

## CONTENTS

Turkey's war against the Kurds. . . . .	2	French tests in the Pacific	3
Mohijir struggles in Pakistan .....		The International Committee has no authority .....	4
Queensland elections .....	8	Vietnam 20 years after victory	6
Close Sydney airport .....	8		

### For a shorter working week

Unemployment is the most serious problem facing working people today. For at least one million, perhaps one million and a half, it means a life of poverty and degradation. As well as the 900,000 or more officially recognised as unemployed we must acknowledge those who don't apply for the dole or who are not eligible (including migrants) many pensioners, especially invalid and single parents. As well we must recognise those who live off their partner's income including housewives. If the true figures were ever presented, the number would be immense. All these people are condemned to a life of poverty. However, as well as the victims of the economic crisis, unemployment is used to attack all workers. The Government and the bosses are using unemployment as a knife at the throat of working people. They are using the threat of the dole to get workers to accept lower and lower wages. They also want to attack hard fought for conditions such as holiday pay and sick pay. It is used to root out union militancy and destroy unionism. The bosses want to abolish these hard fought for gains, outright. At the moment CRA is at the vanguard in the bosses fight for a union free job. Even tame cat unions are too much of a hassle for these greedy bludging bosses. The Keating Government wants enterprise bargaining with awards as a safety net. The bosses want to abolish awards. They therefore find Keating's measures insufficient. But the boss's paper, the Financial Review, does acknowledge that something has been gained - for them. The Keating Government, they say, has made workers responsible for the profitability of the firm. This they find invaluable as it means workers will start to blame themselves and demand less. The bosses find Keating's unfair dismissal legislation to be a burden. They want the right to sack workers without hindrance. By individualising the work force, undermining our collective strength, bosses can say to workers "accept the wages we demand or it's out the gate". With the threat of the dole more gains of struggle are thrown away.

So what is the solution? If the bosses are allowed to get away with it wages will be little better than the dole. We need a united offensive so that the bosses pay for the crisis and not the workers. The demand for a shorter working week with wage rises to meet the increase cost in living is a crucial demand in our struggle. The working week should be continually shortened until there is full employment. At the moment with mass unemployment people working a fifty hour week is not uncommon. This is an outrage! Not only is so much work bad for their health. They are deprived of an active social life. The fact that these people are working so many long hours deprives other people of work.

A shorter working week without loss of pay would mean two things. First, it would mean more leisure time for those already employed. This free time is the basis on which labour can come to meaningfully self managed society. Second and perhaps more important, it would mean the right to work and fight unemployment. This would strengthen our side in the fight against capital. We would be in a stronger position to fight the boss' offensive. We would be less vulnerable to bosses blackmailing us with threat of the dole. We would be in a better position to defend our conditions. We would undermine their ability to impose conditions.

Of course, bosses and governments don't like this. They would fight tooth and nail. We must be in a position to meet their threats. The Labor party won't give us a shorter working week. The trade union bureaucrats won't give us a shorter working week. We must organise ourselves. This requires factory committees. We will need to take strike action. We will need workers militia to meet the repression that the state will counter us with. Progressive reduction of the working week with wage rises must be generalised throughout the working class. The reason why neither reformists nor Stalinists will take it up is that they are committed to the system and will not develop strategies that enforce the transition from capitalist to a socialist society. In the seventies we had a campaign for a thirty-five hour working week raised by the Amalgamated Metal Workers Union and supported throughout the left of the union movement.

Unfortunately this was often linked to productivity deals, and absorbed by overtime. There was some minor gain. Some factories eventually won a thirty eight hour week. This diffused the campaign to reach even the limited goal of a 35 hour week which was thrown away when unions began their collaboration with the Hawke government over the Prices and Incomes Accord. Wages and hours were sacrificed so profits could be increased in the hope of encouraging new investment.

There has been a lot of grumbling about the introduction of advanced technology. Much of this technology was introduced in the context of laying off workers. Workers should have nothing to fear from its introduction if we are strong and organised. Improved technology gives us the material basis to reduce the working week even more. There is one barrier to this - capitalism. That is why capitalism must be overthrown.

Reformism and Stalinism had no answers to the crisis of manufacturing so the demand for a shorter working week in any form was thrown away. It is only a revolutionary party which will fight for a shorter working week because only revolutionaries reject collaboration with the capitalist class. All collaboration makes workers pay. We will co-operate with any worker who agrees with us on this important issue, irrespective of their views on other issues. We urge the formation of shorter working week committees to unite those who want to fight in the community or on the job. A political demand requires a political party committed to working class power. The Communist Left is a nucleus of such a party.

