

Needless to say these men would not be believed for a moment on any other topic than Russia. The average Australian bourgeois would not trust a finger to a person of Krivitsky's (alias Ginsberg's) antecedents; he would not let Valtin, alias Krebs, take his daughter to the pictures; he would not trust his own person, alone on a dark night, to a gangster with Trotsky's self-proclaimed contempt for "vegetarian-Quaker prattle about the sanctity of human life." But he will cheerfully allow people of that moral and intellectual calibre to determine his (and if possible Australia's) attitude to the world's second strongest Power. And he will be confirmed in this by the assurance of clever men at the University, whose business it is to know, that Lyons, Trotsky and Eastman, Souvarine and Krivitsky are still among the most reliable "authorities" on Russia.

When I lectured about this at the University last year my preference for authorities of some standing and reputation, as opposed to the more flamboyant characters of the New York underworld, was laughed at by the assembled W.E.A. bureaucracy as intellectual snobbery derived from my Oxford training! That's what has happened to the University under the successors of the great scholars who once taught there.

You will see then that I am not insisting that the W.E.A. or the University should only publish material "favorable to Russia." I'm not even asking for elementary fairness to the labor movement, Socialism and the Soviet Union. I know capitalist Universities well enough not to cherish so impossibly Utopian a dream. All I venture to suggest is that the disparity between the tutors' treatment of the Soviet, and of other subjects should not be so blatant; that their apologies for fascism and their attacks on democracy should be a little less obviously damaging to the morale of a nation fighting fascism and defending democracy; and finally that they should purge from their list of authorities on world affairs the more notorious members of the international rogues' gallery.

INTELLECTUALS AND THE PARTY

(L. H. GOULD)

THE PROBLEM STATED:—One special aspect of the relation of the intellectuals to our Party was raised when 17 of our artist comrades met recently in Sydney. They requested the Central Committee for permission to form themselves into an Artists' Branch. Arguments in support were that their present membership in locality branches restricted their art activity, that many had joined the Party "on the basis of their art work and interests," and that their greatest value to the Party and the whole of the Labor-democratic movement would be best served by concentrating all their Party activity within the various art bodies and movements with which they were associated. Furthermore, difficulties would be encountered in recruiting, and then consolidating, new members from among other artists if these, too, were to be assigned to locality or industrial branches. Preoccupation with municipal affairs and politics would result in a deterioration of their artistic ability, lower their prestige among fellow-artists, and finally, deny them the opportunity of achieving what both these comrades individually and the Party collectively desire, the all-round encouragement and advancement of art.

But there's the other view, one based on long Party experience. Our Party is designated as the party of the proletariat (or industrial workers). Our Socialist objective is based on the experience, the needs, conditions of work and organization of the proletariat. The proletariat is the leading social force, the hegemon, in the struggle for emancipation; its natural allies are the working farmers, professional workers, artists, small business people, civil servants. But only proletarian theory and practice, only proletarian vision, cohesion and discipline can guarantee the triumph of Socialism. Those who join our ranks are required, quite irrespective of

Will you agree that this is not exactly a gigantic request?

Frankly, I don't believe the University is of supreme importance. As Harry Gould points out in this issue of the Review, the working class has found its own intellectual leaders here as in Russia; it doesn't depend on middle class recruits from the Universities though it welcomes them. Breaking from the W.E.A. in N.S.W., it has been able to launch, through the Labor Council in Sydney and Newcastle, its own educational schemes.

But I still think it would be good if we could have more light and less heat from what is, after all, this State's official centre of learning. It's not right that the simplest issues before the people should be regularly obscured by clouds of prejudice emanating from our official enlighteners. It's not the best thing for Sydney's reputation that one of her University lecturers should at this late stage solemnly voice, as though it were newly discovered, the most ancient excuse for tyranny, that ordinary people aren't capable of deciding what is good for them.

"Since the appearance of fascism, are we prepared to assume that men are rational in this sense, that each man is the best judge of what is good for him? Recent events have caused many to lose faith in this assumption," says Partridge.

