects — military victories over the army and winning over of the people — are closely related, even combined.

Such a *foco* cannot be controlled from the cities, as has been the case with most guerilla movements to date, but the political and military leadership must exist in the *foco*. Further, the political leadership for the cadres in the cities must to a certain extent come from the guerilla forces in the country, thus completely inverting the previously accepted model.

Much of Debray’s essay is given over to elaborations on, and arguments for, this model of revolution in Latin America. In the course of this he castigates all the traditional and neo-traditional sections of the Left without exception or pity. Thus the Communist Parties are accused of dogmatic clinging to theories transplanted from abroad, of neo-reformism, and some leaders of “objective betrayal.” Maoism is a reaction to feelings of futility, and is more likely to take root in “politically becalmed regions” and in Europe, than in “the storm centres” of the third world. Trotskyism “in its final state of degeneration, is a medieval metaphysic” and “has nothing to learn from history.” “Has anyone ever seen a concrete analysis of a concrete situation from the pen of a trotskyist?”
In his extensive criticisms there is no comfort for anybody on the Left, or if you like, cold comfort for everybody. No-one gains anything but everyone can learn something from his analysis.

There have been, and undoubtedly there will be many more, replies to Debray from various sections of the Latin American Left. In this context, a must is the previously cited collection of essays from Monthly Review Press. Many of the criticisms impress by their use of concrete situations as opposed to Debray's rather abstract theorising. (It is interesting, and perhaps a warning, that the strongest praise of Debray comes from two European intellectuals far removed from guerilla warfare — Robin Blackburn and Perry Anderson of the English New Left Review.) Debray's style is very much that of the French intellectual, but this lends a color, and, paradoxically perhaps, a clarity to the content which might not have been achieved by another writer.

Debray has brought the logical analysis of the European intellectual to bear on the problems of a quite different world, and it is in this that both the strengths and weaknesses of the book lie. On the one hand, he has achieved a theoretical synthesis of the basic tenets of "Fidelism" and some of the guerilla leaders elsewhere, but on the other he indulges in non sequiturs and generalisations which are at once compellingly attractive yet annoyingly overconfident.

Any evaluation of the correctness or otherwise of Debray's thesis by someone in Australia is at best difficult and at worst impossible. Not only are we far removed from "where the action is" but it is hard to verify whether what is claimed to be true is in fact true. Given this though, a number of points can still be made:

1 This book is a step forward for the theory of revolution in Latin America. The discussion which it has provoked can only do good, and already has rejuvenated some of the hardened arteries in the Latin American left.

2 It raises anew old questions of importance to revolutionary strategy, and gives answers to these which are at variance with, for instance, the views of some Communist Parties. One of the best examples of this is where he deals with the role of the national bourgeoisie. Many Communist Parties in Latin America have at various times pursued policies of uniting with the national bourgeoisie against American imperialism. There is much controversy about this theory — indeed it might be called the bete-noir of most CP's in the third world, and it is hard to determine what is correct for each and every situation. Undoubtedly, many Communist Parties are not firmly enough rooted in their particular national situation and attempt to import theories which come
from elsewhere. As the Italian Marxist Renato Sandri says: "... any observer who looks at Latin America, can, like Fidel Castro, see the necessity for many Communist Parties to overcome rigidity of thought and action, to mature in the creativity of their own line and to take over in the heat of battle the role of vanguard which does not depend on any doctrinal investiture." However, while one can say that a policy of working with the national bourgeoisie in Latin America is hardly feasible, it is equally true that an oversimplified view of their role, as Debray sometimes seems to have, will lead to errors in other directions. Gerossi, in a speech to a London conference on the "dialectics of liberation" makes an interesting assertion about the non-existence of the national bourgeoisie in Latin America — he contends that it "thinks American" and is therefore not a good ally for revolution. This is true to the extent that the national bourgeoisie in Latin America is probably more dependent on imperialism than in other nations of the third world, yet a view which denies the possibility of any anti-imperialist role on their part would find it hard, for example, to explain recent events in Peru. Despite this, Debray's main point is well taken — there is an urgent need for some Communist Parties and other sections of the Left to overcome many illusions about the national and liberal bourgeoisie.