## Turkey's war against the Kurds

In Turkey today each political party is stressing the need for Turkey to maintain an independent stand and resist western pressure. What they all mean is that they don't like European Union nations such as France and Germany giving them a slap on the wrist and criticising the military operations against the Kurdish people. Of course the EU is not actually doing anything against Turkey. There were no trade sanctions or anything like that. They are just showing a bit of verbal dissent. But even this is too much for Turkish political leaders.

Kurdistan is a country divided by three. Twelve million Kurds are divided between Iraq, Iran and Turkey. None of these three countries recognise that Kurds have any rights let alone a right to a nationality. They all brutally repress the Kurdish people. The Kurdistan Workers Party is leading a military battle against governments of Iran, Iraq and Turkey. During the Gulf War there was a lot of hue and cry about Iraq's treatment of the Kurds. But this was only because Iraq invaded Kuwait. Normally there is a silence. The hypocritical campaign for "human rights" does not appear to apply to the Kurdish people. This is especially true when Turkey is a bosom ally of the west.

Repression of Kurdish people by Turkish air force bombing is nothing new. But in April, Turkey extended the war. It made a serious military incursion into Iraq. For this it gets a wrap around the knuckles. The European Union after all must be seen as believing in "human rights". And can't appear to be in favour of blatant unprovoked invasion. This is total and utter hypocrisy. These days imperialist powers like to be more subtle about manipulation and control of colonies and semi colonies. But despite appearances powers such as Germany as well as Britain, the United States, France and Japan do manipulate and take control of the economies of most of the world.

## French tests in the Pacific

There is a lot of hue and cry about French nuclear testing in the Pacific. It's indeed politically valuable for Paul Keating. Without any danger to the system, he can appear radical and appeal to disenfranchised peace supporters and reformists. He can point a hypercritical finger at the French. Which at the same time will draw people's attention away from Australia's involvement in the war on Bougainville, as well as imperialist involvement in Fiji, Vanuatu and elsewhere. The Liberals and bourgeois press hacks such as Mike Gibson are trying to score points against Keating by sounding progressive. Telegraph Mirror hack Mike Gibson praised the anti-nuclear stand of Lange. These people rejoiced when Keating's Right faction beat the ALP Left on both support for uranium mining, and its export for France. They have only recently discovered the horrors of nuclear testing, now that it is in their electoral interest to score political cheap points. No bourgeois force, Labor or Liberal, opposes military co-operation with France. Nor do they oppose the French empire in the South Pacific.

We must recognise Keating's stand for what it is, hypocrisy! So should we, in Australia, take action against French nuclear testing? We should! (whilst we mustn't. get caught up in the patriotic fervor). The

French Empire is totally reactionary. We must oppose it and support liberation of the remaining colonies including Tahiti and Kanaky/New Caledonia. These people not merely have to endure imperialist super-exploitation they face destruction of their environment and health as well. How many Pacific people will suffer from cancer as a result from this testing? Can the French Government answer? The suffering could be immense!

France is acting out of its imperialist interest. It knows that it needs nuclear weapons to maintain its strategic position, This it will maintain even if it means destruction of the environment and thousands of deaths. Moral persuasion and token protests are useless. France will only respond to force and should come from workers in France and workers internationally.

We in Australia must take action. But we must not get involved in Keating's anti-French bandwagon. Our action must be linked to opposition to all imperialism. Unions must oppose Australia's involvement in imperialist exploits. If we oppose imperialism consistently our actions will be important in the liberation of Pacific peoples. Otherwise we risk becoming the working class wing of Keating's anti-French chauvinist cover up.

## Mohijir struggles in Pakistan

There is fighting in Karachi, the largest city in Pakistan. The fight is between the Mohijir people and the Pakistan government. The roots of the struggle stem from the founding of Pakistan. Pakistan is not really a nation. Its sole uniting factor is religion. Pakistan was formed as an agglomeration of those states whose majority religion is Muslim. Initially Pakistan included part of Bengal now known as Bangla Desh. This was known as East Pakistan. East Pakistan was ripped off by the Pakistan elite. Understandably the poor Bengalis fought and broke free. Pakistan today is an amalgam of states and half states. The Punjab was divided between Pakistan and India. Kashmir was initially part of India (though its religion is Muslim) but has since been divided between the two nations. This still doesn't please many Kashmiri's and a war goes on.

The Mohijir people are not a nation. They are those Indians who moved to Pakistan because of they are Moslems and India is a predominantly Hindu state. Since the partition of Pakistan they have been at the bottom of the social ladder. Much of the proletariat in Karachi is Mohajiri. The Afghan war pushed them even lower down the ladder. In Pakistan society, Pathans and Punjabis are higher up the ladder. Many migrated to Karachi to avoid the effects of the Afghan war. This pushed the Mohijiri's even further down as Punjabi's and Pathans took the top jobs displacing the local Sindis who in turn displaced Mohijiris.