Just now the Australian people, like so many others in this world so tired of its liberties, are showing an intense desire for knowledge. Among other things they want to know about Russia—they want the truth uncolored by political prejudice. They turn to Sydney University as one place where they might find it and what do they get?

Trotsky, Souvarine, Krivitsky, Lyons, Eastman... as purveyed by Professor John Anderson, Mr. Partridge, Mr. Passmore, Dr. Duncan, Mr. Davern.

Don't you think something could be done about it?

social background or vocation, to accept the Party program which, to repeat for the necessary emphasis, has its tap-root in the solid earth of proletarian experience and struggle. The new member becomes a proletarian by the fact of his membership, his acceptance of the Party program, rights and duties. And Party experience has demonstrated that, always allowing for certain exceptions, organization of members into special branches "isolates" them from the proletarian heart and core of the Party. In answer to the argument that artists in locality branches may lose touch with art (which is quite a valid point in itself) there is the contrary argument that special branches of artists, or of scientists, civil servants, etc., will make for a diminution of proletarian perspective, discipline and force; more accurately, proletarianism will never be attained because of that "isolation." In short, assignment to such special branches would tend towards perpetuating specific weaknesses which Marxist associates with the social class from which those members usually come.

For a better understanding of "the problem of the intelligentsia," and because of its importance, the historical background should be examined.

x x x x x

HISTORICAL:—In the general acceptance of the term, intellectuals (or "intelligentsia") refers to the writer, doctor, artist, scientist, all of whom form an important section of capitalist society. They are men of education, specialists who perform important functions in business, state administration, in the arts and sciences. In Marxist literature, however, the term has a particular meaning. "Intellectual" applies not only to the writers, artists, scientists per se, but to any person of

non-proletarian birth or vocation who adopts the proletarian standpoint in the class struggle, one who actively identifies himself with revolutionary Socialism. The "problem of the intellectuals" arises from a contradiction, a paradox. These men of education, and sometimes of talent and genius, are based economically on the capitalist class. They get their living by serving the exploiters. "The bourgeoisie has converted the physician, the lawyer, the priest, the poet, the man of science, into its paid wage laborers."—Manifesto of the Communist Party. Intellectuals manage the capitalist's business enterprises, invent new machines for him, argue his lawsuits in court, write books, paint pictures. They have an economic stake in the perpetuation of exploitative society; ideologically and spiritually, the intelligentsia become part and parcel of capitalism. Literature, paintings and other "spiritual productions" reflect largely the morals and tastes of Moneybags. Intellectuals do not compose a class, because in social origin they come from all classes and sub-classes. Economically and ideologically, they have greater links with the capitalists and landlords than with the toiling people. Politically, they vacillate between the workers and capitalists.

But now the paradox. Scientific Socialism, Marxism, came to the proletarians, not from among themselves, but from the non-proletarian intelligentsia. Socialism came to the workers "from without," from thinkers and humanitarians among the middle and upper classes who revolted against the abomination of masses of people suffering want in the midst of plenty. "If one chose to be an ox," wrote Marx to a friend, "one could of course turn one's back on the agonies of mankind and look after one's skin."

Lenin wrote: "The history of all countries shows that the working class, exclusively by its own effort, is able to develop only trade union consciousness, i.e., it may itself realize the necessity for combining in unions, for fighting against the employers and for striving to compel the government to pass necessary labor legislation, etc. The theory of Socialism, however, grew out of the philosophic, historical and economic theories that were elaborated by the educated representatives of the propertied classes, the intellectuals. According to their social status, the founders of modern scientific Socialism, Marx and Engels, themselves belonged to the bourgeois intelligentsia."—"What Is To Be Done?"

Lenin and Stalin, too, were non-proletarian in social origin. But in terms of lifelong devotion to the proletarian cause, and the superlative genius of their leadership, Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin become the greatest proletarians in history. Many great names in the Russian revolutionary working-class movement belong to men of non-proletarian stock, such as Molotov, Kalfin, Litvinov, Gorky and others. By joining the Party, everyone becomes a proletarian. In formulating his plan for what became the Bolshevik Party, Lenin said: "The organizations of revolutionaries must consist first and foremost of people whose profession is that of a revolutionary... In view of this common feature of the members of such an organization, all distinctions as between workers and intellectuals, and certainly distinctions of trade and profession, must be obliterated."—"What Is to Be Done?" Lenin's emphasis.)