3 Debray has done something which has long been lacking — he has put the question of making revolution back on the agenda. One unfortunate by-product of the ossification of Marxism has been a tendency for Communists to make sacrifices for years with no real perspective on how these fit into the overall goal of bringing about the revolution — Debray has then attempted to solve the problem of how to go about making the revolution here and now. This solution may not be the right one, but those who think this must set out to actually prove it — and therein lies the point.

4 Debray, and by implication Fidel Castro and the Cubans, run the danger of falling into a trap which has already proved costly to the world revolution — that of generalising their own experience as being the way for others. Whereas it is probably true that for some of the nations of Latin America the Cuban experience is relevant and Castro more right than the national CP; it is also true that it is hard to see how many of the Fidelist theories can apply to some of the more developed nations where the urban proletariat has greater strength and which fall closer to a backward European country than a colonial one in some aspects. (Debray himself mentions Uruguay in this respect.) Certainly, one can only be apprehensive at Castro's attempts to impose his own line on others, and it is questionable whether the current Cuban attitude will really help to win the other Communist Parties to
the correct revolutionary strategy, even assuming that they are wrong and Castro is right.

Finally, it must be said that Revolution in the Revolution? and Debray's other essays are essential reading not only for anyone interested in the problems of Latin America, but for anyone who aspires to an understanding of modern revolutionary theory. It was Lenin who pointed out that in order for the masses to make revolution they must go through years of political experience, learning new lessons as they go. Perhaps many of the problems for revolutionaries in Latin America stem from the scant political experience of the masses, many of whom live in much the same ways as generations of their ancestors and prove hard ground for the sowing of revolutionary ideas — as Che Guevara found to his cost amongst the Indians of South East Bolivia. Whether, and for whom, Debray's thesis is correct can only be decided by the course of events, but one thing is certain: revolution in Latin America is an imperative, and if to achieve it the revolution has to revolutionise itself, then the contribution of Debray to this process will ultimately be gratefully recognised, whatever the ultimate truth or falsity of its contentions.

1 Paul Johnson, of the British New Statesman, calls it "The Plundered Continent" — for source see note 2.

2 In Whither Latin America? a collection of essays published by Monthly Review Press, NY 1965 p. 12 — from the text of a speech to be given on US television. Fuentes was prevented from giving it by the refusal of the US to grant him a visa.

3 op. cit., p. 21.

4 The Great Fear in Latin America, Collier paperback, 1967.


8 An independent socialist magazine based in New York.


10 It may be that in this way they are criticising some of Castro's conceptions, but this is pure speculation on my part and rather improbable.


12 The Eleven Months of Che — Renato Sandri — A Young Socialist publication, Sydney, 1968.

13 Published in The Dialectics of Liberation Pelican 1968 p. 85.


TO ANYONE even vaguely interested in education, the appearance of A. S. Neill's Summerhill must seem long overdue. The original Gollancz hardback edition (1962) contained a foreword by Erich Fromm which is omitted here, but it was important more as a comment on Neill the man than as a prelude to the ideas which motivate him.

Essentially, Summerhill is a selection (made by Neill himself) from four of his previous nine books, and as such, can be safely regarded as a distillation of the ideas which he began to articulate in 1926, just five years after the founding of Summerhill. In this sense, Summerhill is a necessary book, for no other English educational experiment of this century has been so popularly discussed or so widely condemned, largely from a basis of ignorance and misinformation.

Some readers may be turned away by the rather dated Freudian concepts which are so liberally sprinkled throughout the book. They need not be, for it remains an important document that overrides the need for special pleading.

Summerhill revolves around the concept of "self-regulation" and its natural adjunct, the "free child". Neill is explicit in his definition:

"Self-regulation means the right . . . to live freely, without outside authority in things psychic and somatic . . . I believe that to impose anything by authority is wrong. The child should not do anything until he comes to the opinion — his own opinion — that it should be done."

Neill's object, of course, is to produce a happy child; one free of the neuroses and hang-ups he sees as the inherent product of any authoritarian system, however mild. The theory is laudable, and few could disagree with it. The practice, however, would seem to raise a few problems.

The first problem is an educational one. "Summerhill is a difficult place in which to study". The words are Neill's, and although he admits this, he offers no viable solution. To the child who genuinely chooses the self-discipline necessary for academic study, a barrier is raised. Rather, Neill skips away from the problem, citing the special case:

"Learning is important — but not to everyone. Nijinsky could not pass his school exams . . . and he could not enter the State Ballet without passing those exams . . . they faked an exam for him, giving him the answers with the papers — so a biography says. What a loss to the world if Nijinsky had had really to pass those exams."