The Mohijir National liberation front MQM although acting like a national liberation front is in effect the vanguard of the Karachi proletariat. Of course it does not base itself on Marxism. Therefore it cannot lead the proletariat to victory. Negotiations are beginning between the MQM and the Pakistan Government. The position of the Mohijir people as the pariahs, and the exploited cannot be negotiated away.

## The International Committee has no authority

In working class areas such as the western suburbs of Sydney, Footscray in Melbourne, Inala in Brisbane and even small towns such as Lithgow and Cessnock the Socialist Labour League is the only socialist group with an overt presence recruiting workers, housewives and youth behind their banner. Their orientation to organising in such areas is commendable. However there is a massive credibility gap. The SLL claim to be standing under Trotsky's banner is false. Their record and that of their international tendency known as the "International Committee of the Fourth International" is one of liquidation and treachery.

In 1986 there was a massive split in their ranks. This followed the expulsion of guru Gerry Healy from the Workers' Revolutionary Party of Britain for sexual abuse of comrades. Many splits were to follow. A Healy-led minority established their version of both the WRP and the International Committee. The majority of the WRP then split from the International Committee when the ICFI demanded that they accept "the authority . of the International Committee". In Australia a significant minority led by Andy Blunden and Phil Sandford were expelled when the Nick Beams, Terry Cook and Linda Tannenbaum leadership of the SLL demanded that they accept "the authority of the International Committee". The minority refused and they were expelled. In Australia the Communist League was born. There has been a series of splits and degeneration since. Whilst we consider that none of the splitters represent the tradition of Trotskyism; we do agree on one major question. The International Committee has no authority. At all stages from the beginning until now the ICFI been revisionist.

The International Committee was formed in 1953 out of the liberalised degenerate Socialist Workers Party of the USA, the Morenoite MAS, which was liquidated into the Peronist movement, the chauvinist degenerated group led by Pierre Lambert and The Club led by Gerry Healy in Britain. It was formed in response to the liquidationist perspective of Michele Pablo. What Pablo effectively argued was that Trotskyists should enter reformist, Stalinist, and even radical nationalist mass parties to pressure the left wing. The ICFI did indeed make orthodox criticisms and opposed formally the liquidation of Trotskyism but sections of the ICFI were liquidationist in their own right. This alliance lasted ten years until the SWP, the Morenoites and allies reunited with the mainstream United Secretariat of the Fourth International led by Ernst Mandel and Pierre Frank. Gerry Healy was Pablo's man in Britain. He formed a faction within the Trotskyist Revolutionary Communist Party to reorient Trotskyists towards the Labour Party. Within the Labour Party he formed this rotten bloc with reformists called Socialist Outlook. On the editorial board was Tom Braddock MP. Socialist Outlook was notorious for lauding "Left" M. P. Aunerin (Nye) Bevan. "Bevan gives the lead the workers want" went one headline. "Aye for Nye" went another. This is gross liquidation into reformism. In no way is it Trotskyism. The formation of the "International Committee" made no difference to Socialist Outlook whatsoever. It continued its reformist

liquidationist practice. In 1963 the British Socialist Labour League was formed. Its main slogan was "a Labour Government pledged to socialist policies". An important slogan raised during this period "Makes the Lefts fight" shows their total subordination behind the banner of social democracy. Often the "Lefts" do fight - to chain the working class to the system and accept pay cuts. Often it is tactically correct to show that the Lefts will not fight the right because they share the same reformist framework. Therefore a political break from reformism is needed. But this is totally different from demanding the lefts fight while they still remain under the banner of left reformism. The slogan "Labour Government pledged to socialist policies" is a Pabloite slogan. In no way did the Trotskyist movement suggest that a parliamentary government carry out socialism. The SLL gave this a left cover by calling for a general strike. For Trotskyists a general strike is linked to a political perspective linking working class struggle to the perspective of power. It is linked to demands such as a revolutionary workers and small farmers government. As Trotsky made clear "A general strike requires workers militia". The failure of the SLL to link the demand for a general strike to such a perspective was itself a betrayal. To appear orthodox the SLL would repeat Trotsky that the general strike "poses the question of power". But the SLL would "forget" that Trotsky also pointed out that the question of power also had to be resolved. This its left Labour programmes consistently refused to do. In fact sometimes their calls for a general strike were linked to a programme of a general election. Even worse were their proclamations that the British working class were already fighting for power in circumstances such as the British miners' strike. Linked to reformism is chauvinism. Here we have to point out how abysmal the SLL record was on questions of chauvinism. The Socialist Labour League refused to organise the working class to fight the British occupation of Northern Ireland. Northern Ireland consists of six counties partitioned off by British imperialism to rationalise imperialist domination of Ireland. In fact the SLL has played into the hands of British imperialist propaganda in their criticisms of the provisional IRA which was the main force fighting Britain. They have also been male chauvinist and homophobic. At a New South Wales ALP Socialist Left meeting Jim Mulgrew, then leader of the SLL, backed up by his comrade Phil Sandford argued that the women's liberation movement was "potentially fascist". In Australia Gerry Healy admitted that homosexuals were not allowed on leading party committees.

