In this issue...

We print an article by American radical intellectual Noam Chomsky, analysing the political strategy of the Carter administration. Chomsky is famous for his work in linguistics and for his devastating critiques of the American war in Indo-China. In the article printed here he applies his analytical skills to laying bare the realities and aims behind such ploys as the 'human rights campaign'.

It is interesting to note that Chomsky, whose articles were once widely printed in such publications as The New York Review of Books, now finds it very difficult to have his social and political analyses printed in such mainstream publications.

Leonie Jackson, a student in Adelaide, writes a revealing analysis of why she is not a socialist. We print the article because we think it illustrates very well the processes of ideological formation which are so important to the maintenance of bourgeois rule. On the other hand, the conditions under which such ideological moulding might be overthrown are also discussed.

We reprint (from CPGB journal Comment) a speech and a statement from the British Communist Party on attitudes to homosexuality. The collective thought the material worth publishing since the subject and the stand adopted are, unfortunately, still controversial among communists as in society at large.

Two reviews complete the issue.
The Carter Administration: Myth and Reality

Noam Chomsky

In attempting to assess a new Administration in the United States, it is important to bear in mind the extraordinarily narrow spectrum of political discourse and the limited base of political power, a fact that distinguishes the United States from many other industrial democracies.

The United States is unique in that there is no organised force committed to even mild and reformist varieties of socialism. The two political parties which some refer to, not inaccurately, as the two factions of the single "Property Party", are united in their commitment to capitalist ideology and institutions. For most of the period since the Second World War, they have adhered to a "bipartisan foreign policy" which is to say, a one-party state as far as foreign affairs are concerned. The parties differ on occasion with regard to the role of the state, the Democrats generally tending to favor slight increases in state intervention in social and economic affairs, the Republicans tending to favor greater emphasis on private corporate power. Thus, under a Democratic Administration, there are likely to be some moves towards "welfare state" policies along with a more aggressive foreign policy, as the state pursues a more interventionist program at home and abroad. But these
distinctions between “liberals” and “conservatives” are only marginal in their significance and are at most slight tendencies rather than serious alternatives.

The domestic sources of power remain basically unchanged, whatever the electoral outcome. Study after study reveals the obvious: the major decision-making positions in the executive branch of the government, which increasingly dominates domestic and foreign policy, remain overwhelmingly in the hands of representatives of major corporations and the few law firms that cater primarily to corporate interests, thus representing generalised interests of corporate capitalism as distinct from parochial interests of one or another sector of the private economy. It is hardly surprising, then, that the basic function of the state remains the regulation of domestic and international affairs in the interest of the masters of the private economy, a fact studiously ignored in the press and academic scholarship, but apparent on investigation of the actual design and execution of policy over many years.

In fact, if some Administration were to depart in a significant way from the interests of highly concentrated private corporate power, its behavior would quickly be modified by a variety of simple techniques. Basic decisions concerning the health and functioning of the economy, hence social life in general, remain in the private sector. Decisions made in this realm set the conditions and define the framework within which the political process unfolds. By modifying the economic factors under their control, business interests can sharply constrain actions within the political sphere. But the issue rarely arises, since, as noted, the government, including those who manage the state sector of the economy, remains basically in the hands of private capital in any event.

Extra-governmental sources of ideas and programs are also, naturally, dominated by those who control the basic institutions of production, finance and commerce. The Council on Foreign Relations and the Trilateral Commission, to which I will return, are obvious examples.

UNIFORM POLICY AND THOUGHT

The Japanese scholar Yoshio Tsurumi has commented on “the American myth that the government and business circles of the United States operate at arms-length, if not in outright adversary relationships” (Journal of International Affairs, Spring, 1976). He is discussing the crucial case of the petroleum industry, but his remark is of much greater general validity.

The basic uniformity of policy is clearly reflected in the ideological institutions. The mass media, the major journals of opinion, and the academic professions that are concerned with public affairs rarely tolerate any significant departure from the dominant state capitalist ideology. There is, for example, no socialist voice in the press, quite a remarkable fact in the mid-twentieth century. While the pressures of the student movement of the late 1960s caused the universities to relax doctrinal rigidity slightly, there has been no significant opening to the left in academic scholarship or teaching. Political criteria are no longer applied in such a blatant fashion as they were in the 1950s to eliminate dissenting opinion from the academic world. Nevertheless, there are numerous and effective barriers that guarantee the dominance of state capitalist ideology within those sections of academia that might have some impact on social thought or interpretation of contemporary affairs.

Henry Kissinger once wrote that the “expert has his constituency - those who have a vested interest in commonly held opinions; elaborating and defining its consensus at a high level has, after all, made him an expert”. The observation reveals considerable insight into what Kissinger calls our “age of the expert”. The institutions that produce “experts” and “expert advice” have been careful to ensure that the “consensus” expressed is quite narrow and well within the bounds of the requirements of those who control the economy and state power. People who deviate from these doctrines are not “experts” in Kissinger’s sense of the term, which does capture the social and academic reality, and thus have at best a peripheral role in the institutions “concerned with the indoctrination of the
young”, in the words of an important study of the Trilateral Commission to which I return, just as they are effectively excluded from the formation of social policy or even public debate, for the most part.

THE MASS MEDIA

As for the mass media, they are major capitalist institutions and it is therefore not very surprising that they rarely challenge “those who have a vested interest in commonly held opinions”, and that they are furthermore committed to guaranteeing that these “commonly held opinions” do not stray beyond rigid limits. The business world, however, is not content to rely on the natural process of ideological control that results from the narrow base of ownership. In 1949, the business journal Fortune reported that “the daily tonnage output of propaganda and publicity .... has become an important force in American life. Nearly half of the contents of the best newspapers is derived from publicity releases; nearly all the contents of the lesser papers .... are directly or indirectly the work of (public relations) departments”. There is no reason to believe that the direct impact of public relations departments of corporate capitalism has lessened in the period since.

The report in Fortune goes on to conclude that “it is impossible to imagine a genuine democracy without the science of persuasion as it is to think of a totalitarian state without coercion”. These remarks express widely-held ideas developed within academic social science. Propaganda is essential in a democracy, the influential social scientist Harold Lasswell wrote, because “men are often poor judges of their own interests”. In a democracy, the voice of the people is heard, and therefore it is essential to ensure that the voice expressed conforms to the needs and interests of those who retain effective power. Hence, the emphasis on what has been called “the engineering of consent”, a term introduced by the leading spokesman for the public relations industry, Edward Bernays, who characterises this device as “the very essence of the democratic process, the freedom to persuade and suggest”.

FREE EXPRESSION - PRINCIPLE AND PRACTICE

Of course, this “freedom” is available to those who have the power to exercise it. It is not unrealistic to regard freedom as analogous to a commodity under capitalist democracy. In principle, it is not in short supply, but one has as much as he can purchase. It is no wonder that the privileged often are numbered among the defenders of civil liberties, of which they are the primary beneficiaries. The right to free expression of ideas and free access to information is a basic human right, and in principle it is available to all, though in practice only to the extent that one has the special privilege, power, training and facilities to exercise these rights in a meaningful way. For the mass of the population, escape from the system of indoctrination is difficult. In a sense, the same is true in practice with regard to legal rights. Elaborate machinery is available under the law for protection of the individual against the abuse of state or private power. The study of criminal justice reveals, however, that here too, to a very considerable extent, one has the rights that one is in a position to purchase.

It is not surprising that the business community should understand “democracy” in the terms explained by Lasswell, Bernays, and Fortune magazine. What is perhaps unusual about the United States, and important for an understanding of American politics, is the extent to which such views are dominant among the intelligentsia, and the elaborate system of controls that have been evolved over the years to put these principles into effect.

MECHANISMS OF CONTROL

The mechanisms of indoctrination that have evolved in the United States are entirely different from those that operate in the totalitarian societies of the world. Force is rarely used to ensure obedience, though it is well to remember that resort to direct force is not rare. Recent revelations of the activities of the FBI in disruption and harassment of groups working for social
change or even civil rights, the provocation of arson and bombings, incitement of gang warfare, support and direction of secret terrorist armies, and even in one case direct complicity in political assassination, simply remind us of the long and ugly history of the Bureau which regularly functions as a national political police, enforcing political conformity and obedience. Nevertheless, the primary mechanism employed is not direct force, but rather "the engineering of consent", which is achieved through the domination of the flow of information and the means for expressing opinion or analysis. The system has been effective, and these successes too must be understood if one hopes to comprehend the nature of contemporary American society and its political processes.

The ease with which the ideological system recovered from the damage it suffered during the Viet Nam war gives a remarkable indication of the effectiveness of these systems of control. When the war came to an end in April 1975, Asahi Shimbun commented editorially that "The war in Viet Nam has been in every way a war of national emancipation". One heard no such comment in the American mass media. The liberal press was willing to concede that American conduct in Indochina was "wrong and misguided - even tragic", but it insisted with near uniformity that the original motives and policy were "right and defensible": "Specifically, it was right to hope that the people of South Viet Nam would be able to decide on their own form of government and social order" (Washington Post).

In short, the hawks allege that we could have won, while the doves reply that victory was always beyond our grasp. As for the merits of these opposing views, which mark the limits of responsible thinking as the Times perceives them, we must await the judgment of history, the editors advise.

CONTRARY VIEWS EXCLUDED

There is, to be sure, a third position: namely, that the United States simply had no legal or moral right to intervene in the internal affairs of Viet Nam in the first place. It had no right to support French imperialism or to attempt - successfully or not - to establish "a viable, non-Communist South Viet Nam" in violation of the 1954 Geneva Accords, or to use force and violence to "preserve" the fascistic regime it had imposed or to crush the mass-based political forces of the South. But this point of view, represented by the leading elements in the quite enormous peace movement, is simply not part of the debate. In fact, the Times
refused even to print a letter challenging its interpretation of the debate, though it was willing to publish quite a range of opinion, including a proposal that we undertake nuclear bombardment in Indochina.

The fundamental position of the peace movement is beyond the limits of responsible discussion because it challenges the basic right of the United States to use force and violence to ensure its international aims. The responsible debate must be restricted to a question of tactics: could we have won, with different means? Other questions were certainly raised during this "decade of fierce polemics": Should we have won? Did we have the right to try? Were we engaged in criminal aggression? But the view that the United States had neither the authority nor the competence to settle the affairs of Indochina is simply excluded from discussion, as the NY Times sets the ground rules. It need not be refuted, but must rather be removed from consciousness.

These editorial responses were quite typical of the liberal press. The remarkable resilience of the ideological system is well illustrated by its success in the two years that have passed since in restoring a badly shattered consensus with regard to the American right of forcible intervention. The official version of the war is that the United States intervened to defend South Viet Nam from aggression, and was right to do so, though the methods employed are subject to criticism as "good impulses came to be transmuted into bad policy". The peace movement, according to this official doctrine, supported North Vietnamese aggression, while the government, perhaps unwisely, came to the defence of its victims. That such a version of history can be sustained in the face of the absolutely massive evidence to the contrary, virtually without articulate objection, is a remarkable testimonial to the effectiveness of the American system of indoctrination and thought control.

PROPAGANDA SUCCESSES

It is important, for an understanding of the American scene, to gain some appreciation of the extent of these ideological successes of the propaganda system. In the course of one of his discourses on human rights, President Carter was asked by a CBS newsman whether the United States "has a moral obligation to help rebuild" Viet Nam. Not at all, he explained: "the destruction was mutual". We bombed their villages and they shot down our pilots. Since "we went to Viet Nam without any desire .... to impose American will on other people" but only "to defend the freedom of the South Vietnamese", there is no reason for us "to apologise or to castigate ourselves or to assume the status of culpability". Nor do we "owe a debt".

Writers of editorials and political commentators find nothing strange in this interpretation of history and expression of Christian morality. When the President says that "the destruction was mutual" in Viet Nam - Khrushchev might have said the same about Hungary - literally not one question was raised, nor was even a qualified objection voiced in the national media in the United States.

It is fair to say, I believe, that the current campaign of falsification of history merits comparison with the more audacious achievements of 20th century totalitarianism, though the mechanisms, as noted earlier, are entirely different. That such a campaign would be undertaken was never in question, and was predicted long ago. It is necessary to restore the faith of the public in American benevolence, and to restore the accompanying passivity and obedience on the part of the population, if new interventions are to succeed. And since the institutional factors that shape American foreign policy have in no way been modified, it is fair to assume that the interventionist policies of the past will persist.