The objection is not to the "faked exam" but to the fact that Neill concedes a bias in favour of creative activity. While admitting a need for concessions to aid creativity, he fails to admit that concessions may be necessary to aid intellectual curiosity.

Equally important is the social objection which must be made, for no matter how important Summerhill has become as an educational experiment, it cannot in any sense be regarded as a social one. To his credit, Neill admits this:

"When we opened the school, the difficulties were especially grave. We
could only take children from the upper and middle classes because we had to make ends meet... we have never been able to take the children of the very poor. That is a pity, for we have had to confine our study to only the children of the middle class.''

The ramifications of this problem are self-evident and while they cannot be ignored, they do not necessarily detract from the value of the Summerhill concept. Neill's successes can help ameliorate the needless authoritarianisms of many of our schools; his failures (and their admissions) can remind us that idealism need not be allied with zealotry.

Leila Berg's *Risinghill*, by contrast, is a fine example of what could have been a major piece of social criticism, spoiled by undue partisanship and at times, ideological bigotry.

*Risinghill* is the story of the rise and fall of a new comprehensive school and of its headmaster, W. M. Duane. A friend and admirer of A. S. Neill, Duane attempted to apply some of his non-authoritarian principles to a school within the London County Council system. Risinghill came into being in 1960. In 1965 it was closed in the face of documented evidence which proved that Duane had not only raised the academic standards of the school, but had also lowered the number of students on police probation from ninety-eight to nine.

These issues are clear. Clear also is the fact that Duane needed a champion. Leila Berg obviously had the energy and the dedication to fill such a role. She was also wise enough to realise that the issues which caused the Risinghill controversy were not polarised around the refusal of W. M. Duane to use corporal punishment:

"Is it not worth underlining that the inspector who denounced the school the first time was a man who was interested in 'grammar-school material' and a man who approved of corporal punishment, and that the inspector who denounced it the second time was a man who was opposed to comprehensive schools and to all large schools?"

Although assured otherwise when offered the job at Risinghill, Duane entered a school which was doomed from its beginnings. Here the picture becomes cloudy. This is due in part to the difficulty in getting adequate information from the L.C.C., but Mrs. Berg must take a large amount of the blame. The extent to which the L.C.C. was determined to close Risinghill in spite of, rather than because of Duane, is not easy to ascertain, but Mrs. Berg obscures the issue by using the book to pillory anyone who does not agree with her very definite views on authoritarianism. Hence all "authoritarian" teachers are lumped together and charged with the same fault:

"Since the authoritarian teachers were horrified at the idea of going into the English children's homes, they were scarcely likely to visit the immigrants."

No exceptions? Apparently not, and the implication that "authoritarian" equals "bigoted" is left to stand. Nor is the example an isolated instance. When a school governor laments that the Risinghill children don't behave like those in Hampstead, Leila Berg parenthetically comments "This cry, slightly varied, was to be passed like a sad bean-bag from one authoritarian socialist to another". Socialist equals authoritarian?

Just as damaging to *Risinghill* as a valid document are the credibility problems. When marshalling evidence in favour of her own principles, Mrs. Berg is careful to denote time and place. When the need arises, however, she will resort to gossip and innuendo:
"Intriguingly (pun?), some of the most rigid authoritarians, the most bitter opponents of Mr. Duane were Communists. Roughly speaking, within the district, English Communists tended to oppose Mr. Duane, while foreign Communists (by which I do not mean Russian or Chinese; I never saw a Russian or Chinese in Islington) warmly supported him. But those Communists who opposed him did so in a much more organised way than any other of his opponents bar the L.C.C."

There is no question of citing dates or places here, just a blanket accusation which Leila Berg's needs seem to demand.

Risinghill school was closed. Education suffered, the community suffered, W. M. Duane suffered and the children suffered, but what could have been a needed indictment and a handbook to prevent its recurrence is marred by authorial intrusion. Unlike Jonathan Kozol's *Death at an Early Age* (an objective yet human analysis of the segregated schools in Boston) Mrs. Berg's book fails because her polemics dominate the analysis.