During the seventies The British Socialist Labour League which became Workers Revolutionary Party became blatantly malignant. They adapted to many third world bourgeois regimes. They became pr agents for Colonel Qaddafi of Libya and the Baathist regime of Iraq, and the Ayatollah Khomeini of Iran. Of course in the fine print they would mention that these regimes were not socialist. But in reality all attempt to build a proletarian opposition to these regimes was abandoned. And their crimes against the working class whitewashed. Oppositionists in Britain and Australia have established that the IF "sold its principles for cash" In Britain the WRAP apologised for left reformists such as Ken Livingstone and Ted Knight. They apologised for their cutbacks and attacks on the working class. In fact they attacked their opponents who fought the cuts as playing into the hands of the Tories.

Gerry Healy was not expelled from the WRAP because of any fight for Marxist principle. He was expelled due to serious allegations concerning his sexual practices and abuse of cadre. But after his expulsion there were many splits. Both in Britain and internationally. In Australia the majority of the SLL proclaim continuity with the tradition of the International Committee. Their method has been to scapegoat individuals. For example: When Indonesia invaded Timor, the SLL defended East Timor led by Fretilin. This was changed when the analysis of Michael Banda was imposed on the SLL. The Banda position was that East Timor was really part of Indonesia. And therefore Fretilin's attempt to defend this (according to him) non nation was an adventure which endangered the Timorese people. Banda covered for the Indonesian invasion and Workers News faithfully repeated Banda's line. The Australian SLL opposed Banda. But the point is. Why did this line on Timor become the line faithfully reproduced consistently in the press of the International Committee? Why wasn't this blatant and treacherous revision defeated in those so called revolutionary international which supposedly "maintained continuity". There are two unpalatable options for the LS, Either an international did not exist, Or the international that did exist was thoroughly and utterly treacherous. The Northite "continuity of the International Committee" refuses to make a materialist analysis of Healyite degeneration. Marxists recognise that decent revolutionaries can make mistakes. But gross and consistent revisionism reflects material interests at the expense of the working class such as the middle class and the labour aristocracy. Healy Banda Mitchell Torrance and company didn't merely make mistakes. Theirs was gross and malignant opportunism. And their internal regime was a bureaucratic tyranny. The Australian SLL maintains that the ICFI was a revolutionary international. But if this was so the WRP leadership would not break from this internationalism . unless they had an interest at the expense of the working class.

The post-Healy SLL has hardly been orthodox: In Australia during the late eighties they demanded "Make the "Lefts" fight for a workers government. This is an improvement on the old Healyite demand in that it does put some revolutionary dynamic on the fight. But it still subordinates the working class to the left of the Labour Party.

A book by Martin McLaughlin Vietnam and World Revolution really exposes their Marxist credentials. Not only does this book whitewash the destruction of Trotskyism in Vietnam by covering for Stalinism. McLaughlin does not understand the fundamental class line between Trotskyism and Stalinism. For McLaughlin the Stalinists had a strategy of combining the question of national liberation with the interests of the peasantry and the struggle for socialism. No the Stalinists liquidated the interests of the working class and therefore socialism behind the interests of the peasantry and the banner of national liberation. Socialism was posed in the indefinite future. The Vietnamese Trotskyists with whatever tactical faults stood for the dictatorship of the proletariat. The Vietnamese Stalinists did not betray merely because of their ties to Moscow or Beijing (although this was a factor). They betrayed because of their class character and programme. The book by McLaughlin shows that leading members of the ICFI do not understand the class lines which separate Trotskyism and Stalinism in colonies and semi colonies. McLaughlin merely continues the treacherous line of Healy in covering for Stalinism in Vietnam.