Two years after the end of a war in which the United States devastated Indochina on a scale that has few historical parallels, press commentary virtually ignores the American role in the Indochinese tragedy. When the NY Times or Newsweek feature articles on postwar developments in Indochina, there is literally no reference to the impact of the American attack. In the NY Times, for example, the only reference is that there are "substantial tracts of land made fallow by the war", with no agent indicated. Furthermore, the picture they portray is simply one of unrelieved gloom and oppression.
There is, in fact, extensive eyewitness testimony, including journalists of international repute, visiting Vietnamese professors from Canada, American missionaries and volunteer workers who speak Vietnamese and have an intimate knowledge of the country where they worked for many years during and long after the war. This testimony is sharply at variance with the reports presented in the American press. It is ignored not out of ignorance or because of lack of faith in the trustworthiness of the sources, but simply because the account presented does not accord with the requirements of the propaganda apparatus. When the distinguished American radical historian Gabriel Kolko visited Viet Nam in 1976, the NY Times asked him to submit an account of his trip, which they then refused to print, after having denied Asahi the right to print it, Kolko informs me. Had he described the tribulations of the Vietnamese under oppressive communist rule, the report would surely have been featured and would have received wide comment, as has happened in other cases. But since he portrayed the courage and commitment of the Vietnamese in trying to reconstruct an egalitarian society out of the ruins left by the American attack, the report simply could not be permitted to reach the attention of the public. Similarly, when a Mennonite missionary who worked and lived in Vietnam for many years, remaining for 13 months after the war, testified before Congress on a recent visit in which he observed great progress despite the "vast destruction of soil and facilities inflicted by the past war", there is no mention in the press, and his testimony, along with much else that corroborates it, is eliminated from the official version of history.

It does not come as a great surprise, then, that the editor of the New Republic, virtually the official journal of American liberalism, can write, two years after the war's end, that "the American collapse (in Indochina) will read in history as among the ugliest of national crimes". It is not what the United States did in Indochina, but its failure to continue, that was criminal. And indeed, given the standard version of history, one can draw that conclusion. The ruler of any totalitarian state could be proud of a comparable ideological victory.

FALSIFICATION US STYLE

The campaign of falsification is undeniably bearing fruit. In the liberal weekly Newsweek one reads a letter by a reader urging consideration for Richard Nixon, on the grounds that "We forgave the British, the Germans and the Japanese, and are currently in the process of forgiving the Vietnamese". Since the state propaganda apparatus had been laboring mightily to shift the moral onus for American aggression and barbarity to the Vietnamese, it is understandable that the ordinary citizen should applaud our generosity in forgiving the crimes they committed against us. An editorial in the Christian Science Monitor, a leading national daily, which a few years ago was deliberating the relative advantages of bombing trucks and bombing dams (the latter so much more satisfying to the pilots, as "the water can be seen to pour through the breach and drown out huge areas of farm land, and villages, in its path") now proclaims that the United States must "evaluate Viet Nam's potentiality as a responsible world citizen". After the record of the past 30 years, the United States is entitled to stand in judgment over Vietnam.

Any thought of reparations to the victims of American savagery and terror is angrily dismissed as an absurdity. Aid is refused. Even this is not enough. In June 1977 the Senate voted 56 to 32 in favor of legislation sponsored by Republican Vice-Presidential candidate Robert Dole that instructs US representatives in international lending organisations to vote against any aid to Indochina. If such aid is nevertheless granted over US objections, the US must reduce its contribution to these organisations by a corresponding amount. Proposing this legislation, Dole criticised the countries of Indochina for their "extremely repressive and inhumanitarian character", as distinct from Brazil, Chile, Indonesia and Iran, for example. That there is an element of "inhumanity" in the Senate vote would be beyond the comprehension of the mass media.

US representatives in international lending institutions are not generally required to block aid to repressive regimes. About 1/3 of the $9 billion that the World
Bank expects to lend in the fiscal year 1979 will go to 15 of the most repressive regimes, according to the analysis of a Washington-based private research organisation that monitors American aid and human-rights efforts, the New York Times reports (June 19, 1977). The same group observes that US-supported aid through international financial institutions has been increased to compensate for reductions in direct American support, allegedly motivated by the newly-expressed concern for human rights, a matter to which I will return. Congress, in fact, is making some efforts to restrict aid to repressive regimes, taking seriously the Administration rhetoric concerning human rights. The Times report just cited explains the problems this is causing the Carter Administration, which “has been put in the embarrassing position of trying to check the zeal of some lawmakers who say they want to translate President Carter's words into action”. Administration efforts to block these Congressional initiatives tell us a good deal about the meaning and significance of the current human rights campaign.

In fact, while the press tries to make its readers believe that malnutrition and disease in Indochina are somehow the result of communist brutality, the United States not only refuses and blocks aid to Indochina but even refuses assistance under the “Food for Peace” program to “any exporter which is engaging in, or in the six months immediately preceding the application for such financing has engaged in, any sales, trade, or commerce with North Viet Nam or with any resident thereof ....” Furthermore, US agricultural commodities are barred to “any nation which sells or furnishes or permits ships or aircraft under its registry to transport to or from Cuba and North Viet Nam any equipment, materials, or commodities so long as they are governed by a communist regime”. When India sought to provide 100 buffaloes to help replace the herds decimated by American terror, they were compelled to channel even that minimal assistance through the Indian Red Cross, to avoid American retribution (Far Eastern Economic Review, Feb. 25, 1977). Evidently, the process of “forgiving the Vietnamese” for their crimes against the United States still has a distance to go.

It is remarkable, and illuminating, that none of this is ever mentioned, just as the American role in Viet Nam is characteristically ignored, when the press pontificates about alleged human rights violations by Viet Nam. Again, these facts illustrate the efficacy of the awesome American propaganda system.

SCHOLARLY MYTH-MAKING

There is no space for a detailed review here, but it is worth mentioning that academic scholarship is making its effective contribution to the requisite myth creation. In the Pentagon Papers and other documents, there is substantial evidence concerning the imperial planning that motivated the American intervention in support of France and the later efforts to crush the popular movements for independence and social change. Since the 1940s, there was never any doubt in the minds of top planners about “the unpleasant fact that Communist Ho Chi Minh is the strongest and perhaps the ablest figure in Indochina and that any suggested solution which excludes him is an expedient of uncertain outcome”, or that Ho had “captured control of the nationalist movement”, in the words of a State Department policy statement of 1948. As Secretary of State Dean Acheson accurately explained, French military success “depends, in the end, on overcoming opposition of indigenous population”. The record reported in the Pentagon Papers shows that although American intelligence tried very hard to establish that the Viet Minh was controlled by China or Russia, as required by the propaganda system, they were unable to do so. Yet in the face of this ample record, well-known American Asian scholars such as John King Fairbank and Edwin O. Reischauer not only ignore totally the documentation of explicit and elaborate imperial planning but even claim that US intervention was based on fear of Chinese (later North Vietnamese) expansionism and a failure to understand that we were combating a nationalist revolution. The refusal to make reference to the planning documents in the Pentagon Papers is a particularly striking feature of contemporary scholarship on the American involvement of 30 years in Indochina.
The “lessons of the war” are also drawn in terms conforming to basic imperialist doctrine. Thus Edwin Reischauer concludes in *Foreign Policy* (Fall 1975) that “The real lesson of the Viet Nam war is the tremendous cost of attempting to control the destiny of a Southeast Asian country against the cross-currents of nationalism”, currents of which he falsely claims the government was unaware. And Secretary of Defence Harold Brown, a leading advocate of heavy bombing during the war, states in *Time* magazine (May 23, 1977) that “A lesson we learned from Viet Nam is that we should be very cautious about intervening in any place where there is a poor political base for our presence”. This is the typical refrain in scholarship, government, and the media. The United States need not abdicate its role as global judge and executioner, but must be more cautious about the prospects for success, and must carefully consider the costs - to the United States - of forceful intervention in violation of the UN Charter, a valid treaty and thus part of “the supreme law of the land”. The violation of law, incidentally, was always explicit in imperial planning, for example, in the repeated insistence in the highest level planning documents of the 1950s that American force should be used (even against China if deemed necessary) in response to “local Communist subversion or rebellion not constituting armed attack” (my emphasis; the emphasised phrase is repeatedly added to make explicit the direct violation of domestic and international law that is intended). The mythology of resistance to aggression was created for public consumption, and is dutifully repeated by propagandists in the mass media and the scholarly professions.

**CARTER’S HUMAN RIGHTS CAMPAIGN**

It is against this background of ideological conformism and institutional rigidity that one must assess a new political Administration in the United States. The Carter Administration has sought to convey a new “image”, namely, a concern for human rights and morality. In a special section of the liberal *Boston Globe* headed “The Carter crusade for human rights” (March 13, 1977), the well-known historian and former adviser to President Kennedy, Arthur Schlesinger, writes that “President Carter’s promotion of human rights as an international issue must be judged thus far, I think, a considerable and very serious success”. In a facing column, correspondent Don Cook of the Los Angeles Times explains that “Because Europeans have lived with the human rights problem in their midst through centuries of revolution and dictatorship, there is a lot more inflammable human material on this side of the Atlantic than there is in the United States”. The land of slavery and genocidal assaults on the American Indians is uniquely privileged, in this regard.

Schlesinger is certainly correct in judging the human rights campaign to be a success, but some questions remain: specifically, what is the nature and significance of this achievement?

One answer is supplied by Schlesinger himself. He writes: “In effect, human rights is replacing self-determination as the guiding value in American foreign policy.” The remark is presented seriously, without irony. It is a dogma of the state religion in the United States that American policy has been guided by the “Wilsonian ideal” of freedom and self-determination. Again, it is a tribute to the effectiveness of the propaganda system that this faith can still be maintained after the record of American intervention to prevent self-determination, independence, and - crucially - social change, in Indochina, Guatemala, the Dominican Republic, Chile, and elsewhere, with the well-documented ensuing horrors.

It is not, of course, that the facts are entirely ignored. For example, the diplomatic historian Norman Graebner, a “realist” critic of alleged American moralism in foreign affairs, after reviewing many incidents of “American idealism”, observes that “It was ironic that this nation generally ignored the principles of self-determination in Asia and Africa where it had some chance of success and promoted it behind the Iron and Bamboo curtains where it had no chance of success at all.” This is about as far as “responsible” academic analysis can go. It is “ironic” that our commitment to self-determination is manifested only where it cannot be exercised. The fact in no way
suggests that the "commitment" is mere rhetoric, undertaken purely verbally in an effort to gain popular support for the actual policy that has been systematically pursued; namely, intervention, by force if necessary, by more delicate means if they suffice, to prevent the kinds of social change that would be harmful to the needs and interests of US-based corporations, surely the dominant factor in American policy during the postwar period of American global hegemony.

Arthur Schlesinger's real concern for the principle of self-determination is revealed in a recently classified memorandum that he presented to President Kennedy shortly before the Bay of Pigs invasion, the first of many attempts to overthrow the Cuban revolutionary government by force, to assassinate Castro, and to undermine the regime by terror and sabotage, poisoning of crops and spreading of disease among farm animals. In this secret memorandum, Schlesinger condemns the "muddling and moralising conservatism of the Eisenhower period", which was never sufficiently aggressive in international affairs to please liberal ideologists, despite planned and actual military intervention and CIA subversion in Guatemala, Lebanon and Iran. Schlesinger recognised that it would be necessary to lie about the Bay of Pigs invasion. Thus he counselled that "When lies must be told, they should be told by subordinate officials". The basic decisions should be made "in (the President's) absence" so that someone else's "head can later be placed on the block if things go terribly wrong". He then outlines a series of answers that the President might give in a press conference. He should deny any knowledge of the facts and describe the invasion as "a purely Cuban operation" by "patriots in exile", rejecting the idea that the US government has any "intention of using force to overthrow the Castro regime or contributing force to that purpose unless compelled to do so in the interests of self-defence". Even Schlesinger is unable to conjure up an answer to the question whether the US has "resolutely enforced the laws forbidding the use of US territory to prepare revolutionary action against another state". Here, the historian-adviser is reduced to the response: "? ? ? ?" (Washington Star Syndicate, April 30, 1977; the report was successfully suppressed in the national liberal media). The President, incidentally, rejected this sage advice.

In his book on the Kennedy Administration, (A Thousand Days), Schlesinger refers to this and other memoranda he submitted and states that they "look nice on the record" because they register his purely technical objections to the planned attack, on grounds of political costs and likelihood of failure. The facts just cited nowhere appear.

THE 'HUMAN RIGHTS' DEVICE

Returning to Schlesinger's dictum on self-determination and human rights as principles guiding American foreign policy, if we take these remarks seriously we are led to a rather cynical appraisal of the human rights crusade. Exactly to the extent that self-determination was the guiding value in the era of Viet Nam and Chile, Guatemala and the Dominican Republic, the Congo and Iran, so human rights will be the guiding value henceforth. In short, the human rights campaign is a device to be manipulated by propagandists to gain popular support for counter-revolutionary intervention.

Some Washington correspondents see the point, though they put it in a misleading way. William Beecher of the Boston Globe reports that National Security Adviser Zbigniew Brzezinski and others have urged Carter "to continue to take the ideological high ground on human rights not only out of conscience, but also because it may restore American prestige that was badly bruised in Viet Nam and during the Watergate scandal .... " (March 31, 1977.) The part played by "conscience" is indicated by Carter's observations on Viet Nam, cited above, and the press response. Or by the case of Brady Tyson of the US Delegation to the UN Rights Commission, who expressed "profoundest regrets" for the part he said some American officials and private groups had played in subverting the Allende government in Chile, only to be quickly reprimanded and called home to "make sure he understands the ground rules", in the words of the State Department.