**Grant McGregor.**

**THE MAKING OF THE ENGLISH WORKING CLASSES, by E. P. Thompson. Penguin, 958pp., $3.05.**

The period between 1780 and 1832 seemed to have been saturated with studies some years before the first publication of Thompson's book in 1963. So much takes place that it is reasonable to see this epoch as more influential than any other in the shaping of modern English history: the Industrial Revolution, the French wars, Romanticism, the French Revolution, Utilitarianism, the organisation of an independent America and the years leading up to the Reform Bill, Marx, Toynbee, the Webbs, the Hammonds, Dr. Dorothy George, Clapham, Bryant, Hobsbawn, Rogers, Ashton, Hayek and many more have been fatally attracted and in many cases equally fatally betrayed.

Being a period in which the modern class struggle was becoming clearly defined — the rise of the working classes, the consolidation of middle class power — it is especially open to biased interpretation. On one hand, the early historians who were also social reformers, Thorold Rogers, Toynbee and the Hammonds for instance, allowed their sympathy for the oppressed elements of the working classes to distort their historical perspective. On the other hand, there are historians like Professor Ashton whose more recent works read suspiciously like special pleading, who suggest that a certain amount of oppression is inevitable and justifiable and who go out of their way to defend the virtues of middle class capitalism. Somewhere off on a limb of his own is Arthur Bryant. His three books on the years between 1792 and 1822 are impressive, occasionally brilliant works, with a distinct propagandist intention. Patriotism, gentlemanship, sterling British soldiery, beef and John Bull; he does not evade the problem of working class suffering but he minimises it. His belief in British character, which in some ways is reminiscent of Thomas Arnold, leads him into suggesting that the legacy of the past has been well fulfilled in the future, that everything turned out for the best.

This is not Thompson's view, and while asking for complete objectivity from a historian is asking too much, it is necessary to point out the limitation of his bias. There is a slight but persistent undertone of anger. The working classes, Thompson maintains rightly, have been betrayed. In dealing with the early history of Radicalism he is necessarily dealing with oppres-
sion, persecution, political sabotage, exploitation, deprivation, and with the progress of a large part of the population whose political talents and aspirations were never allowed to fulfil their potential.

Establishment repressive measures were the equivalent of modern totalitarian oppression: emotionalism seems inevitable in surveying them. Fortunately the laws were always harsher than the way they were applied, as Thompson points out. The traditional civil right to be tried by jury often meant acquittal when twelve good men and true preferred this course to the ludicrous extremity of sending a minor pamphleteer to the gallows. And the trials also offered the kind of direct confrontation with the Establishment that working class politics at this time required. But Thompson's bias is evident when he is dealing with the agents of betrayal.

"Unless he had the knowledge of humanity of Dickens or Mayhew, the middle class man saw in every open palm the evidence of idleness and deceit."

Not quite true, one must say—or misleadingly put. Suggesting that any man had Dickens' knowledge of humanity is something of a rhetorical trick. Not all Victorians were willing to fill open palms but many were, in the name of a quite sincere humanitarian paternalism.

Two great new influences were making themselves felt at this time, Methodism and Utilitarianism. Methodism, with its authoritarian God and its belief that true virtue is rewarded in the afterlife, with its anti-revolutionary social doctrine, undoubtedly siphoned off a huge amount of political energy and Thompson is quite right in exposing the reactionary and algolagniac neuroses of many of its followers. But his attack on "apologists" and "fair-minded secularists trying to make allowances for a movement which they cannot understand" is pure polemic. In compensating for the usual fairy-tale attitude to Wesley's work he has moved so far the other way that he is unable to get back. That Methodism achieved a series of desperately needed social reforms at a time when reform seemed most impossible escapes him. Wesley's concern was with "the common people" and the difficulty is that Thompson resents this concern because it did not take the form that he himself would have liked. After the one-sidedness of Thompson's treatment it is ironical to reflect on the perfectly logical union that developed between secular socialism and non-conformist Christianity, which is represented today by Donald Soper and which was effected because both movements found their social aims were held in common.

A similar difficulty arises with his treatment of Utilitarianism, especially of Chadwick. As soon as he starts discussing him he slips into the use of emotionally loaded prose. Chadwick's English, he says, "may one day be as quaint as the thumbscrew and the stocks". He talks of "Chadwick's insane Instructional Circulars", of his attempted reforms as "perhaps the most sustained attempt to impose an ideological dogma, in defiance of the evidence of human need, in English history". This is all very well, but it suggests that G. M. Young's wry opinion is not only wrong, but blind.