The Socialist Labour League justifies the "authority of the international Committee" on the basis of their record of struggle for the Fourth International. Yes! certainly they made formally left orthodox criticisms of the liquidation of Pablo and Mandel. But their subsequent evolution shows that their differences were not fundamental. Moreno in Argentina continued his liquidation into the bourgeois nationalist Peronists whilst under the banner of the International Committee. And as has already been pointed out, Healy's gross liquidation into the Labour Party continued without change even after the "anti-liquidationist" International Committee was established. The book The Heritage We Defend by David North of the US ICFI affiliate Workers League does not make a Marxist analysis of the degeneration of the International Committee. On the contrary, it refuses to make one and covers for opportunism. The formative years of the Healy group in the Labour Party, hardly get a mention. And then it is to cover for their rotten record which is attacked by Banda. Banda is merely blocked with the revisionist Haston.

Communist Left has consistently given a materialist analysis for the degeneration of the International Committee. The ICFI reflects the material interests of the British labour aristocracy. Lenin analysed that large sections of the British working class gained from and politically identified with imperialism. The revolutionary Third International called "Labour Parties" such as the British and Australian Labor Parties "social imperialist". The Comintern saw their social base as the labour aristocracy. It is precisely this stratum that the Healyite movement adapted to. It is no accident that this tendency whether liquidated in the labour Party or "independent" was notorious for its chauvinism and sexism, had a bureaucratic internal regime, and failed to consistently oppose imperialism in Ireland. Healyism amounted to a serious adaptation to Labour. Their adaptation to Arab and other third world bourgeois regimes stems from their Anglocentric view that the British revolution mattered. Therefore it was permissible to get money by adapting to bourgeois regimes in the third world as revolution wasn't so blatantly on the agenda in those countries.

The Socialist Labour League has every right to disagree with this analysis. But what it cannot deny is such gross opportunism is a reflection of material interests alien to the working class. The ICFI of David North has written volumes concerning Healy's degeneration. But the point has been to avoid a materialist Marxist analysis. What we are supposed to believe is: whilst a "revolutionary international"..."maintained its continuity" revolutionary internationalism broke down. But the point is why? Either there wasn't consistent revolutionary internationalism in the first place. Or, alternatively, one or more of the sections degenerated and abandoned the proletariat becoming a conducting medium for alien class elements. If you believe that the ICFI was revolutionary in the first place you have an obligation to analyse how alien class forces led to the degenerate morass that was Healy's WRP. Healy's degeneration was gross and malignant. For decades it received no consistent opposition within this so called "revolutionary international". A so called "revolutionary international" which covers its past mistakes and crimes, which refuses to make a Marxist analysis of this record, has no authority. We urge Socialist Labour League members and supporters to demand a real history of their tradition and then make a Marxist analysis of Healyite revisionism.

## Vietnam 20 years after victory

Vietnam 20 On April 28, 1975 the Vietnam war was over. The NLF flag was raised in Saigon, which was renamed Ho Chi Minh City. In Australia, there was a sense of relief. Vietnam still had to face the extremely difficult task of national reconstruction. There was the legacy of bombing. North Vietnam during the war had to face bombing of a greater intensity than any country had during World War 2. The country was devastated by chemical bombing including agent orange. The experience of Australian soldiers with this nasty chemical was horrific. But the Vietnamese had to endure a far greater amount of this vicious chemical. Haiphong Harbour was still mined and shipping was in danger.

The Vietnamese faced immense difficulties in constructing an economy. The US and allies including Australia were responsible for the devastation. But the US offered no compensation what so ever. The US

bears full responsibility for the devastation of Vietnam. However had the Stalinist Vietnam Workers Party pursued a Marxist strategy instead of a Stalinist one, the war could have been won, the war could have been won much earlier.

Vietnam was divided in half because the National Liberation Front (within which the VWP was liberated had faith in the US honouring its agreement to hold elections in the South. The NLF had every reason to believe that it would have won any election handsomely. But US wanted power not democracy. Instead of democracy they installed puppet regimes. One US puppet, Sth. Vietnamese president Ky was well known as a supporter of Hitler. This did not worry the US.

The result of this refusal to honour agreement was twenty years of war. The people North or South did not want the US nor their puppets. It was blatantly clear that in any election the National Liberation Front would win with a landslide support. This the US could not allow. Of course the US imperialists were and are totally cynical and treacherous. But the Stalinists should not have "agreed" to divide the country in the first place. The agreement could make the NLF fighters appear to be aggressors invading a country which they agreed should be divided. The US could make the war appear