This is explicit. But the contradiction of the historical need of the workers to obtain their Socialist theory from outside their ranks still requires elucidation. The answer is that Socialism, being a science, demands mastery of economics, philosophy, history, the arts and sciences—academic qualifications for which being beyond the capacity of the workers of mid-19th century Europe. When Marx produced "Capital," he knew that the workers of that period would not (not just then!) be capable of reading and understanding so profound a work. "Capital" was to be read and mastered, in those days, only by specialists like himself, by other sympathetic intellectuals who, through favorable personal circumstances, enjoyed the necessary academic training. But from the earliest days of his leadership of the workers in Europe and

America, Marx initiated the struggle for improvements in their economic conditions, including the shorter working day, first for its own sake, to mitigate one of the worst features of capitalist exploitation; second, to enable the workers to obtain the tempering and training in organized struggle; and third, to secure for themselves the leisure time for study. Marx emphasized that so long as the workers slaved ten to twelve hours daily in the factories, there could be no hope of emancipation. Only through their own efforts—in organization, persistent struggle and themselves mastering revolutionary theory—would the Socialist revolution triumph.

(The historical materialist can point to the relation between leisure and culture in the evolution of society, Greece, Rome and other ancient empires were slaveholding societies. But the institution of slavery afforded the ruling classes leisure time for art and science, thus creating the basis for an acceleration of mankind's social and cultural development in later epochs. The advent of capitalism, with its enormously high industrial technique, provided the opportunity for all members of society to enjoy a cultured life, one where every citizen can be "thinker as well as doer." But the prerequisites must be people's control over production and all the means of life.)

"Capital" was produced in 1867. Decades of struggle since then have witnessed remarkable advances by the Labor movement in most countries. Not only in the Soviet Union, where the workers captured power, but in other lands as well are thousands of proletarians who have mastered economics, history, philosophy—the science of Socialism. Eighty years ago, leadership of the Socialist movement was entirely in the hands of proletarians whose social background was "bourgeois intelligentsia." Some forty years ago, Lenin noted at a congress of Russian Marxists that only four of the 44 delegates present were workers. Today the proletariat produces its own theoreticians and intellectuals. The working class is mature! The leadership of most of the Communist Parties in the world is now composed largely of working-class stock. In terms of social origin, the C.C. of the ACP is almost entirely proletarian. It is interesting to note that in socially backward countries like India and China, the leadership is in the hands of former "bourgeois intellectuals," and for the same reason that obtained in Marx's days. Coolies and their children have no opportunity for attending university! Mao-tse-tung, Chou En-lai, Chu Teh come from China's wealthy upper classes. The last-named joined the Party in Germany, where he went to study.

Socialist Russia offers the example of how the "problem of the intellectual" is finally solved. Under Socialism, the Soviet worker's prospects are unlimited. All society fosters his abilities, encourages his all-round development, and everything is done to help his progress. The worker is stimulated to master the qualifications of an engineer or executive, and to this end is offered every opportunity to study technology and science. Most of the Soviet technicians, engineers and executives come from the working class. Numbers of the Soviet Union's army commanders, organizers and statesmen, of its scientists and writers are of working class stock. This process of mass advance is constantly going on. Millions of yesterday's working men today help to make up the intelligentsia—a body firmly rooted among the people. The distinction between the working class and the intellectuals is beginning to be effaced. Everybody is studying, expanding his talents, developing his abilities. Everybody has the same opportunity to advance, to master the treasures of knowledge and culture.