The sincerity of the crusade for human rights and the role played by "conscience," can be put to the test in other ways. It is easy
enough for the Kremlin to denounce human rights violations in the United States and the American sphere of control, and it is equally easy for President Carter to condemn the Russians for their extensive abuse of elementary human rights. The test of sincerity in both cases, is the same: how do they respond to violations of human rights at home, or violations that they have backed and for which they share responsibility. In the case of Russian moralists, the answer is plain enough. It is no less plain in the case of President Carter and his acolytes, as the example of Viet Nam and Chile clearly illustrates.

TWO TEST CASES

To mention one last issue, consider President Carter’s response to clear cases of human rights violations in the United States. Take the case of the assassination of Black Panther leader Fred Hampton in Chicago in December 1969 in a 4 a.m. police raid on the Panther headquarters in which Hampton was killed in bed, sleeping and probably drugged (the hail of police bullets was not a response to Panther firing, contrary to police lies that were quickly exposed). The families of the murdered Panther leaders undertook a civil suit in Chicago in an effort to obtain some limited redress. During the case, extensive evidence was produced of FBI complicity in the assassination. It was shown that the chief of the Panther’s security, Hampton’s personal bodyguard, was an FBI informer and provocateur who had provided the police, through the FBI office, with a false report of illegal possession of arms as a pretext for the raid and also a plan of the apartment with Hampton’s bed indicated. Earlier, the FBI had sought to provoke a criminal gang in the Chicago ghetto to attack the Panthers with a fabricated letter claiming that the Panthers were planning to kill its leaders. The Chicago judge refused to permit the jury to consider any of the extensive evidence concerning FBI involvement in this sordid affair. Surely this merits some comment from a passionate advocate of human rights.

The case is perhaps unfair, since it has been well-reported. On June 3, 1977, columnist William Raspberry of the Washington Post pointed out that:

If President Carter is serious about freeing political prisoners - if he is genuinely concerned about the whole range of human rights issues - he needn’t look to Africa or Latin America or the Soviet Union. Let him look to North Carolina and the incredible case of the Wilmington 10.

In fact, the case of the Wilmington 10 has received international attention, with demonstrations and protest in Western Europe, far more than in the United States. In 1971, a Black minister, Ben Chavis, eight black teenagers, and a white VISTA volunteer working in the Black ghetto, were indicted on the charge of conspiracy and arson, following racial disturbances in Wilmington, North Carolina. Chavis received a 34 year prison sentence, and the others too received heavy sentences. Since that time, every significant prosecution witness has recanted his testimony, with allegations that it was given under threat or after bribery by the prosecution. In a recent Court hearing, a White minister and his wife testified that Chavis was with them in their church parsonage when the arson took place, adding that they were prevented by intimidation from testifying at the trial. The Judge at the hearing refused to grant a new trial. As Raspberry points out,

President Carter may be as powerless to do anything about the Wilmington 10 as he is in the case of, say, Russian dissidents. But it would be a most useful thing if he could bring himself to speak out on it. Human rights, after all, don’t begin at the water’s edge.

The opportunity to speak out arose a few days later in a televised June 13 press conference. The President was asked to comment on the case by a reporter who noted that Reverend Chavis and others were “sentenced to prison terms totaling 282 years for what they contend were human rights activities,” and that civil rights groups and “several prominent business and political and elected leaders in North Carolina, have implored you for your intervention and comments on their behalf.” The President responded as follows:
Well, the only comment I am free to make under our own system of Government is that I hope that justice will prevail... I trust the system in its entirety... I'm not trying to evade the question; I think that it would be improper for me to try to impose what I think should be a judgement in a case that I've not heard tried and I don't have any direct familiarity with the evidence. I believe that justice will prevail.

Carter's plea concerning the “strict prohibition... against the encroachment of the executive branch of Government on the judicial branch” hardly rings true. It is difficult to perceive any impropriety in a properly qualified statement by the President to the effect that if the information reported without serious challenge in the press is accurate, then there has been a miscarriage of justice. As for his objection that he had not heard the case tried and had no direct familiarity with the evidence, it is again difficult to see how this distinguishes the case in hand from many others, in Russia for example, where evidence is far more sparse. As for the expressed belief that “justice will prevail,” that reveals considerable innocence, at best, with regard to the treatment of blacks and dissidents in the courts, not infrequently.

PHILOSOPHY AND PRACTICE

What the incident does reveal clearly, however, is that under the New Morality, human rights do begin at the water’s edge. Actually, even that is not accurate, as we can see in a column by NY Times columnist James Reston, reporting from Bonn, West Germany, on June 15, 1977:

The closer you get to the borders between Western Europe and Communist Eastern Europe, the more the issue of ‘human rights’ becomes intensely human and personal. In Washington, and even in London and Paris, it is mainly a philosophical question, but here in the Federal Republic of Germany, it is a question of divided families, parents and children, husbands, wives and lovers.

The remark is apt enough with regard to Eastern Europe; violation of human rights there is in a class by itself, within Europe. But it is hardly true that in the Western capitals - particularly Bonn - “it is mainly a philosophical question.” Consider just West Germany. Here, in the past several years, thousands of civil servants (who constitute about 15% of the work force) have been subjected to disciplinary actions, including termination of employment, for such crimes against the State as participating in demonstrations against the Viet Nam war, signing petitions in support of a legal (Communist) party during an electoral campaign, criticising “capitalist development” for ecological damage, and so on. The German “Berufsverbot” (“Ban on professional employment”) involves human rights violations that go beyond the worst moments of American “McCarthyism”, and that have already had a severe “chilling” effect on academic freedom and the exercise of democratic rights. Furthermore, they have, not surprisingly, raised considerable apprehension in neighbouring countries that have some reason to recall earlier episodes of German history. True, they have barely been reported in the United States, and may be unfamiliar to the political commentator of the NY Times. But if that is so, then the problem revealed by his remarks is far deeper than is indicated by the comments themselves.

The special nature of the human rights crusade is revealed in many other ways. Take the case of Iran, a country which may well hold the current world’s record for torture of political prisoners. Iran, however, is by far the major purchaser of American arms, having purchased some $15 billion worth in the past five years. Visiting Iran in May, 1977, Secretary of State Cyrus Vance stated that “No... linkage has been discussed” between arms sales and the issue of human rights, in his conversations with the Shah. Joe Alex Morris of the Los Angeles Times, reporting on Vance’s press conference in Teheran, reports:

Nothing Vance told reporters after his meeting with the Shah indicated that he had laid particular stress on the (human rights) issue, however. In fact, the secretary appeared at one point to be defending the Shah’s tough policies against alleged subversives in his one-party state. “Each country has a responsibility to itself to deal with terrorist problems,” he said. “On the other hand, the question of dissent doesn’t necessarily involve terrorist actions. It depends on the individual
factual situation whether the question of human rights arises."

Once again, we see that what counts as a violation of human rights depends not so much upon the act as upon the agent.

It would be inaccurate to suggest that the United States is simply responding to Iranian requests for arms, closing its eyes to gross violations of human rights because of overriding economic considerations. In fact, the Carter Administration is pressing the Iranians to purchase sophisticated arms that they do not want and probably are incapable of using. A case in point is the effort by the Administration to sell to Iran sophisticated radar surveillance planes that are designed to monitor and control air battles, at a cost of $850 million. Reports from Washington indicate that the US Air Force would have to provide technical personnel to operate the system. "One of the principle reasons behind the Pentagon pressure for the offer to Iran," according to the NY Times (April 27, 1977) "was to keep the Boeing production line open, thus reducing the costs of the plane to the Air Force and to keep open the possibility of future sales to European allies," who have so far refused to purchase the planes, because of their price and complexity.

Arms sales to the oil producing countries have been a significant factor in improving the US balance of trade, and although there has been talk under the Carter Administration of reducing these sales, there is so far little indication of any action in this regard. But one thing at least is clear: the issue of human rights can easily be dispensed with, when need be.

Even the case of the Russian dissidents raises some serious questions. Again, protests over abuse of human rights in the Soviet Union obviously indicate nothing as regards the sincerity of the crusade. Furthermore, there seems to be evidence that Carter's crusade for civil rights East of the Elbe has perhaps been a factor in intensifying the Russian attack on dissidents, which is now described as the worst in a decade. Responding to such reports, "The Carter Administration issued a pointed warning yesterday that it will not be dissuaded from its public campaign for human rights around the world (sic) by the harassment of individual dissidents in foreign countries." (Washington Post, June 3, 1977). This is a curious response, which raises questions about the purpose of the crusade. If the purpose is to relieve the situation of people who are oppressed, then the nature of the response must surely be a
factor in determining whether or how to press the campaign. If, on the other hand, the purpose is “to restore American prestige,” then the effect on victims becomes irrelevant.

THE US RECORD

It is worth noting that while the United States obviously is not in a class with the Russians in violations of the Helsinki agreements, still its record is hardly clean. Under the Carter Administration, Tariq Ali, of the Fourth International (Trotskyite) has been barred from entering the United States to speak at several American universities. The Justice Department has also refused a visa to the Peruvian author and peasant leader Hugo Blanco and maintains the ban against the Belgian Marxist Ernest Mandel. In the case of Hugo Blanco, the Immigration Service offered the absurd rationalisation that no evidence had been submitted to “establish the preeminence of the beneficiary in a particular field, whether literary, political, sociological, or philosophical...” Apart from the fact that the claim is grossly false, just consider how many people would be permitted to visit the United States under these conditions. In another case, a Vietnamese nun, visiting Canada, was denied entry to the United States, while the press protests that American correspondents are not authorised to visit Viet Nam.

Other actions of the Administration indicate quite clearly how thin and meaningless is the alleged commitment to human rights. Carter’s appointment as Ambassador to Iran, a regime established by a CIA-backed coup, is William H Sullivan, whose best known accomplishment is his direction of the “secret war” in Laos, involving a CIA-run mercenary army and a fearsome bombing campaign launched against the defenceless peasant society of Northern Laos, from 1964 to 1969. This was followed by a tour in the Philippines where he was able to oversee American support for the Marcos dictatorship. Sullivan follows Richard Helms, retired head of the CIA, as Ambassador. All of this may make a certain amount of sense, given the origins of the Iranian regime and its role in American global planning, but it hardly has much relation to a crusade for human rights. Similarly, the Carter Administration, as already noted, has been bending every effort to prevent Congress from enacting a bill that would require US representatives at the World Bank and other international lending institutions to vote against funds or credits for nations that violate human rights. Carter urged that this bill “would handicap our efforts to encourage human rights improvement.” The logic is not transparent. A more reasonable interpretation is that the legislation would serve to permit some meaningful pressure against client states that are champion human rights violators. For example, US military aid to Argentina was reduced from $32 million to $15 million on grounds of the human rights violations by the military junta, but at the same time the junta received a $105 million World Bank loan, an Inter-American Development Bank loan of $32 million, and an $100-million stand-by credit from the International Monetary Fund (Seven Days, June 6, 1977). By such means, the United States is easily able to undercut any effect of the direct aid reductions. Recall that in the special case of Indochina, harsh conditions on direct or even indirect US assistance have been imposed as well as constraints to prevent aid from other countries.

THE FOREIGN POLICY CONNECTION

The aggressive and interventionist American foreign policy of the postwar period has been quite successful in creating a global economy in which US-based corporations can operate with fair freedom and high profits. But there have been failures, for example, in Cuba and Indochina. When some country succeeds in extricating itself from the US-dominated global system, the immediate and invariable response is to impose harsh conditions (not excluding terror and sabotage) to prevent what are sometimes called “ideological successes” in international documents. In the case of China, Cuba and Indochina, the fear of planners has always been that the success of social reform or revolution might influence others elsewhere to pursue the same course. Then “the rot will spread,” as the planners say, causing further
deterioration in the US-dominated system. Such considerations were at the heart of imperial intervention in Vietnam since the 1950s. It was feared that the success of the popular, nationalist and revolutionary communist forces might provide a model for others. If the rot were to spread in such a manner to the rest of Southeast Asia and beyond, Japan - always the centerpiece of American planning in Asia - might be affected. With the loss of markets and sources of raw materials, it might be induced to accommodate itself to Asian communism, thus escaping from the American system. In effect, this would mean that the United States would have lost the Pacific War, which was fought, in large measure, to prevent Japan from constructing a closed Asian bloc that would exclude the United States.