to be a civil war by creating a puppet regime. The division of Vietnam was totally unnecessary and a serious setback to the Vietnamese struggle. The Vietnamese people fought heroically. We do not challenge their ability as fighters. What we take issue with is the class forces within the NLF and its political programme. These all had a consequence in determining the type of state created after their decisive victory. The National Liberation Front went further than its programme. They expropriated the bourgeoisie. However such a formation based on the liquidation of the proletariat could not establish the dictatorship of the proletariat. Nor did they. The Vietnamese revolution once again the antagonism of the peasantry to the proletariat and the nationalist characteristics of the peasantry. Communist Left characterises the post revolutionary Vietnamese state as a bureaucratically deformed workers and peasants state. Nationalised property relationships were established. But within the bureaucracy, peasant property interests were defended at the expense of the proletariat. The peasantry own property and are therefore a conducting medium for capitalism. There is a massive swing towards capitalism in Vietnam. Of course this is linked to the sell-out of the former Soviet Union and the failure of the Stalinist bureaucratic economy. But the peasantry facilitates its reintroduction. The peasantry can be the most nationalist of all class. Nationalism has been a significant degenerating force in the Indochinese revolution. The division of the Indochinese Communist Party into national lines to pursue their different national roads exacerbated nationalism as both Kampuchean and Vietnamese Stalinists sold out each other thus exacerbating nationalist hatred between Vietnamese and Kampuchean peoples. For example; Pol Pot's Kampuchean Stalinists were not invited to the Geneva Conference where it was decided that Kampuchea was to be ruled by Prince Sihanouk. Sihanouk proceeded to jail and murder Communists. In the seventies the Kampuchean Stalinists in the FUNK adapted to anti-Vietnamese chauvinism to maintain their class collaborationist alliance. Imperialism successfully divided Vietnamese and Kampuchean worker and peasant. The Stalinist nationalist strategy facilitated this nationalist division.

Just three and a half years after victory, these antagonisms exploded into war. The Vietnamese Stalinists responded to border provocations with wholesale invasion. The Vietnamese invasion put capitalism on the agenda in Kampuchea. Alliances with the reactionary feudalists were formed by both sides. Both sides made it clear that they would prefer feudalism or capitalism to the victory of their Stalinist rivals. Vietnam has justified intervention by pointing to the horrors of Pol Pot. Pol Pot has been accused of killing millions. Pol Pot is guilty of mass murder. but the killing fields are not an aberration but the logic of Stalinism. Many of those killed were the class enemy committed to sabotaging the revolution. Some were killed due to hunger, bureaucratic inefficiency. Some were killed out of Pol Pot's factional hostility to those Kampuchean Stalinists who were pro-Vietnam. However a massive amount was killed due to Pol Pot's hostility to the proletariat of Kampuchea. Many counter-revolutionaries gathered in Phnom Pehn. It was after all the last outpost of [on Nol. But Pol Pot took his antagonism to the proletariat to its logical conclusion. ..the liquidation of the city. Opposition to Pol Pot internal regime was really an afterthought. The real reason for the invasion was the traditional national I antagonisms between Vietnam and Kampuchean it was fuelled by the different national strategies of the Stalinists and mutual sellout of each other's revolution. Things became more serious when China responded by invading Vietnam. Had the soviet Union honoured its military treaty, we might have witnessed a full scale fratricidal war amongst post capitalist states. This could have cost millions of lives. Of course imperialism would have been the real winner as the post capitalist states would have been weakened or perhaps destroyed. We can be thankful such a full scale war did not occur.

Imperialism may have lost the wars of liberation. But capitalism is winning the slow way. The bureaucracies are acting as conducting mediums for the denationalisation of the economy. There was an alternative to the treacherous Stalinist VWP. Vietnam had a strong Trotskyism movement based on the proletariat. Of course there were tactical weaknesses. Trotsky was critical of their weakness on the

national question and the peasant question. And their tactical weaknesses in dealing with the Stalinists were no doubt decisive. But the Trotskyists led a mass workers movement which stood for proletariat. They scored a massive victory in local election which represented mass sentiment for revolution. They stood up against Ho Chi Minh's sell out to imperialism. After the defeat of the Japanese, the Stalinists were willing to hand Vietnam back - to the French. The Trotskyists were murdered en masse for defying their dictates. The following extract from the article by Trotskyist leader Lu Sanh Hanh reprinted in the Communist League [Slaughterite] publication Vietnam and Trotskyism shows that Trotskyism had a mass resonance within the Vietnamese working class. "Mon 21 AUGUST more than 300,000 men and women grouped in column, thronged Saigon's Norodom Boulevard. Banners and placards blossomed above this human sea.