SOLVING THE PROBLEM:—In the recent period we recruited many thousands of industrial workers, and with them hundreds of intellectuals flocked into the Party. There is no need to dilate here upon the "fate of the middle class" under capitalism, and certainly under fascism. They are the allies of the workers, and their most advanced members take their place in the ranks of the Party. The old society is patently disintegrating

before our eyes; only Socialism presents a certain future. The best that reactionaries can do to offset the shining example of Soviet Russia's achievement in peace and war are the old stand-by of abuse and misrepresentation, and pathetic apologies for the sacred rights of "free enterprise." Occasionally, movements labelled "socialist" or "new order" spring up to trap the unwary, such as Common Wealth in England, headed by well-to-do persons looking for a refined type of Socialism, "something from which the smell of the workshop and oily overalls is absent;" or the H. G. Wells' fantasia of "rules by scientists," or whatever his latest fad may be. Socialism will come only through the mass movement under the leadership of the Communist Party.

And inside the Party? The intellectuals can bring education and talent which most workers as yet lack. But the essential is the proletarian standpoint. Our artist comrades, our scientists, now revolutionaries, must be interested in what is happening in the factories and trade unions, just as the Party member working in industry must understand the problems of the artist, scientist, farmer and housewife.

The antithesis between mental and manual labor in capitalist society frequently results in antagonisms between sections of the democratic masses. (This antagonism sometimes seeps into our ranks; the individual worker believes that because he is an intellectual, he is perforce an unstable Party type! But the "ventilation" of the middle class refers only to their class position in society. If it is a question of individuals, then the workers have also produced their share of weaklings and traitors.) Every member should digest the following from Lenin: "The consciousness of the masses of the workers cannot be genuine class consciousness, unless the workers learn to observe from concrete, and above all from topical, political facts and events, every other social class and all the manifestations of the intellectual, ethical and political life of these classes; unless they learn to apply practically the materialist analysis and the materialist estimate of all aspects of life and activity of all classes, strata and groups of the population." Communism comprehends all phases of social activity and experience. There is no division or conflict. Within the Party, all members

comprise a harmony of collective effort for advancement both in the workshop and the art studio—now under capitalism, later under Socialism.

Every member has his part to play. By the very nature of things, industrial worker comrades are most directly concerned with the conditions of their industry, and their trade union. The job of the artist is naturally in the sphere of art. "We don't want to take good writers and make bad strike leaders out of them," said Earl Browder once to a congress of American writers. But the Party demands that while departmentalising and specialisation are necessary—the ordinary "division of labor"—there can be no Chinese walls within the Party separating problems of art from, say, agrarian problems. Work among women, as has been stated a hundred times, concerns male comrades too. We are first and foremost Communists, Marxists, activists who must master all arms of the class struggle. The intellectual who joins the Party enters an organisation pledged to political struggle in its widest sense; a struggle which embraces all fields of work. Having joined the Party, and having committed himself to a definite political line of action, discipline, he continues his creative work. Within that he must accept the discipline of the Party. Artists who have discovered that the fervor and moral integrity of the revolutionary struggle make for greater art.

Our great Party, with its spirit of unity, democracy and dynamic brotherhood, or struggle for social advancement in every sphere, contains in embryo the features of the Socialist society of the future. As the precursors of the Australian Socialist state to come, both proletarians and intellectuals who join our ranks may be well guided by Stalin's description of the intelligentsia in the land of Socialism: "It is no longer the old hidebound intelligentsia, which tried to place itself above classes, but which actually, for the most part, served the landlords and the capitalists. Our Soviet intelligentsia is an entirely new intelligentsia, which by its very roots is bound up with the working class and the peasantry. . . . Formerly it had to serve the wealthy classes, for it had no alternative. . . . It is now an equal member of Soviet society in which, side by side with the workers and peasants, pulling together with them, it is engaged in building the new classless, Socialist society."

MARXISM, MEDICINE AND TOMORROW

(DR. STEFANIA SIEDLECKY and JOHN O'DONNELL)

RECENT discoveries in medical science, the organisation of knowledge for the defeat of fascism, and interest in the post-war world have focussed the spotlight on this sphere of man's activity. Within the last few weeks we have seen the press announce Professor Florey's return to Australia, new advances in the treatment of tropical disease, fresh fields opened up in the treatment of tropical diseases, fresh fields opened up in the Soviet Union and the Canberra Conference on the future medical services in Australia. Recently, too, we have witnessed the growth of a new, progressive trend in the medical profession and the entry of many medical scientists and practitioners into the Communist Party.