These ideas are quite explicit in imperial planning since at least 1949, though one would never know this from the study of the press or most "responsible" scholarship. The business press, incidentally, offers an occasional exception to the general rule. When American power was defeated in Indochina, Business Week lamented that the "stable world order for business operations is falling apart," noting particularly the dangers "if Japan cannot continue to export a third of its products to Southeast Asia" (April 7, 1975). As both the secret and public records confirm, a major goal of American policy in Asia "was to develop markets for Japan in South East Asia in order to counteract communist trade efforts and to promote trade between Japan and South East Asian countries" (Chitoshi Yanaga, Big Business in Japanese Politics, Yale 1968). Today, as well, it is important to keep the rot from spreading, by maintaining the harshest possible conditions for the Indochinese revolutionaries. It is hoped that along with economic difficulties, internal repression will mount, and the model will seem less attractive. With utter cynicism, American journals now search assiduously for human rights violations in Indochina - of which there are undoubtedly many, just as there were, for example, in Liberated Europe under American occupation - often fabricating evidence if need be, and ignoring entirely any indications of social progress or popular commitment, while dismissing the American role. For some examples, see Chomsky and Herman, "Distortions at Fourth Hand". The Nation, (June 25, 1977).

WHAT ARE HUMAN RIGHTS?

The human rights crusade in the United States is not only limited with regard to place, but also with regard to the concept of "human rights" itself. In much of the world, the concept of "human rights" is understood to include the right to a decent job, adequate shelter, medical care, food for one's children, and the like, as well as the right to share in the democratic control of production, in determining the character of labor and the nature and disposal of its products.

These rights are never mentioned under the New Morality; no discussion of them appears, for example, in the State Department Human Rights Reports. In fact, it would be stoutly denied that some of these rights - particularly, to democratic control of production - even exist. But in most of the world, including the United States, these and related matters should be at the very heart of any honest concern for human rights. By dismissing these concerns, the New Morality reveals that its commitment is not to human rights, but rather at best to such rights as may be secured under capitalism.

In considering how human rights might serve as a "guiding value" in American foreign policy, one should not dismiss the historical record, which is ample. There is indeed a close relationship between human rights and American foreign policy. There is substantial evidence that American aid and diplomatic support increase as human rights violations increase, certainly in the Third World. Extensive violations of human rights (torture, forced reduction of living standards for much of the population, police-sponsored death squads, destruction of representative institutions or of independent unions, etc.) are directly correlated with US government support (for some evidence and discussion, see Chomsky and Herman, "The United States versus Human Rights", forthcoming). The linkage is not accidental; rather it is systematic. The reason is obvious enough. Client fascism often improves the business
climate for American corporations, always
the guiding factor in foreign policy. It would
be naive indeed to think that this will change
materially, given the realities of American
social structure and the grip of the state
ideological system.

A realistic analysis can hardly lead to any
faith in the current human rights crusade in
the United States. Its primary objective, as
noted above, is to reconstruct the passivity
and obedience on the part of the population
that is required if the interventionist policies
of the past are to be continued, in the
interests of the private power that dominates
the State apparatus and sets the

basic conditions within which political
power functions.

THE TRILATERAL COMMISSION

Turning from myth and propaganda to
reality, what are the special features, if any,
of the Carter Administration?

Perhaps the most striking feature of the
new Administration is the role played in it by
the Trilateral Commission. The mass media
had little to say about this matter during the
Presidential campaign - in fact, the
connection of the Carter group to the
Commission was recently selected as "the
best-censored news story of 1976" - and it has
not received the attention that it might since
the Administration took office. All of the top
positions in the government - the office of
President, Vice-President, Secretary of
State, Defense and Treasury - are held by
members of the Trilateral Commission, and
the National Security Adviser was its
director. Many lesser officials also came
from this group. It is rare for such an easily
identified private group to play such a
prominent role in an American
Administration.

The Trilateral Commission was founded at
the initiative of David Rockefeller in
1973. Its members are drawn from the three
components of the world of capitalist
democracy: the United States, Western
Europe, and Japan. Among them are heads
of major corporations and banks, partners in
corporate law firms, Senators, professors of
international affairs - the familiar mix in
extra-governmental groupings. Along with
the 1980's project of the Council on Foreign
Relations (CFR), directed by a committed
"trilateralist" and with numerous links to
the Commission, the project constitutes the
first major effort at global planning since the
War-Peace Studies program of the CFR
during World War II. The latter have
received virtually no scholarly or journalistic
attention, even though they give a revealing
insight into the thinking that lay behind the
design of the postwar world. The first serious
book dealing with these studies has just
appeared (Shoup and Minter, The Imperial
Brain Trust, Monthly Review, 1977), to a
resounding silence in the press.

The War-Peace Studies Group, like the
Trilateral Commission, involved top-level
government policy planners, industrialists and other powerful figures in the private economy. It developed the concept of a “Grand Area” including the Western hemisphere, the former British empire, and the Far East, to be extended if possible to a global system in which the United States would exercise “military and economic supremacy”. Careful attention to these plans would have been quite rewarding a generation ago, and remains so today. Like the high level planning documents of the Pentagon Papers which they so closely resemble, the reports of the CFR planning groups have been systematically excluded from “respectable” scholarship. In both cases, the plans developed and motives expressed depart too radically from the main tenets of the ideological system to be made available for public or professional attention.

The new “trilateralism” reflects the realisation that the international system now requires “a truly common management”, as the Commission reports indicate. The trilateral powers must order their internal relations and face both the Russian bloc, now conceded to be beyond the Grand Area planning, and the Third World.

In this collective management, the United States will continue to play the decisive role. As Kissinger has explained, other powers have only “regional interests” while the United States must be “concerned more with the over-all framework of order than with the management of every regional enterprise.” If a popular movement in the Arabian peninsula is to be crushed, better to dispatch US-supplied Iranian forces, as in Dhofar. If passage for American nuclear submarines must be guaranteed in Southeast Asian waters, then the task of crushing the independence movement in the former Portuguese colony of Timor should be entrusted to the Indonesian army rather than an American expeditionary force. The massacre of over 60,000 people in a single year will arouse no irrational passions at home and American resources will not be drained, as in Viet Nam. If a Katangese secessionist movement is to be suppressed in the Congo (a movement that may have Angolan support in response to the American-backed intervention in Angola from Zaire, as the former CIA station chief in Angola has recently revealed in his public letter of resignation), then the task should be assigned to Moroccan satellite forces and to the French, with the US discreetly in the background. If there is a danger of socialism in southern Europe, the German proconsulate can exercise its “regional interests”. But the Board of Directors will sit in Washington.

The founding of the Trilateral Commission coincided with Kissinger’s “Year of Europe”, which was intended to restore a proper order and hierarchy to the trilateral world (specifically, the “Atlantic alliance”), after the Viet Nam failure. A particularly ominous development was, and remains, “the prospect of a closed trading system embracing the European Community and a growing number of other nations in Europe, the Mediterranean, and Africa,” a system from which the US might be excluded (Kissinger). This is the counterpart of the fear that Japan might strike an independent course in East Asia, in part as a result of Communist success on the mainland. American policies towards the Middle East—in particular, the US support for some rise in oil prices—must be understood in this context, a fact I have discussed elsewhere (see my “Strategie petroliere ou politique du paix?”, Le Monde diplomatique, April 1977.). The trilateral arrangements are intended to abort these threatening tendencies and ensure American dominance of the world economy, while laying the basis for a more successful West-East and North-South “dialogue”.

GOVERNABILITY OF DEMOCRACIES

The Trilateral Commission has issued one major book-length report, namely The Crisis of Democracy (Michel Crozier, Samuel Huntington, and Joji Watanuki, 1975). Given the intimate connections between the Commission and the Carter Administration, the study is worth careful attention, as an indication of the thinking that may well lie behind its domestic policies, as well as the policies undertaken in other industrial democracies in the coming years.

The Commission report is concerned with the “governability of democracies.” Its American author, Samuel Huntington, was former chairman of the Department of Government at Harvard, and a government
adviser. He is well-known for his ideas on how to destroy the rural revolution in Vietnam. He wrote in Foreign Affairs (1968) that "In an absent-minded way the United States in Vietnam may well have stumbled upon the answer to ‘wars of national liberation’". The answer is "forced-draft urbanisation and modernisation." Explaining this concept, he observes that if direct application of military force in the countryside "takes place on such a massive scale as to produce a massive migration from countryside to city," then the "Maoist-inspired rural revolution" may be "undercut by the American-sponsored urban revolution." The Viet Cong, he wrote, is "a powerful force which cannot be dislodged from its constituency so long as the constituency continues to exist." Thus "in the immediate future," peace must "be based on accommodation," particularly since the US is unwilling to undertake the "expensive, time-consuming and frustrating task" of ensuring that the constituency of the Viet Cong no longer exists (he was wrong about that, as the Nixon-Kissinger programs of rural massacre were to show). "Accommodation," as conceived by Huntington, is a process whereby the Viet Cong "degenerate into the protest of a declining rural minority," while the regime imposed by US force maintains power. A year later, when it appeared that "urbanisation" by military force was not succeeding, and it seemed that the United States might be compelled to enter into negotiations with the NLF (which he recognised to be "the most powerful purely political national organisation"), Huntington, in a paper delivered before the AID-supported Council on Vietnamese Studies which he had headed, proposed various measures of political trickery and manipulation that might be used to achieve the domination of the US-imposed government, though the discussants felt rather pessimistic about the prospects. On similar assumptions, he has explained that the American invasion of the Dominican Republic to overthrow the popular democratic Bosch regime was "a success" (for the United States, though not for the impoverished masses whose income drastically declined, or those murdered by death squads or the forces of order placed in power in this American dependency; cf. my At War With Asia, chapter 1 and "The United States versus Human Rights", cited above).

In short, Huntington is well-equipped to discourse on the problems of democracy.

The Report argues that what is needed in the industrial democracies "is a greater degree of moderation in democracy" to overcome the "excess of democracy" of the past decades. "The effective operation of a democratic political system usually requires some measure of apathy and noninvolvement on the part of some individuals and groups." This recommendation recalls the analysis of Third World problems put forth by other political thinkers of the same persuasion, for example, Ithiel Pool (chairman of the Department of Political Science at MIT), who explained some years ago that in Vietnam, the Congo, and the Dominican Republic, "order depends on somehow compelling newly mobilised strata to return to a measure of passivity and defeatism... At least temporarily, the maintenance of order requires a lowering of newly acquired aspirations and levels of political activity." The trilateral recommendations for the capitalist democracies are an application at home of the theories of "order" developed for subject societies of the Third World.

The problems affect all of the trilateral countries, but most significantly, the United States. As Huntington points out, "for a quarter-century the United States was the hegemonic power in a system of world order," the Grand Area of the CFR. "A decline in the governability of democracy at home means a decline in the influence of democracy abroad." He does not elaborate on what this "influence" has been in practice, but ample testimony can be provided by survivors in Asia and Latin America.

As Huntington observes, "Truman had been able to govern the country with the co-operation of a relatively small number of Wall Street lawyers and bankers", a rare acknowledgement of the realities of political power in the United States. But by the mid-1960s this was no longer possible since "the sources of power in society had diversified tremendously," the "most notable new source of national power" being the media. In reality, the national media have
been properly subservient to the state propaganda system, a fact on which I have already commented. They have raised a critical voice only when powerful interests were threatened, as in the Watergate episode, or when rational imperialists determined that the Vietnam enterprise should be liquidated. Exceptions are rare. Huntington's paranoia about the media is, however, widely shared among ideologists who fear a deterioration of American global hegemony and an end to the submissiveness of the domestic population.

A second threat to the governability of democracy is posed by the "previously passive or unorganised groups in the population," such as "blacks, Indians, Chicanos, white ethnic groups, students and women - all of whom became mobilised and organised in new ways to achieve what they considered to be their appropriate share of the action and of the rewards." The threat derives from the principle, already noted, that "some measure of apathy and noninvolvement on the part of some individuals and groups" is a prerequisite for democracy. Anyone with the slightest understanding of American society can supply a hidden premise: the "Wall Street lawyers and bankers" (and their cohorts) do not intend to exercise "more self-restraint". We may conclude that the "greater degree of moderation in democracy" will have to be practiced by the "newly mobilised strata."

Huntington's perception of the "concerned efforts" of these strata "to establish their claims," and the "control over... institutions" that resulted, is no less exaggerated than his fantasies about the media. In fact, the Wall Street lawyers, bankers, etc., are no less in control of the government than in the Truman period, as a look at the new Administration or its predecessors reveals. But one must understand the curious notion of "democratic participation" that animates the Trilateral Commission study. Its vision of "democracy" is reminiscent of the feudal system. On the one hand, we have the King and Princes (the Government). On the other, the peasantry. The peasants may petition and the nobility must respond to maintain order. There must, however, be a proper "balance between power and liberty, authority and democracy, government and society." "Excessive swings may produce either too much government or too little authority". In the 1960s, Huntington maintains, the balance shifted too far to society and against the government. "Democracy will have a longer life if it has a more balanced existence," that is, if the peasants cease their clamor. Real participation of "society" in government is nowhere discussed, nor can there be any question of democratic control of the basic economic institutions that determine the character of social life while dominating the state as well, by virtue of their overwhelming power. Once again, human rights do not exist in this domain.