The Cao Dai-ist and Hoa Haoist peasants formed a column 100,000 strong with the monarchist banner at the head. In opposition to the reactionary nationalist parties, the ICI boldly unfurled the banner of the Fourth International, three meters long, two meters wide. Carried by worker C., an old Bolshevik - Leninist, the flag was a proud beacon of revolutionary strength and attracted the lively attention of hundreds of thousands of slaves, who had been duped for many years by the exploiters of their country. Revolutionary slogans were duped in huge letters on a series of huge placards that waved above our heads: 'Down with imperialism! Long Live the World Revolution! Long live the workers and peasants front! Popular committees everywhere! For a Peoples Assembly! For the arming of the people! Nationalise the factories under workers control! For a workers and peasants government!'

Thousands of workers who were leaderless dispersed and demoralised during the war years, had never lost their faith in the revolutionary movement. From the first moment when the flag of the Fourth International and the slogans of the revolutionary proletariat appeared, they spontaneously regained their political consciousness and felt their revolutionary faith reviving. They embraced each other for joy in the midst of the crowd, they competed for the right to carry this banner of flag. workers arrived in waves, greeting each other with clenched fist salute, declaring themselves ready to fight with their vanguard party. Within hours, the workers who gathered under the leadership of tens of thousands of Trotskyists numbered 30,000 Terrified by the violence of the revolutionary masses, the bourgeois could only grit their teeth: they were politically paralysed, and obliged to leave a clear field for the Trotskyists. While the masses marched through the street, the militants of the LCI tirelessly put forward their policies at open air meetings" Various self proclaimed "Trotskyists" have an interest in playing down or even burying the revolutionary record of Trotskyism in Vietnam. The mainstream so-called "United Secretariat of the Fourth International" found them an unpleasant obstacle in their opportunistic attempt to seduce the Stalinists as part of their "vanguard". In effect they sold out the proletariat. Denis Freney in his pamphlet in Defense of the Vietnamese Revolution against its 'Trotskyist' detractors" spreads the lie that the Trotskyists objectively assisted if not openly supported Japanese imperialism. He rationalised their slaughter. Martin McLaughlin of the International Committee "Vietnam and World Revolution" liquidates the fundamental class line between Stalinism and Trotskyism. Revisionists have argued that the success of the Vietnamese revolution showed that permanent revolution was either irrelevant or alternatively the method that Stalinists could apply under the force of objective pressures when they were independent of Moscow or Beijing. The VWP was consistently Stalinist. The subsequent degeneration of the Vietnamese revolution shows that it is only the method of permanent revolution that can lead workers and exploited to victory and prevent the degeneration of the revolution.

worker and peasant. The Stalinist nationalist strategy facilitated this nationalist division.

Just three and a half years after victory, these antagonisms exploded into war. The Vietnamese Stalinists responded to border provocations with wholesale invasion. The Vietnamese invasion put capitalism on the agenda in Kampuchea. Alliances with the reactionary feudalists were formed by both sides. Both sides made it clear that they would prefer feudalism or capitalism to the victory of their Stalinist rivals. Vietnam has justified intervention by pointing to the horrors of Pol Pot. Pol Pot has been accused of killing millions. Pol Pot is guilty of mass murder. but the killing fields are not an aberration but the logic of Stalinism. Many of those killed were the class enemy committed to sabotaging the revolution. Some were killed due to hunger, bureaucratic inefficiency. Some were killed out of Pol Pot's factional hostility to those Kampuchean Stalinists who were pro-Vietnam . However a massive amount was killed due to Pol Pot's hostility to the proletariat of Kampuchea. Many counter-revolutionaries gathered in Phnom Pehn. It was after all the last outpost of [on Nol. But Pol Pot took his antagonism to the proletariat to its logical conclusion. ...the liquidation of the city. Opposition to Pol Pot internal regime was really an afterthought. The real reason for the invasion was the traditional national I antagonisms between Vietnam and Kampuchean it was fuelled by the different national strategies of the Stalinists and mutual sellout of each other's revolution. Things became more serious when China responded by invading Vietnam. Had the soviet Union honoured its military treaty, we might have

witnessed a full scale fratricidal war amongst post capitalist states. This could have cost millions of lives. Of course imperialism would have been the real winner as the post capitalist states would have been weakened or perhaps destroyed. We can be thankful such a full scale war did not occur.