Marxism not only permits us correctly to assess and understand the history of medicine, but also aids in discovery, dialectics being the laws of change or development in their most general form, which are to be drawn both from nature and society. The natural science of the XIXth Century, conditioned by mechanics, developed a rigid mechanistic, un-historical materialism which failed to account for the processes of social change and became increasingly inadequate in natural science until the discovery of radio-activity precipitated a crisis. This mechanistic approach still persists, doing great harm, since it develops a sterile, rigid specialism which prevents a many-sided approach to a problem. It encourages the separation between the physicist and chemist, the physiologist and the surgeon, the X-ray man and the physician.

Marx and Engels studied intensely the results of research in all fields. We see Engels coming to London to make a study of physics which lasted years. Marx doing an experimental course, and the exchange of letters and material with Carl Schorlemmer, the organic chemist. This study confirmed their conception of the world, how it developed and changes. "For in nature nothing happens alone, everything has an effect on something else and vice versa, and it is mostly forgetfulness of this general movement and integration which prevents our investigators of nature seeing the simplest things clearly." (Engels, "Dialectics of Nature.") It is this failure to see things in their relations and inter-connection which mars and frustrates so much medical research. Were scientists as a body conscious of the dialectical nature of things and their interconnection, the enormous time lag between discovery and application would not exist. With the mastery of the knowledge of how change occurs comes the power of scientific prediction. In the hands of medical scientists this means that many errors would be avoided and the significance of some facts would be more fully and more readily appreciated. Thus if our University curriculum were re-arranged to provide real instruction in scientific method and gave more attention to the history of medicine and less time to formal instruction of botany, physiology, etc. in isolation, our medical men would be better equipped to meet the realities of practice.

Marxism postulates that the form of production is the foundation upon which is developed the whole super-structure of law, politics, science, philosophy and religion. Changes in the foundation are reflected in the super-structure. How does this apply to medicine? What lessons are to be drawn from it?

The periods of advance have been the periods of democracy; great medical discoveries have never been made in periods of reaction. A close and organic bond exists between the most progressive forces on the historical stage and those who have contributed most to medicine.

We can plainly recognise five great periods in the history of medicine:—

1. Primitive magical medicine from savagery up to and including the medicine of civilised Egypt.
2. (a) Grecian scientific medicine (Hippocrates); (b) Indian medicine—chiefly surgery; (c) Jewish medicine—chiefly public health from the point of view of sociological pathology; (d) Roman medicine—chiefly engineering and drainage in public health.
3. Early feudal or monastic medicine. Learning kept alive by Byzantines, Arabs and Jews.
4. Renaissance—date feudal. Revival of all learning, particularly Hippocrates—advances.
5. Capitalist: (a) individual discovery; (b) systematised discovery.
6. Socialist medicine.

All periods of changes in the means of production and characterised by revolutionary struggles.

Medicine attained a high technical level in ancient Greece. With the rise of slavery it became the practice for Greek surgeons not to operate but to direct slaves. Not only did the surgeons lose their operative skill but also positive knowledge and ignorance. This fatal divorce-ment of theory and practice annihilated surgery which was re-born in the flush of the revolutionary renaissance. As is well known the decline of Greece and the history of ancient Rome is characterised by a prolonged class struggle in which neither of the contending classes was capable of holding power. Hence the medicine of Europe was fed from the East by the Byzantines, Jews and Arabs who had inherited Grecian knowledge.

The stream from the East continued into the medieval age. Medieval Europe conceived a world made in the image of the Catholic Church, an unchanging hierarchy of things, the universe, a hierarchy of planets and stars revolving about the central earth, the hierarchy of the Church and society revolving around the Pope just as the hierarchy of serfs, peasants, stewards, overlords etc. revolved around the lord of the feudal manor. Within this set-up little or no progress was possible. The revival of learning, the renaissance, was a period of intense, prolonged, bitter class struggle, the prelude to the bourgeois revolution. This was the age and the struggle which threw up Vesalius, the founder of modern scientific anatomy.