WORKERS AND INTELLECTUALS

The Report does briefly discuss "proposals for industrial democracy modeled on patterns of political democracy," but only to dismiss them. These ideas are seen as "running against the industrial culture and the constraints of business organization." Such a device as German codetermination would "raise impossible problems in many Western democracies, either because leftist trade unionists would oppose it and utilize it without becoming any more moderate, or because employers would manage to defeat its purposes." In fact, steps towards worker participation in management going well beyond the German system are being discussed and in part implemented in Western Europe, though they fall far short of true industrial democracy and self-management in the sense advocated by the libertarian left. They have evoked much concern in business circles in Europe and particularly in the United States, which has so far been insulated from these currents, since American multinational enterprises will be affected. But these developments are anathema to the trilateralist study.

Still another threat to democracy, in the eyes of the Commission study, is posed by "the intellectuals and related groups who assert their disgust with the corruption, materialism, and inefficiency of democracy and with the subservience of democratic government to 'monopoly capitalism'" (the latter phrase is in quotes since it is regarded as improper to use an accurate descriptive term to refer to the existing social and
economic system; this avoidance of the taboo term is in conformity with the dictates of the state religion, which scorns and fears any such sacrilege).

Intellectuals come in two varieties. There are the “technocratic and policy-oriented intellectuals,” the good guys, who make the system work and raise no annoying questions. In reference to our enemies, we call them *commisars* or *apparatchiks*. But there is also “a stratum of value-oriented intellectuals who often devote themselves to the derogation of leadership, the challenging of authority, and the unmasking and delegitimation of established institutions.” These are the bad guys. We honor them in Russia as the democratic dissidents, but here, they constitute “a challenge to democratic government which is, potentially at least, as serious as those posed in the past by the aristocratic cliques, fascist movements, and communist parties.”

The authors do not claim that what the value-oriented intellectuals write and say is false. Such categories as “truth” and “honesty” do not fall within the province of the apparatchiks. The point is that their work of “unmasking and delegitimation” is a threat to democracy when popular participation in politics is causing “a breakdown of traditional means of social control.” They “challenge the existing structures of authority” and even the effectiveness of “those institutions which have played the major role in the indoctrination of the young.” Along with “privatistic youth” who challenge the work ethic in its traditional form, they endanger democracy, whether or not their critique is well-founded. No student of modern history will fail to recognize this voice.

What must be done to counter the media and the intellectuals, who, by exposing some ugly facts, contribute to the dangerous “shift in the institutional balance between government and opposition”? How do we control the “more politically active citizenry” who convert democratic politics into “more an arena for the assertion of conflicting interests than a process for the building of common purposes”? How do we return to the good old days, when “Truman, Acheson, Forrestal, Marshall, Harriman, and Lovett” could unite on a policy of global intervention and domestic militarism as our “common purpose,” with no interference from the undisciplined rabble?

The crucial task is “to restore the prestige and authority of central government institutions, and to grapple with the immediate economic challenges.” The demands on government must be reduced and we must “restore a more equitable relationship between governmental authority and popular control.” The press must be reined. If the media do not enforce “standards of professionalism,” then “the alternative could well be regulation by the government” - a distinction without a difference, since the policy-oriented and technocratic intellectuals, the commisars themselves, are the ones who will fix these standards and determine how well they are respected. Higher education should be related “to economic and political goals,” and if it is offered to the masses, “a program is then necessary to lower the job expectations of those who receive a college education.” No challenge to capitalist institutions can be considered, but measures should be taken to improve working conditions and work organization so that workers will not resort to “irresponsible blackmailing tactics.” In general, the prerogatives of the nobility must be restored and the peasants reduced to the apathy that becomes them.

This is the ideology of the liberal wing of the state capitalist ruling elite, and, it is reasonable to assume, its members who now staff the national executive in the United States. We may note finally that the second Carter Administration carries us right to 1984.

**THE FUTURE WITH CARTER**

The Carter Administration is unlikely to undertake any significant new initiatives in foreign or domestic policy, though there will be some new rhetoric, largely for propaganda purposes. Any American administration coming to power in 1976, must face certain challenges. During the Viet Nam war, American hegemony in the Grand Area declined, though by now it has been significantly restored. Trilateralism - that is, collective management of the capitalist international order by the major industrial
powers, under Washington’s supervision - must replace the Grand Area system with its emphasis on exclusive American hegemony. This is entirely natural in an era of multinational corporations with far-flung global interests involving ruling groups in many countries. Nationalist currents in the Third World must be contained, and insofar as possible, elites that will be responsive to the needs of international capitalism must be imposed or supported. Some version of detente must be pursued; that is, an arrangement with the second major superpower, which insists on ruling its imperial domains without undue interference, and will agree to play a relatively minor role elsewhere; an arrangement in which there must, as Kissinger phrased it, be “a penalty for intransigence” if the junior partner in enforcing world order becomes too obstreperous, but in which the danger of superpower confrontation must be reduced. The major resources, particularly energy, must be accessible to the industrial capitalist powers, and largely controlled by the United States. The crucial American interest in ensuring its substantial control of Middle East oil and its distribution must be maintained.

The hopes of rolling back Communism in China, still alive in policy-making circles through the mid-1960s, have been abandoned. The United States will cultivate its relations with China, in part as a barrier to Russian influence but also as a way of imposing constraints on the independent development of Japan. Where independent nationalist forces intent on taking control of their own resources and pursuing their own path towards modernization and development have not been destroyed, as in Cuba and Indochina, barriers must be imposed so as to maximize the difficulties that they will face and to increase the intrinsic pressures, internal to these societies, towards authoritarian rule and repression. Sooner or later, the United States will come to terms with these societies, if they are able to persist in their present course, as it has, after many years, in the case of China, or earlier, the Soviet Union.

Within the trilateral domains, effective controls must be instituted to contain and restrict the pressures towards the extension of democracy. In particular, encroachments on the system of authoritarian private control of production, commerce, and finance must be resisted, and the ideological system must be restored. Insofar as possible, the population must be reduced to the state of compliance and unquestioning passivity of the period before the turmoil of the 1960s which created a few breaches in the system. The fundamental dogmas of the state religion must be restored to their position of unchallenged domination: the United States is a global benefactor, committed to self-determination, human rights, and general welfare, trying to do good in an ungrateful world, though occasionally erring in its naivete; the United States is not an active agent in world affairs, pursuing the interests of groups that dominate domestic society, but rather only responds to the challenges of evil forces that seek to upset world order, to international aggressors, as in Indochina, where China and Russia were successfully depicted in this manner during the period when France and the United States were devastating Indochina.

There are severe problems facing the industrial societies. The crisis of energy, pollution, depleted resources, the massive waste of scarce resources in military production and artificially stimulated consumption, unemployment, inflation, stagnation, and so on, must somehow be faced without institutional modification. It is not obvious that there are answers to these problems, at least within the current social order. It is not unlikely that efforts to resolve them without serious institutional change will lead to further extension of centralized planning on the part of (and in the interests of) ruling groups, using the state as an agency of control and coordination. The system may evolve towards what some have called “friendly fascism” - that is, social structures reminiscent of the fascist order, but without the brutality, barbarism and cultural degradation of the fascist states.

There is no indication that the Carter Administration is committed to any different path, and even if it were, persistent tendencies in the private economy would pose serious if not insuperable barriers. These seem to me to be the prospects for the years ahead, unless popular forces that now exist only in a limited and scattered form can be organized and mobilized to introduce really significant changes in the domestic social and economic order.
‘Why I am not a socialist’

A personal study of the forces that made me respect and then conversely reject the title “She’s a Good Worker”, with particular reference to the part educational institutions have played in inculcating in me the values of capitalist society while at the same time, because of the inherent contradictions at work in these same institutions, perhaps sowing the seeds of an eventual rejection of these same values.

- Leonie Jackson.

After many years spent living an unthinking, unquestioning life, accepting my so-called “limitations” and doing the best with what has been called in the past “my good points”, I came to the realisation that I was spending my life in the pursuit of a goal that was unattainable. How this realisation came about is not as important as the effect it had on me, which was to say the least “shattering” and brought some of my previously held values and expectations into question.

I discovered through a series of incidents that no matter how “good a worker” I tried to be, the simple fact that I was female was going to limit my advancement, at a predetermined level, within the company for which I worked. I was resentful and angry that I had been fooled for so long by false promises of advancement I would gain if I kept up the standard of my work, did not involve myself in office politics, and continued to do just that little bit more than employees of similar status. I could not understand why positions of trust, seniority and status could not be doled out on the basis of competence rather than sex. Surely it was of benefit to the company to have the best person doing the job. Apparently not! Even after this shattering discovery that ability and productive effort on my part would gain me very little in the way of advancement, I still believed that this was only because I was a woman. It never occurred to me that the same situation could be true for other sections of the community as well. Only after a series of events which eventually led to my reading The Communist Manifesto did I begin to question all that I had previously believed about the society in which I live.

When re-living now the feelings that I had whilst reading The Communist Manifesto the strongest impression I can remember is one of incredulity that this could be the document so many people, myself included, feared. From there I asked myself why I had feared communism, without ever actually having read any of the works of its proponents, and couldn’t find an answer. But my fear had been real; I had always assumed that communism meant some terrible and catastrophic change for the worse. I continued asking myself questions and found some enlightening answers. First of all, because I found nothing frightening in The Manifesto did not mean that everyone else would feel the same. When re-reading it I discovered that some people would find a great deal to fear in this document - capitalists - because it foretold their demise. That answer creates in itself more questions.
"The essential condition for the existence, and for the sway of the bourgeois class, is the formation and augmentation of capital; the condition for capital is wage-labour. Wage-labour rests exclusively on competition between the labourers. The advance of industry, whose involuntary promoter is the bourgeoisie, replaces the isolation of the labourers, due to competition, by their revolutionary combination, due to association. The development of Modern Industry, therefore, cuts from under its feet the very foundation on which the bourgeoisie produces and appropriates products. What the bourgeoisie, therefore, produces, above all, are its own grave-diggers. Its fall and the victory of the proletariat are equally inevitable."

F. Engels, K. Marx, Manifesto of the Communist Party.

I had always considered myself as part of capitalist society and as such its aims were my aims, its justice my justice, its democracy my democracy. Why then did I feel that there was nothing to fear in this document? A simple answer is immediately obvious; the measures propounded would not make my life any less enjoyable than now, in fact, they hold out hope that it could be a great deal more enjoyable. But for the ruling class in capitalist society, the document spells out great changes, in fact it states that by the very nature of the capitalist mode of production they will bring about their own end.

Discovery of these facts still doesn't answer my original question of why I as a member of the working class feared communism, or why I still reject many socialistic ideas that seem eminently reasonable, but they do show that in our society there is a conflict of interest between wage-labor and capitalists. How can I, at one and the same time, accept and reject capitalist society's values? As a member of the working class I now reject the ideology of the superiority of the capitalist system over all others and yet, at the same time, still believe in many of the personal values that the same system teaches us are part and parcel of our "way of life". I hope to show, in the coming pages, that this conflict I feel is caused by the contradictions inherent in capitalist society, but to do so will mean simplifying a complex series of events to enable me to show the "main" forces and influences over my life until now.

I was born into what appears on the surface as a typical working class family, living in a typical working class area, but underneath the surface there lies a multitude of contradictions in that one statement. First of all, my father at his birth was not part of the working class; his family had some rural property and a small family business, most of which was lost during the Great Depression. He also had a more extensive education than many men received at that time, although this education was always directed towards his eventual take-over of the family business. This meant that when the business failed so did his opportunity to use his education to advantage. All that was left for him to do, and many others in the same predicament, was to sell his labor for a wage and to do this meant leaving the country town of his birth and travelling to Adelaide where more work was available. This movement of people from one class to another is described by Marx and Engels in The Communist Manifesto.

My mother was the eldest of seven children who, because her father could not obtain more than six months' work a year, was sent to work at a very early age in a clothing manufacturers. Her education was not only

"Within the exploited classes (and within each member of such a class) ideologies and 'belief systems' are underdeveloped, fragmented, contradictory and internally inconsistent. The experience of daily life gives rise to dissatisfactions which might lead to class conscious or revolutionary positions, on the one hand, or to cynicism, despair and apathy on the other. The ideological institutions operate in such a way as to forestall and prevent the articulation of class interests. Both within the working class and within individual members of the class bourgeois values and positions hostile to the capitalist order are held side by side (in a constantly changing mosaic) with little or no feeling of discomfort."

limited by the length of time she attended
school but also by the continual shifting
house which the family went through to
escape debt-collectors. There was simply no
other way that her parents could feed their
seven children than by leaving their debts
behind. The depression meant that her
father had no control of his earnings, he took
what work was available when it was
available. Probably due to this deeply felt
lack of education, my mother always extolled
the virtues of a 'decent education' and the
advantages it could bring.

"The lower strata of the middle class - the small tradespeople, shopkeepers, and retired
tradesmen generally, the handicraftsmen and peasants - all these sink gradually into the
proletariat, partly because their diminutive capital does not suffice for the scale on which
Modern Industry is carried on, and is swamped in the competition with the large capitalists,
partly because their specialised skill is rendered worthless by new methods of production. Thus
the proletariat is recruited from all classes of the population."