"Born in 1800, in a Lancashire tarm house where the children were washed all over, every day, the mainspring of Chadwick's career seems to have been a desire to wash the people of England all over, every day, by administrative order. In practical capacity Chadwick was the greatest, in the character of his mind, in the machine-like simplicity of his ideas and the inexhaustible fertility of his applications, the most typical of the Bentha-
mites . . . He found England stinking. If he did not leave it sweet, the fault was certainly not his.”

(G. M. Young: *Victorian England*)

These two views are not incompatible. Young is humorous about Chadwick’s often repellant, theoretical, but highly organised mind, where Thompson sees it as an inhumane obsession. What Thompson does not say is that Chadwick and his associates alleviated the sufferings of a vast number of men and women at a point of time when it seemed unlikely that anyone was going to do anything. It was Utilitarian thinking and practice that set up administration at the level of competence at which reform becomes possible, the services, the committees and the invaluable Blue Books that were the first indication to a major part of the nineteenth century population of the true nature of industrial conditions. That this organisation virtually ensured middle-class domination for the remainder of the century is something that apparently concerns Thompson more than the very real achievements. Both Methodism and Utilitarianism are historical alternatives which might be called the lesser of two possible virtues. That they were relatively unsatisfactory alternatives leads Thompson into proclaiming that they were no good at all, and this is just not true.

But even Thompson’s limitations are healthy. The Methodist-Utilitarian myth badly needs puncturing and his work at least places the issue in an atmosphere of debate. When we come to consider his successes, criticism of even his most severe limitations becomes almost petty. Simply as a piece of documentation his work is astonishing. He has let the working classes speak for themselves and his use of previously unplumbed sources like the minutes of the corresponding Societies has rescued from an unjustified oblivion men like Thelwall, Gerrald, Gale Jones, Thomas Hardy, Richard Carlile, Maurice Margarot, Binns, Place, and many more.

Because Thompson never forgets the dynamics of class relationships, the demands of social, political, economic and traditional ties, his book has a still greater relevance. No class exists in a vacuum although the work of some historians would suggest that they sometimes do. Thompson’s examination of the working classes is a study of a period seen from one contemporary social position but handled with such fair judgement and with such painstaking care that it becomes a study of an entire age. Going further, it can be said that any study of the nineteenth century, in politics, literature, philosophy or social history, which pretends to any depth at all, must make use of this book. It is not so much useful as invaluable. It is essential in placing the Romantics, specifically Wordsworth and Blake, in their political contexts. His treatment of Paine seems to me to be the best work done on the subject, and his work on Cobbett, Burdett and Owen is nearly as good. It is not just an examination of Radicalism but of a whole complex of political and intellectual traditions, of Deism, free-thought, Shelleyan intellectualism, trade-unionism and ‘Chiliasm’, of “sober, constitutionally minded tradesmen and artisans”, and of the entrenched techniques of middle class domination and oppression which have persisted right through into our own day.

What will probably stand as one of his finest successes is contained in the chapter on ‘Exploitation’ where he surveys all the major work that has been done on the period. Informed, cool, fair, he reveals his own and others’ prejudices.

“It is because alternative and irreconcilable views of human order — one based on mutuality, the other on competition — confronted each other be-
between 1815 and 1850 that the historian today still feels the need to take sides.”

What is refreshing is that Thompson is honest enough to admit it, and one must say that it is wiser to err his way than to go the other. But as I have said, his limitations pale beside the quality of his successes. It is a magnificent book, organised in a logical and lucid way which is remarkable in a book of such size. The Penguin blurb describes it as “probably the greatest and most imaginative post-war work of English social history.” In this case, there is no reason to demur.

H. W. BROWNING

THE FIRST CIRCLE, by A. Solzhenitsyn. Collins and Harvill, 582pp, $5.35.

THE BRONZE STATUES of Stalin were melted down. He was daubed out of paintings, chipped out of mosaics, and picked out of tapestries following the revelation of the ‘personality cult’ at the 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union in 1956.

But despite the bewildering denunciations and removals of the outward trappings of the ‘Stalin era’, a full analysis of the phenomenon of mass repressions taking place in a socialist country was not really entered upon. The result was that the thaw was not complete, and the climate remained such that despite improvements, icy winds could still return to chill some area of Soviet society.

Literature was one such area, and Solzhenitsyn’s book The First Circle — itself an attempt to reveal and analyse some of the problems of Soviet society during the Stalin period — is one of the many works remaining unpublished in the USSR. (Such expressions as ‘Stalin era’ are inadequate to describe the period, but are used here for convenience.)