Vesalius was the product of his age. His struggle to restore medicine to a scientific basis was itself part of the struggle against feudalism. Thus we see in the young Vesalius the brilliance and versatility so characteristic of the period. It was not enough for him to hear the works of Galen, recited while an ignorant servant carried out the dissection which was too sordid for the lecturer himself to attempt. Robbing graveyards and places of execution, he carried out careful dissections on the human body and prepared the manuscript for his book, "De Humani Corporis Fabrica." Vesalius identified himself with the political struggle and was exiled. For some years he was a Court physician. In the reactionary and artificial atmosphere he rapidly degenerated. He suffered, was aware of his degradation, broke free of this unreal life and was drowned on the way back to fling himself again into the struggle.

This was a class struggle, not the work of one man. Leonardo da Vinci, a true son of his age, contributed to medicine. In this struggle Servetus was executed because

he proclaimed that blood flowed from the heart to the lungs. The bourgeois revolution initiated an enormous expansion, made possible by the new technical developments and social needs. The industrial revolution was reflected in medicine. "If you say technique largely depends on the state of science, science depends far more still on the state and the requirements of technique. If society has a technical need, that helps science forward more than ten universities. The whole of hydrostatics (Torricelli, etc.) was called forth by the necessity for regulating the mountain streams of Italy in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. We have only known anything reasonable about electricity since its technical applicability was discovered." (Engels to Starkenburg, January 20, 1894.)

Hydrostatics underlie Lænnec's discovery of the stethoscope and the subsequent demonstration of blood pressure. The establishment of bourgeois production laid the basis for the new medical science and placed before society the questions it was to answer. Pasteur established bacteriology while solving problems of brewing, Koch and Ehrlich consolidated bacteriology because of the growth of the chemical industry in Europe. "For physiology the decisive factors have been first, the tremendous development of organic chemistry, and secondly the microscope which has only been properly used for the past twenty years." (Engels, letter to Marx from Manchester, July 14, 1868.)

Scientific surgery is developed because of the guarantee of chemical, engineering and other technique. Public health comes into its own and the beginnings of industrial medicine are seen. Here we see the connection between the interests of the bourgeoisie and science and production.

With the concentration of capital comes the systematised discovery of the twentieth century, modern X-ray technique, the dye-derived drugs culminating in the mass production of sulphanilamides, the chemistry of immunity and its wide application, etc. Medical science has over-taken practice, which still retains the form developed by and suitable for early growing capitalism. Hence the crisis in medicine in all countries outside the Soviet Union. The history of medicine in Australia too has been a reflection of our social history. Unfortunately it has yet to be accurately recorded. However, it is important to notice that after the defeat of the labor movement in the '60's the growth of Australian technique, science and medicine was held back. London, the centre of Imperial Britain, dominated Australian economy. Hence from 1895-1925 and later, there was a steady stream of Australian scientific workers, writers, artists, etc., flowing to London. A large percentage of the teaching staff in the medical schools of Oxford, Cambridge, Edinburgh, and other British universities are expatriate Australians.

Professor Florey, who developed the extraction and purification of penicillin, is one of those who went abroad. It is more than symbolic that independent Australian capitalism having emerged, as Lenin worked out in 1918, Florey is brought back to Australia by the Federal Labor Government.

An interesting example of dialectical interpenetration is seen in work now being done in Australia on penicillin. Bacteria have the ability to undergo mutation, i.e., suddenly change their hereditary characters. Thus exposure to certain chemical agents may produce a germ which secretes a given ferment etc. or cause the germ to become resistant. This is one of the dialectical leaps in nature brought about by the transformation of quantity into quality. Such mutations occur outside the laboratory. Already the sulphanilamides are declining because resistant strains of germs are now infecting people. Penicillin resistant strains have been produced. With the extension of the use of penicillin these will increase, so the struggle for mass production of penicillin contains the germ of its own negation within it. If this contradiction is thoroughly grasped, we can fight for the planned use of this drug and organise national research so that the structure of the penicillin molecule may be mapped and variations