F. Engels, K. Marx, Manifesto of the Communist Party.

Because my parents were members of the
working class, and as such had only a limited
earning power, my only chance to "make
something of myself" was by gaining the
qualifications necessary to start me on the
road towards an interesting and rewarding
career. The idea being that if I had the ability
and was willing to work hard I would
somehow overcome the disadvantages that
exist for a member of the working class in
capitalist society. Does not our society, state
that equal opportunity is available for all?
Even if opportunities were equally
obtainable, which they are not, by starting
with an already predetermined inequality,
members of the working class can never hope
to gain by "equal work" a rise in their status
or standard of living. They must, in fact,
work much harder than members of the
middle or ruling class to gain "equal results".

As a member of the working class and
living in a working class area I attended, as a
matter of course, the local state school, as did
all my friends, most of whom left school at
the age of fourteen qualified only for jobs in
factories and shops. But my father still had
connections with people from his middle
class background which enabled him to buy
a house at interest rates within the reach of
his earnings. These connections made
possible a move to an area of Adelaide which
contained elements of working class, middle
class, and even small pockets of ruling class
private schools. Did I have access to these
private schools? Technically I suppose I did,
at least I cannot imagine their principals
physically barring my entry, but in reality,
because the main prerequisite for my
attendance was payment of hefty school fees
completely beyond my father's earning
capacity, I had little hope of attending. So I
was sent to the local state school like others
of my class in that same area. Within the
field of primary education, the move from
one area to another would probably have
made little difference to the type or quality of
the education I received because even though
the new area contained a diversity of social
classes, they each lived within very set
boundaries. Each local primary school
reflected the class patterns of the locality
surrounding it but in the area of secondary
education, where the pattern of large
technical and high schools had emerged,
students were admitted from all the primary
schools in the whole area. Even though
students were admitted to these schools from
within the total area, in the technical school
there were mainly students from working
class families and in the high school the
majority were of middle class backgrounds.

My education throughout primary school
was a continual indoctrination of the values
which capitalist society needed to instil in me
to help create what I have labelled "A Good
Worker". I was taught that girls were very
different from boys and the whole arrangement of the school was set up to emphasise this point. From segregated classrooms to separate playing areas, from cooking lessons for girls to woodworking lessons for boys, and from girls being made to look a fool for "stomping down the corridor like a boy", our differences were emphasised and our future roles as aggressor and submitter were laid out for us.

So why were our roles of aggressor and submitter so clearly laid out within the education system? Dividing the labor force into two distinct groups and allowing one group to be exploited more than the other could not happen unless both groups consider that there is nothing strange, unusual, or unnatural about this phenomenon. If men and women had been taught at school that both groups had the same right to employment then this separation or division into two distinct groups could not come about. Women could not be exploited as easily if the schools did not reinforce and stress these divisions in a way that makes them appear as natural, biological, unchangeable facts of life. Therefore, schools are part of the machinery producing the eventual tools for capitalist society's use and exploitation.

The schools' reinforcement of the "Divide and Rule" policy of capitalism does not stop at dividing men from women. Within the workplace many and various divisions of labor are used to control and manipulate the labor force into maximum production. The schools teach acceptance and submission to superiors, whether they be students from higher grades or teaching staff, and because of our acceptance of the rights of others to supervise and organise our lives we also automatically assume our own right to supervise students (and in the workforce, employees) of lower status than ourselves. We are taught that if we work hard, accept discipline, take orders, we will continue to advance from one grade to the next.

So, by the time my primary schooling was coming to an end I had accepted as a part of life the fact that men were considered superior to women (even if it was with a half-felt resentment), that teachers were to be revered, respected and obeyed, and that by working hard and gaining good scholastic results I could be, or do, almost anything I wished.

There then arose a small problem. I could be, or do, almost anything I wished within the confines of the technical school, not the high school. The principal at the primary school insisted that I would not be able to "cope" with the curriculum at high school and that at the technical school I would receive the training I needed to fit me for the workforce. The simple fact was, that of a class of forty-odd students at this working class primary school, the majority were being streamed into the technical school and only a few were going to attend the local high school, and the principal did not consider my results justified my being among the few high-achievers.

My mother, not giving way to the considerable pressure applied by the principal when he stated that I would be with my friends at the technical school, would find the curriculum easier to handle, and so on, insisted that I should be given the chance of attending the high school. By doing so she won a minor battle, but lost the war, because when I applied for entry at the high school

"Rene Dumont points out that in many zones of tropical Africa today men are often idle, while women are forced to work all day. This exploitation has no 'natural' source whatever. Women may perform their 'heavy' duties in contemporary African peasant societies not for fear of physical reprisal by their men, but because these duties are 'customary' and built into the role structure of the society."

Juliet Mitchell, Women - the Longest Revolution.

The schools teach acceptance and submission to superiors, whether they be students from higher grades or teaching staff, and because of our acceptance of the rights of others to supervise and organise our
the staff convinced her that a general education would not be of much use to me. What if I failed? What if I suddenly decided I wanted to leave school earlier than I had originally intended? By enrolling me in a commercial course, it would not matter when I left because I would at least have some recognisable job skills.

It all sounded so sensible that my mother capitulated. After all, they were only trying to help me. There is nothing unusual about this capitulation, it happens all the time to working class parents with their over-abundance of respect for authority in general, and teachers in particular. The only surprising factor about this incident is that my mother had the courage to stand up to the principal of the primary school in the first place. I had at least gained entry to a school with high achievement records and one that was viewed favorably by prospective employers.

I left high school after three years, my certificate in hand, and proceeded to look for an office job of some kind. I gained a position as a shorthand typist (incidentally, I never actually used my shorthand skills) which meant typing orders that someone else had written out for me. The fact that I had to have passes in geography, art, arithmetic, English, as well as book-keeping and shorthand, to enable me to sit all day typing orders did not strike me as being strange at the time. But it certainly does now. I could not have obtained my position without these qualifications, but I certainly did not need them, so of what value to my employers was my education? First of all, I was ready to accept authority and take orders, but my employers needed more than that from me. I had to be trusted to work without much supervision, and more than that, to work consistently. My schooling, by stressing individual achievement and effort as the road to a successful and rewarding career, had given me the incentive to work well with, or without, supervision, because by doing so I would advance my career.

“That division of the labor force is of further importance to Capitalism because it allows certain groups, namely minorities and women, to be super-exploited, used as a marginal work force in order to smooth over cycles in the economy, and to perform vital but menial and poorly paid jobs.”

M.P. Goldberg, The Economic Exploitation of Women.

That I would only ever advance to a predetermined level did not occur to me for many years, after all, as a junior employee (or student) I had been led to expect that age was a prerequisite of advancement. Even if I had thought about it, and I didn't, the fact that at twenty-one or twenty-five an employee suddenly becomes promotable, whereas previously they were not, did not at that time seem at all unusual.

From my original employment as a shorthand typist (who didn't use her shorthand) I found myself within twelve months being trained as a comptometer operator and this training took a total of only three weeks. So much for the advantages of being taught set job skills at school! I did not find it hard to reconcile these seemingly conflicting ideas of needing set job skills in order to get a job which must, by the very nature of capitalist production, eventually require completely new skills because it did not occur to me at any time to question the rightness of “the system” in which I lived. If I did not question the rightness of “the system” it stands to reason that I would be even less likely to question my employer’s right to order me to take over this new job. After all, if I didn’t like it I could always leave and get another! Of course, if there are no other positions available I have a rather difficult decision to make; I do the job or I join...
"In sum, in primary and secondary schools the bulk of children receive practice coping with situations structurally similar to those encountered in the routinized sector of the primary labor market. Social relations with the teachers and peers, promotion patterns, content and structure of tasks all have qualitatively similar analogs on the job."

M.A. Carter, Contradiction and Correspondence.

the ranks of the unemployed!

After some years had passed, computerism became more and more prevalent in the business world and comptometer operators became almost obsolete. As my shorthand and typing skills had disappeared, I had to virtually begin again by developing my clerical ability. I held a variety of positions in the next few years from which I gained a diverse and widespread background in the accounting field. Again, at a later stage these skills were eroded as my work became increasingly specialised. The quality, variety and type of labor I performed was controlled by its profitability to my employers at any given time and, as such, could be reorganised or changed completely minimum. They provided bonus payments and luncheons for the successful completion of tasks within an ever-decreasing amount of time. The more you did, the more you were expected to do next time round and eventually our day could be stretched no more and we found ourselves working through lunch hours, of an evening and at weekends. There were rumbles of discontent at our low status and the company issued us with new titles to stick on our doors. That didn’t work for very long, as we soon realised that fancy name-plates had not changed our relative position in the hierarchy and that the same men were still issuing us with the same orders. The company then set up a special once-a-month meeting for their women employees to air their problems and
to suit prevailing market conditions. I had absolutely no control over this process.

I was, by this time, working for a progressive, rapidly expanding company in an era of full employment. The bulk of low-status positions within the company were held by women but because of the streamlined nature of the company’s office procedures, if one woman left, the result was usually chaos. If one of the smaller group of women who knew all the accounting and sales procedures was to leave, it compounded the chaos, as they could, and did, step in and keep two jobs going for as long as necessary.

So the company initiated moves to keep the turnover of their women employees at a make any necessary changes. When complaints were made that women were doing jobs that were under-classified, the reason given for this state of affairs was that we were not “qualified” for higher classification. When confronted by a decision to only undertake work covered by our classification if we were not given the same opportunity as male employees to gain these “qualifications”, the company capitulated. It was a hollow victory, as the company well knew, because most of the women involved were married and this fact combined with their already heavy work load left them little time to undertake studies.

Even though I wasn’t sure that I could cope with the extra work involved in gaining a

"Particularly after World War I, the capitulation of the schools to business values and concepts of efficiency led to the increased use of intelligence and scholastic achievement testing as an ostensibly unbiased means of measuring the product of schooling and classifying students."

S. Bowles, H. Gintis, Capitalism and Education in the United States.
"By their very nature, these jobs afford the worker little intrinsic satisfaction. Hence the motivation to perform them must come from outside the job, from its "circumstances" rather than from the job itself. In this situation the dominant method of eliciting steady high levels of performance and output has been to arrange the various jobs in hierarchical structures."

M.A. Carter, *Contradiction and Correspondence*.

qualification of some kind, I decided that it was at least worth trying. But when I wished to enrol in a course that interested me the company insisted I would have to sit through a series of aptitude tests to discover what I would be best suited to study. The results of these tests showed a high mathematical ability and so I was told to enrol in an accounting course which was not the field of study I wished to undertake. I decided to leave my decision for a year as I wanted to be sure I was doing the right thing before I went ahead.

When I now think about the results of my aptitude testing, I am not at all surprised they turned out as they did. After all, I had spent most of my working life dealing with arithmetical problems and for the results to show a deviation from this fact would need a miracle.

At the same time that I was sitting through my aptitude testing, another female employee was doing the same. As she wished to gain qualifications in the area of personnel relations, and her normal work was within that same field, the results were not hard to foresee. This employee started her course, and to the amazement of executives within the company, it became obvious she was determined to continue despite all the obstacles they placed in her way. It would take far too long to list the many and various ways in which they made life difficult for her at this time, but I must state that these “obstacles” became more and more visible as the employment situation worsened due to the recession, and the corresponding need to keep employees “happy” lessened.

Then suddenly she was sacked and the reason given for her dismissal was that she could not get along with other members of the staff. This excuse may have been believable if she had just recently started working for the company, but I was unable to accept that it could take them three years to discover this fact. Even though employment conditions were not encouraging at that time, and therefore there was little likelihood of her co-workers risking their own jobs in her defence, the company very nearly had a mass walk-out. The situation was saved by an executive stating that she had been warned about her “attitude” previously and had done nothing to change it. That her co-workers accepted the executive’s word and not hers simply reinforces my argument that capitalist society, including the capitalist-controlled education system, has done well its job of dividing workers hierarchically and accepting the ideology that superior ability is the reason for this division. The executive was much higher in this office hierarchy and so therefore must be right!

After this episode it was quite obvious to me that there was absolutely no chance of advancing my position within the company and, as this company was considered progressive and up-to-date, obviously little chance elsewhere. Over a period of time I found myself unwilling to be used as a stepping stone for my superior’s advancement, to passively accept someone

"The entire capitalist economic system is a fluid structure of real and potential concrete labor tasks that the worker is forced into and out of depending on underlying and immediate market conditions ...."

One way to increase productive labor relatively is to change or modify the division of labor within a capitalist enterprise with the result that more values and surplus values are produced. This normally takes the form of specializing work functions and dividing up the labor process with the aim of expanding values without any change in total labor-time.


else using my labor to their own ends. I could not articulate my resentment, I simply felt that somehow I had been cheated of my rights. I decided to apply for entry to teachers' college. I would solve all my personal problems by changing one career for another, little knowing that this change would not solve my existing problems but would open my eyes to a great many social problems I never knew existed.