The First Circle introduces us to one of the extraordinary institutions of Stalinist repression. It is a prison de luxe — a walled and wired mansion at Mavrino, near Moscow, where political prisoners with scientific or technical qualifications work on special research projects on special orders from ‘The Boss’. At Mavrino the soup is thick and meaty, the blankets are woolly and the prison heated. But the memory of the frozen camps, the hunger, the unbearably hard labor and the physical brutality is strong. The threat of returning is ever-present.

But this is not the main point. It is the deprivation of human dignity, the inhuman relationships between people, and between prisoners and their work, which freeze the soul more than the Siberian frost. Although the action described in the book spans only three days, the reader is introduced to a wide range of characters. For the most part, the prisoners owe their scientific and technical qualifications to Soviet power, and they serve their country and people well. Their sentences have been incurred because of foolish outspokenness, indiscretion, mistakes, or for no reason at all. With an insight that seems remarkably authentic, Solzhenitsyn reveals their attitudes to the society which has used them in this tragic way.

Most tragic of all are the prisoners who maintain an aloof attitude because they believe Soviet society to be completely healthy. Traitors, saboteurs, slanderers and enemies of the people deserve what they got, but a mistake has been made in their own cases.

Barbed wire, brick walls, and elaborate security measures cannot insulate Mavrino from the society ‘outside’. The whole apparatus of investigation, prosecution, punishment, and forced labor pervades society through links visible and invisible. One is reminded of the words of Dostoyevsky in his Notes from a Dead House, based on ten years in
Omsk convict prison during Tsarist days...

"...Tyranny is a habit which grows on a man until it becomes a disease. I insist that the best of men can turn coarse and obtuse from force of habit until he becomes a brute. Blood and power intoxicate: they lead to coarseness and perversity; the most abnormal qualities develop in the mind and the senses until they become indispensable and even sweet. The man and citizen vanish forever in the tyrant, and a return to human dignity becomes almost impossible for him. Besides, the possibility of such perversion infects all society: such power is tempting. A society which looks upon such things with indifference is contaminated at its roots."

Solzhenitsyn represents the large number of Soviet citizens who are not indifferent, and who are a guarantee that their society, whatever its problems, was and is not contaminated at the roots. A former front-line soldier who received an eight-year sentence for a derogatory remark in a letter about 'the man with the moustache', his experiences in a labor camp, a special prison (he was a graduate in physics and mathematics) in exile, and in a cancer hospital gave him rich material for his works.

The world came to know of Alexander Solzhenitsyn in 1962 through his ice-breaking book A Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovitch — an account of conditions in a concentration camp during the worst period of the 'Stalin era'. Publication of this book was said to have been sponsored by the then Soviet Premier Khrushchev. His two major works written since then, Cancer Ward and The First Circle remain unpublished in the USSR, although a story has it that the latter was set up in type for the progressive magazine Novy Mir before final rejection by the authorities.

Some will object to The First Circle as "doing damage to socialism". Certainly the book will hurt those socialists who did not know or could not believe that such things were happening in the USSR during those years.

But what is really harmful to socialism — the actual perpetration of crimes, or the exposure and analysis of them? Does one defend or advance socialism by concealing or defending its distortions? More than one example shows that the honest and open discussion of distortions has the overall effect of restoring confidence and releasing initiative. Confrontation and analysis of the past is a pledge that the crimes will not be committed or permitted again.

How many people suffered under the repressions in those nightmare years under Stalin? Exact figures are hard to come by, but a labor camp population of ten million would not seem to be an exaggeration. Whatever the figure, it should be known from records and should be published. A leading Soviet scientist, A. D. Sakharov, has stated that in the years 1936 to 1939, no less than 1.2 million members of the Communist Party were arrested. The overwhelming majority of these were shot, or died in camps. Most of them were leading Party workers, such as members of city or regional committees. They included many old Bolsheviks who had taken part in the revolution, so the effect of the repressions was not marginal. In terms of lives they rank second only to World War 2, and in terms of influence on mass consciousness the effects are wider and deeper.

This magnificent book should not have needed to be smuggled to the West. It should have been published in a mass edition in Russian, and in English by Progress Publishers, Moscow. It would have earned foreign exchange in more senses than one.

D. Davies.
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