At college, as I have related earlier, I discovered *The Communist Manifesto* and from there went on to read other socialist articles and books which opened my eyes to the inbuilt inequality that exists in our capitalist society. I hope I have shown within these pages how my education strengthened and supported the capitalist ideology of individual differences of ability being the reason for success or failure, and also that women somehow are preordained to be submissive, take orders, and not challenge male authority. If this is true of the education system, and I believe it is, how is it possible that I now rebel against this ideology? The answer, when looked for, is quite simple. The two ideologies are antagonistic. If you believe one, then the other must be rejected. Both cannot be correct. By discovering that my ability would have no bearing on my success, or lack of it, I first of all blamed my sex but later found I could not accept that explanation. After all, had I not also been taught that ability and productive effort are all that are needed to gain success in our society, no matter who you are? When leaving aside sexual differences and simply looking at the opportunities for members of the working class, as compared with the ruling class, it became quite obvious that our eventual place in society is not determined by individual ability but by the class structure of capitalism.

To enable me to write this article I have had to pull aside all the complexities and look for the basic forces that have affected my life until now. But even when this has been done, contradictions remain. I am a working class woman, but I must have been influenced in some way by my father whose background was not of the working class. If I, and my mother, had not seen the power, esteem, and advantages given to him because of his more extensive education, who could say with any degree of certainty what I would be doing with my life now. If I had not changed suburbs and schools I may never have come to the stage in my life when one capitalist ideology clashed with another so markedly that it made me question the whole of capitalist society.

But no matter where I lived or what I was doing, as a member of the working class I would have come across these ideological contradictions at some time in my life. A society with different sets of values for different occasions and different people cannot hope to forever hide them. When the time comes for testing the validity of all the fancy cliches bandied about in our society, and the facts of life do not fit the theories, is it any wonder that anger and disillusionment are the result. That the education system, even with all its contradictions, does the job of reinforcing capitalist ideology very well is proved by my continual acceptance of many of its tenets. I still find I cannot completely reject the idea that even with all its faults it is the best we can hope for.

Even while writing this I realise that if capitalism is to continue that is just the kind of ideology they need desperately to have me believe, but I cannot wipe out thirty-odd years of indoctrination in a few months. But capitalism be warned - my story isn't finished yet!

…”The student-teacher relationship resembles the relationship that primary routinized workers have to management and to engineering and scientific personnel.... However, the teacher’s authority to extract ‘labor’ from the students derives not merely from a hierarchical relation to them, but also from superior knowledge and expertise. Thus in technical, intellectual matters the teacher is always assumed to be infallible.”

M.A. Carter, *Contradiction and Correspondence.*
British Communists on Homosexuality

The following is a speech by Dave Cook, National Organiser of the CPGB, to the Executive Committee of that party, meeting on September 11 and 12, 1976. The speech is followed by a statement adopted by the committee at the meeting.

Homosexual men and women in Britain face discrimination and oppression in law, behaviour and attitudes - especially in the widely held belief that homosexuality is a sickness; something that is abnormal or indecent.

On the rare occasions that gay people are shown in the media they are either figures of fun or seriously disturbed people. There are very few portrayals of gay lifestyles with which homosexuals can identify.

The idea that homosexuals are likely to corrupt children, or to assault them, has been shown to be false by social and psychological research. People do not become homosexuals through association with older homosexuals.

Nor are homosexual people any more likely to interfere with children than are heterosexuals. Yet the widespread acceptance of these ideas means that the courts do not give lesbian mothers the custody of their own children and also leads to harassment of gays in jobs dealing with children such as teaching and social work. In Tower Hamlets, NALGO are at present fighting the case of a victimised gay social worker.

Anyone, in any type of employment, who comes out openly as gay, can jeopardise their future. Often many suffer instant dismissal. This results in a situation where gay people are forced to deny, or to conceal their homosexuality in order to stay in their jobs.
The majority of gay people feel they have to live secret, guilty lives, alienated from the society in which they live. Some have accepted the idea that they are sick and are appalled by their own sexuality.

This has helped to reinforce people's ideas that homosexuals are neurotic and disturbed. It is important that since the gay movement has asserted that homosexuality is within the normal spectrum of sexuality, many gay people have felt self-respect for the first time.

Oppression also takes a more violent form for many - such as physical assault and abuse, and police harassment. Over recent months violent attacks have been made on three Gay Centres in London.

The resolution on women adopted at our last national Congress committed the party to fight sexist attitudes wherever they appear.

These hostile attitudes to homosexuals are essentially sexist.

Their basis is firstly that men and women are expected to perform clear cut roles in economic, social and cultural life. Homosexuality threatens this and questions traditional ideas about sexual identity. Secondly ideas about the unnaturalness of homosexuality arise from the belief that all sexual relations between people of the same sex are unnatural because they do not lead to procreation.

Although only a small minority of homosexuals have been involved in it, the gay movement has led thousands of people to political conclusions which question capitalism. The fight for homosexual rights developed mainly in Germany and England during the last half of the 19th century.

Today in Britain the movement has several parts; the Campaign for Homosexual Equality (CHE), which grew out of the campaign to reform the law on homosexuals in the 1960s. The Gay Liberation Front developed in response to increasing openness and militancy by gay people, particularly in the USA. There are also lesbian groups and conferences and Gay Societies in Colleges and Universities.

CHE now has a membership of between 5,000 and 6,000 and 130 branches. The fortnightly newspaper Gay News, now in its fourth year, has a circulation of 20,000.

There are the beginnings of involvement in the labour and trade union movement, with the formation of unofficial gay groups in several trade unions, gay participation in left demos, and particularly in anti-fascist activity. Gay workers' conferences have been held.

We as Marxists are concerned with all aspects of oppression. The tasks of winning the working class to play a leading part in the struggle for socialism; of raising the political understanding of working people and of bringing together into anti-monopoly unity the various progressive social and political forces - all these three objectives will themselves be divided and held back if the oppression for example of women, of racial minorities and all other oppressed minorities, homosexuals included, is not actively opposed by the working class.

In this sense the fight on behalf of oppressed minorities in society, is not only for the "benefit" of these minorities. It is also part of the struggle to raise the political understanding and unity of the working people as a whole. The process of discussing, understanding and combatting the oppression experienced by minorities in society can help people to recognise and to understand the ideas and the forces which oppress all working people.

The party must declare itself totally opposed to discrimination and oppression against homosexuals. In the socialist Britain which is our goal, we want the oppression of homosexuals to have no place.

We need to recognise that this means that we must help to oppose sexist and anti-gay, attitudes wherever they occur, including in our own party.

We need to recognise that much more than changes in law will be necessary to achieve homosexual liberation - but, as in the fight against racism and discrimination against women, campaigns to change the law can themselves become powerful reinforcements to the process of changing attitudes.
Finally to assist these changes in law and attitudes we should set up a committee to promote discussion and analysis and to help our gay comrades play a part in the gay movement and this could be paralleled in the districts where the District Committee feels it would be helpful.

* * *

STATEMENT ADOPTED ON SEPTEMBER 11-12:

The Communist Party opposes discrimination and victimisation against homosexuals, and supports the following changes in law:

No distinction

The criminal law should not distinguish homosexual activities from heterosexual activities. This means that...

(a) The law should be the same in Scotland and Northern Ireland as it is in England and Wales.

(b) Homosexual acts should be legal for men and women in the armed forces and on merchant ships.

(c) The age of consent should be the same as for heterosexual acts, with the same allowance for a "reasonable belief" that the other party was over age.

(d) Penalties for indecent assault should be the same if the victim is a male as if the victim is a female.

(e) The definition of privacy should be the same as for heterosexual acts.

(f) It should not be an offence to publish contact advertisements for homosexual relationships.

(g) No enactment or by-law should prohibit conduct between persons of the same sex if it does not also prohibit similar conduct between persons of opposite sexes.

No discrimination

Just as there has been legislation to outlaw discrimination on the grounds of sex or race, so legislation should be passed to outlaw discrimination on the grounds of sexual orientation in the following fields:

(a) Employment - to cover recruitment, training, promotion and job security.

(b) Education, including professional training and qualifications.

(c) The provision of goods, facilities and services, especially in housing and in places for meetings, conferences and socials.

Beyond law

It is important to recognise that much more than legal reform is necessary to achieve homosexual liberation.

Homosexuality should no longer be regarded as a mental illness in itself requiring aversion therapy.

Gay parents should not be excluded from having custody of their children on the grounds that they do not live a conventional heterosexual way of life.

There should be sex education and social studies curricula in schools that include free discussion of homosexuality. There should be no ban of speakers from gay organisations addressing school and college students.

Police harassment of gay people should stop.

A fundamental change in attitude will require political struggle and work to change the general climate of opinion which is hostile to, or derisive of, homosexuals. In this, the campaign to end the oppression of homosexuals in law can make a major contribution.

We must help to combat sexist and anti-gay attitudes wherever they are found, including among the left, in the labour movement and in our own party.

The Communist Party supports the right of people to be actively and openly gay, and gives support and encouragement to gay comrades to work in the gay movement.

In order to assist these changes in law and attitude, the Communist Party will establish a committee to promote discussion and analysis on gay rights, and assist the party in activity on these questions.
John Gurley has an impeccable background as a 'straight' economist having been managing editor of the prestigious journal the American Economic Review from 1963 to 1968, but his writings on China since the late 1960's have been those of a committed leftist disillusioned with the answers provided by conventional economics. The book under review contains eight essays of uneven length and interest, ranging from a short consideration of the Chinese financial system to a long account of the formation of Mao's economic strategy in the base areas before Liberation. It is an odd collection. No less than five of the essays have been published before, and the most important of them (chapter 1) has already been widely read and is still easily available. Chapter 3 consists entirely of book reviews and takes up almost one-third of the whole volume. The essays do not progress logically from one subject to another, and the major themes appear in much the same form in several places.

What of the content? At its heart is Gurley's deep concern with the inadequacies of capitalist development in the third world, and he is quite rightly most impressed by the experience of China since 1949. He wrote an influential piece on this subject in the late 1960's. It is this which forms the first and I think the most important chapter of the book. It was written at a time when to express sympathy for China was regarded as 'dangerous' rather than 'chic'. Its central message is simple and powerfully expressed: "The truth is that China over the past two decades has made very remarkable economic advances (though not steady) on almost all fronts. The basic overriding economic fact about China is that for twenty years it has fed, clothed, and housed everyone, has kept them healthy and has educated most. Millions have not starved; sidewalks and streets have not been covered with multitudes of sleeping, hungry, and illiterate human beings; millions are not disease-ridden. To find such deplorable conditions one does not look to China these days but rather to India, Pakistan, and almost anywhere else in the underdeveloped world. These facts are so basic, so fundamentally important, that they completely dominate China’s economic picture, even if one grants all of the erratic and irrational policies alleged by its numerous critics." (p.13).

No matter which period one looks at in China's post-Liberation history this story is basically true; it is an enormous achievement. Moreover, the dilemmas of capitalist development in the third world are still with us to-day. A recent World Bank annual report noted that while many underdeveloped countries had achieved respectable growth rates, "statistics conceal the gravity of the underlying economic and social problems, which are typified by severely skewed income distribution, excessive levels of unemployment, high rates of infant mortality, low rates of literacy, serious malnutrition, and widespread ill-health." (quoted in Gurley, pp.259-60). Gurley emphasises the fact that the Chinese achievement is dependent on the political revolution of 1949 which brought into being a planned economy controlled by a group of people sympathetic to improving the livelihood of the mass of the population. He is surely correct in his scepticism concerning the possible applications of the 'Chinese strategy' in a piecemeal context in countries that have not undergone that political revolution (chapter 8: Is the Chinese Model Diffusible?).

I think that real problems occur when Gurley moves beyond this level of analysis. In the first place he focuses almost entirely on Mao personally. Of course no-one could seriously deny that Mao is the most important character in Chinese politics since Liberation (and indeed in the twentieth century), but his policies have by no means met with uncritical acceptance either inside or outside the party. Gurley comes close at times to implying that 'Mao's strategy' and the 'Chinese strategy' are synonymous, and he certainly does not provide an adequate account of the intense struggles inside the party over the correct 'line' to pursue, yet these have been at the centre of post-Liberation politics. Thus I think one would be hard-put from Gurley's book to make head or tail of the events in China over the last year or so. I do not think this can be entirely blamed on an excessive concentration on the positions adopted by Mao, since a full consideration of those should involve
an analysis of the conflicts out of which Mao's approach has evolved.

Frankly, insofar as Gurley does attempt an answer to these and similar questions, he does not progress far beyond the level of clichés: 'The post-revolutionary Chinese economy has been distinguished primarily by the political power of the workers and peasants and their control of the production process' (p.121); 'a distinctive feature of Maoism is its mass line', which is a method of involving the masses in policy formulation and implementation' (p.71); 'within the framework of Marxism-Leninism, individuals (in China) are involved in a dynamic process of gaining freedom, in the sense of becoming fully aware of the world around them, responding rationally to it, and engaging in active decision-making in regard to their own lives' (p.8), and so on. There is no doubt that they have tried hard to achieve them; indeed, the attempt to do this in a poor backward country is an important one for a socialist to understand. However, the Maoists have been heavily circumscribed in their attempts by China's underdevelopment and by the need for strong control economically and politically to lift her out of it in a relatively humane fashion. A more suitable analysis of Maoism is surely one which brings out the tensions and contradictions of its objectives rather than one that effectively sweeps them under the carpet.

I thought that there were serious flaws in this book in other respects also. Firstly, virtually no mention is made throughout its 325 pages of China's foreign policy, other than in relation to the Soviet Union. At the very least, China's actions need explaining. Gurley chides the bourgeois social scientists for not following Hegel's dictum, 'the truth is the whole' (p.11) but he does not do so himself. Secondly, his characterisation of the Soviet Union suffers from the same tendency noted above, namely to simply accept what the translated Chinese press says. We are told in good Peking Review style that a 'capitalist restoration' has occurred in Russia (p.205). To characterise a society in which there is virtually no private ownership of the means of production and in which production is primarily for use not exchange, as a 'capitalist' society, is surely a gross misuse of the word 'capitalist'. Unquestionably, there are classes in the Soviet Union, with 'congealed' inequalities in the distribution of control over the means of production and of personal income, but so were there in slave and feudal societies.

A third flaw I feel is his treatment of the peasant questions. There is obviously a populist strand to Mao's thinking, but I think Gurley caricatures Mao's view when he says that 'Maoism is a vision of rusticity, of social development in thousands of small but integrated units, each springing from the uncorrupted soil of the countryside' (pp.227-8). China has indeed pursued a policy of developing small scale rural industries and has tried to limit the growth of large cities. There is a sound
economic rationale behind both of these policies, at least at the present stage of development. However, the impact of these policies should not be exaggerated. It is estimated, for example, that in 1972 the small-scale sector contributed under 10 per cent of total factory output value in China, and that the industrial output value of the three largest cities (Peking, Shanghai and Tientsin) has grown rapidly throughout the post-Liberation period (total output in billions of 1952 yuan: 1952 - 9; 1957 - 19.6; 1973 - 94.9). (2) I think Gurley (perhaps unintentionally) misleads the unwary reader into imagining that heavy, large-scale, urban industries have been de-emphasised in China in a way that they have not been: Mao, after all, advocated ‘walking on two legs’, not one.

Related to this is his approach to the Cultural Revolution, where he appears to be simply factually wrong. He claims that ‘the real locus of power’ for Mao in the Cultural Revolution was ‘the peasants in the socialist countryside’ (pp.221-1) and that Mao ‘called upon the peasants in the socialist countryside and young people everywhere to transform the cities from capitalist into socialist centres’ (p.22). He even suggests that while Mao’s ‘peasant based movement had implanted socialism with some success in the countryside (in the 1950s), ... the urban areas had still not been fully incorporated into the socialist movement’ (p.22). This really is a strange view. Most sources stress that the impact of the Cultural Revolution in the countryside was much less than in the towns. Moreover, far from being more socialist than the urban areas, I think it is quite clear that peasant conservatism has been one of the fundamental problems for China since Liberation. China has resolved the production question much better than the Soviet Union did, but has still been left with an ideological ‘Achilles Heel’ in the shape of a relative stasis in production relations in the countryside since the early 1960s, when, far from being the bastion of socialism, there was a widespread breakdown of the collective economy. One has only to look at the strength of support for the ‘Gang of Four’ in the countryside relative to the towns to realise the inaccuracy of Gurley’s view (the base of their support has come from the Shanghai workers).

What then are we left with? Despite the shortcomings I have indicated, it remains the case that this is an eminently readable collection of essays, by someone who feels deeply about the problems of underdevelopment. It also has some penetrating insights into the economic rationale for China’s development policy. It does, however, leave me disappointed yet again at the failure of a left-winger to produce a genuine ‘political economy’ analysis of China’s development since Liberation. On the other hand, there are those socialists who are correctly critical of China at the superstructural level, but who fail to attribute adequate importance to the enormous achievements at other levels, who often inadequately assess the constraints within which poor countries such as China operate, and who frequent fail to recognise the serious attempts made under Mao to resolve the very shortcomings that they highlight. (3) I can think of only one work, that by Franz Schurmann (Ideology and Organisation in Communist China) (4) that comes close to the breadth of vision that a socialist analysis requires.

FOOTNOTES

- PETER NOLAN

* * *

"War when you are at it, is horrible and dull."

This is a book about a horrible war waged against black people by conspirators in foreign wealthy countries. The black people, like so many people before them, are seeking their dignity and their birthright as human beings - to be free and independent.

The conspirators, playing their ageless role to put down the search for freedom, the search for peace and independence, have recourse to only that which is available to them. No longer can some phoney war be waged. The authors show why, with great insight.

Instead, the so-called soldier of fortune must be sought: persons trained in modern weaponry in the most sophisticated armies… men whose career for some reason or another is ended in the army which trained them. Despised by the professional soldier and private citizen alike, they are recruited to put down the freedom-seeking black nationalists.

Angola, and the trial in June 1976 at Luanda of the thirteen British and American mercenaries: the authors of this valuable historic work are at the trial. Professor Derek Roebuck, a lawyer-academic-author is there as, a member of the International Commission of Inquiry on Mercenaries. Wilfred Burchett who has so far refused to be burnt at the stake by the CIA is there as a journalist with an unequalled record as a war correspondent and an expert in Asian affairs. At the invitation of the Commission, the authors have written this book.

One of the captured mercenaries, a former Mafia enforcer in the USA, coined the phrase "The Whores of War". The authors have had recourse to this metaphor to give a title to the book. It is an unfortunate choice and tends to take away some merit from this outstanding treatise. The title is confusing, sexist and, despite protestations to the contrary, is insensitive to women and their struggle for freedom and independence in male-dominated society.

Nevertheless, the authors who, as a deliberative act, have avoided the 'soldier of fortune' description of the mercenaries, go to great lengths to explain their use of the title and, in the long run, they are probably correct in their difficult choice of a title.

“In each case economic power is abused to hire human bodies with specific intentions of avoiding public association with them and the responsibility for their welfare, and using money to exploit their moral weakness.” (Preface).

A critic of Wilfred Burchett once said of him that he wrote like a bricklayer, to which Burchett replied that he did not find that offensive for, as he saw it, he picked up each fact like a brick, one by one, and carefully cemented them together into a whole. A strong undeniable whole that would stand any attack as to the truth in what he had to say. And so it is with this book. Burchett and Roebuck: just a couple of brickies putting things together.

It is certain that these two outstanding socialists would use that. No one who reads the book will be disappointed. It is a book written by two outstanding craftsmen, written objectively, without passion. The facts themselves damn the evildoers.

Professor Roebuck has made a special contribution in the closing chapters of the book in looking at the law generally as it attempts to deal in various countries with the legality or illegality of recruiting mercenaries to engage in a war in which their own country is not involved. Recruited to serve in a foreign army in a war against a country to which their own country declares itself to be on friendly terms.

The expose of the refusal of the countries concerned to stop the extensive advertising for, and engagement of, mercenaries, either within the existing law or new legislation, is challenging to all Australians, but particularly Australian lawyers.

It has been said: “Yet there is a souring of respect for law and the men who work it. Where there should be enthusiasm there is indifference. Where there should be understanding there is distrust. What should be a refuge in affliction is often a source of distress. And, even as its prestige declines, new dangers press in on every hand. The law is in a crisis as never before and freedom consequently in the direst peril.”

(The Law in Crisis, C.G. Weeramantry.)

At a time when the contemporary bourgeois interpretations and evaluations of the theory of justice are being subjected to stress in their everyday application, there is increasingly a highly developed marxian criticism of the theory, especially in socialist countries. This criticism, of course, is not a one-way street.

However, Professor Roebuck, with great restraint, paints a picture that must make even the most conservative lawyer uneasy.

In Australia, not only were the contracts advertised, they were subject to special interview programs on national television.

In England and the USA, the situation was much worse. And yet the position has not been
remedied, but the reader should accept the facts as produced and ponder upon them. Who, indeed, are the conspirators? Who finances their expensive operations? Who could possibly put 'Colonel Callan' in charge of operations?

Four death sentences, three thirty-year sentences, three twenty-four year sentences - but the conspirators are free - hiding in the shadows of almost anonymity. Only the CIA is really identified.

The last paragraph of the introduction reads: "The tawdry and sinister image of the mercenary must be contrasted with that of the liberator: the man or woman who takes up arms only when convinced that all else has failed and when the unbearable oppression of others compels the moral decision to use retaliatory force. The inadequate bully stands against the ordinary man, not just the prepared revolutionary but the ordinary worker in field or factory for whom fighting is a horrifying intrusion into his life......Sende Isabel and Andrew Gordon McKenzie: the pregnant peasant woman and her brutal unwanted intruder. May Sende Isabel's child grow up in a world in which the mercenary monster has no place!"

These brickies have done well. Don't miss it.

- Roy Turner.

Civilisation at the Crossroads: social and human implications of the scientific and technological revolution, $4.50 (300 pp.), 1969.

Some copies of this very important pioneering work are still available. Published by ALR in 1969, the book is the work of a Czechoslovak interdisciplinary research team headed by Radovan Richta. It appeared late in 1967 in Czechoslovakia and undoubtedly resulted from the deep concern with the crisis in economy, politics and ideology which came to a head there at that time.

Its findings in turn provided the theoretical basis for the Action Program developed by the Czechoslovak Communist Party to meet that crisis.

These national aspects do not, however, detract from the universality of the problems dealt with. The book is a first-class piece of research: and analysis about issues confronting all advanced industrial societies, as apt today as it was when published. Over 300 pages of text are supplemented by extensive tables and references. At today's prices, it is selling cheaply.

Antonio Gramsci: The Man, His Ideas, by Alastair Davidson (100 pp.), 1969. $2.

This short book was one of the first works published in English about the life and work of the Italian marxist thinker and communist leader. It is still a valuable reference for those interested in Gramsci's contribution to marxist thought and socialist politics.

A NOTE TO CONTRIBUTORS

ALR is only too happy to receive contributions on any subject of interest to the left and the labor movement. We prefer the length to be less than 5,000 words but exceptions are made in special cases.

We prefer articles, on whatever subject, to be accessible to all interested readers prepared to make an effort, and therefore request that unnecessary jargon or 'academese' be avoided. For time and space considerations, we reserve the right to cut articles where this does not affect the basic sense of the discussion. Occasionally we propose style or sub-editing changes but only in consultation with the author(s). We ask that all manuscripts be typed, double-spaced, on paper no larger than quarto size.

We ask those authors who do not hear from us about publication of their articles in a reasonable time to recognise that this is purely due to pressure of other work on our small collective. Usually we have not forgotten you.

APPEAL FOR BACK NUMBERS

Remaining gaps in our stock of back numbers have now been filled with the exception of numbers 36 and 38. We make a special appeal to readers who might have copies of these two issues which they no longer require to send them to us so that requests for them can be met. In addition, we would still be grateful for copies of numbers 29, 32 and 41, as numbers of these held by us are still small.
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A New Australian Left Review Publication

The Debate on ....
“EUROCOMMUNISM”

Documents and articles from overseas publications, as well as contributions to the discussion by Australian writers.

$1.00 per copy.
Available from Australian Left Review, Box A247, Sydney South P.O., Sydney. 2000; or from Left bookshops listed on this page.

JOSEF SMRKOVSKY
(An unfinished conversation)

The story of the Czechoslovakian invasion of 1968, as told by an insider.
At the time of the invasion Josef Smrkovsky was Chairman of the National Assembly of Czechoslovakia.
He tells of the events leading to the "Prague Spring", the negotiations with the Soviet leaders, the occupation, the forced flight to Moscow, the events there, and the subsequent developments.

Price: $1.00 plus postage (24c. within Australia)

Orders for all these publications to:
ALR, Box A247, Sydney South PO, Sydney. 2000.
A new course is not a blueprint. It's a spotlight on the possibilities.

It focuses on the grim facts of Australia in 1977, and throws into relief what lies behind them. It explains, in commonsense terms, how our economic crisis and the lingering malaise of our social life are built into a system dominated by the power of large corporations.

Its inescapable conclusion is that Australia needs to follow a new course, based on a new kind of power. That is the power of ordinary people, in factories, offices and communities, acting together, building their ability to control the things affecting their own lives.

But this kind of document does more than assert the need for a new kind of power - any wall slogan can do that. It spells out the possibilities for it. It looks at the system's inner workings, pinpoints the levers which a mass movement can wield to bring corporate power under popular control.

Until that power is brought under control, the problems facing Australia in economic, political and social life will continue to fester.

Tackling the problems

Proposals are put forward to tackle those problems. They are tentative and are offered for discussion. The titles for the various sections of the publication are:

- The malaise - something is seriously wrong;
- What's behind it - unions, government, greed, what?
- Hard facts of economic power;
- The corporate-led crisis;
- Tackling corporate power - where its strategic levers are.

Programs to help tackle these problems include:

The economy; the workplace; Transport; Building; Health; Media; Energy; Democracy.

Others yet to be printed are Women; Migrants and International Affairs. Still more are being worked on.