Imperialism may have lost the wars of liberation. But capitalism is winning the slow way. The bureaucracies are acting as conducting mediums for the denationalisation of the economy. There was an alternative to the treacherous Stalinist VWP. Vietnam had a strong Trotskyism movement based on the proletariat. Of course there were tactical weaknesses. Trotsky was critical of their weakness on the national question and the peasant question. And their tactical weaknesses in dealing with the Stalinists were no doubt decisive. But the Trotskyists led a mass workers movement which stood for proletariat. They scored a massive victory in local election which represented mass sentiment for revolution. They stood up against Ho Chi Minh's sell out to imperialism. After the defeat of the Japanese, the Stalinists were willing to hand Vietnam back - to the French. The Trotskyists were murdered en masse for defying their dictates. The following extract from the article by Trotskyist leader Lu Sanh Hanh reprinted in the Communist League [Slaughterite] publication Vietnam and Trotskyism shows that Trotskyism had a mass resonance within the Vietnamese working class. "Mon 21 AUGUST more than 300,000 men and women grouped in column, thronged Saigon's Norodom Boulevard. Banners and placards blossomed above this human sea.

The Cao Dai-ist and Hoa Haoist peasants formed a column 100,000 strong with the monarchist banner at the head. In opposition to the reactionary nationalist parties, the ICI boldly unfurled the banner of the Fourth International, three meters long, two meters wide. Carried by worker C., an old Bolshevik - Leninist, the flag was a proud beacon of revolutionary strength and attracted the lively attention of hundreds of thousands of slaves, who had been duped for many years by the exploiters of their country. Revolutionary slogans were duped in huge letters on a series of huge placards that waved above our heads: 'Down with imperialism! Long Live the World Revolution! Long live the workers and peasants front! Popular committees everywhere! For a People's Assembly! For the arming of the people! Nationalise the factories under workers control! For a workers and peasants government!'

Thousands of workers who were leaderless dispersed and demoralised during the war years, had never lost their faith in the revolutionary movement. From the first moment when the flag of the Fourth International and the slogans of the revolutionary proletariat appeared, they spontaneously regained their political consciousness and felt their revolutionary faith reviving. They embraced each other for joy in the midst of the crowd, they competed for the right to carry this banner of flag. workers arrived in waves, greeting each other with clenched fist salute, declaring themselves ready to fight with their vanguard party. Within hours, the workers who gathered under the leadership of tens of thousands of Trotskyists numbered 30,000 Terrified by the violence of the revolutionary masses, the bourgeois could only grit their teeth: they were politically paralysed, and obliged to leave a clear field for the Trotskyists. While the masses marched through the street, the militants of the LCI tirelessly put forward their policies at open air meetings" Various self proclaimed "Trotskyists" have an interest in playing down or even burying the revolutionary record of Trotskyism in Vietnam. The mainstream so-called "United Secretariat of the Fourth International" found them an unpleasant obstacle in their opportunistic attempt to seduce the Stalinists as part of their "vanguard". In effect they sold out the proletariat. Denis Freney in his pamphlet in Defense of the Vietnamese Revolution against its 'Trotskyist' detractors" spreads the lie that the Trotskyists objectively assisted if not openly supported Japanese imperialism. He rationalised their slaughter. Martin McLaughlin of the International Committee "Vietnam and World Revolution" liquidates the fundamental class line between Stalinism and Trotskyism. Revisionists have argued that the success of the Vietnamese revolution showed that permanent revolution was either irrelevant or alternatively the method that Stalinists could apply under the force of objective pressures when they were independent of Moscow or Beijing. The VWP was consistently Stalinist. The subsequent degeneration of the Vietnamese revolution shows that it is only the method of permanent revolution that can lead workers and exploited to victory and prevent the degeneration of the revolution.

## Queensland elections

The Goss Labor Government is facing an election campaign. When Goss was elected he was the first ALP Queensland Premier since Vince Gair during the fifties. Queensland had over three decades of rampant rightwing administration. For most of that time notorious right-winger Joh Bjelke-Petersen was Premier. His war on the middle class left and the trade union movement was notorious. Bjelke- Petersen was no country backwoodsman. He knew where his political bread was buttered. Queensland is a state dominated by multinational capital as opposed to comprador capital. Queensland is rich in natural resources. The multinationals who exploit these want a government who can represent their interests directly. In Queensland the Nationals representing an alliance between farmers

and multinational capital on the latter's terms, have been the dominant party. The Liberals have played a minor role in the coalition. The southern states of Australia are dominated politically by the comprador bourgeoisie. The main party of the compradors is the Liberals who represent the interests of the multinational less directly. Labor attempts to administer the system by cementing an alliance between the labour bureaucracy, comprador and multinational capital. Bjelke-Petersen cemented an alliance between multinational capital and the rural farming community. He established a notorious gerrymander which kept the Nationals in office with support often almost as low as thirty percent. By putting the boot in, acting decisively against working people he showed up Labor as weak and unworthy of leading anyone. Bjelke - Petersen treated it with contempt. Goss was only elected when the whole National machinery was exposed as massively corrupt. Goss was elected only after showing that he would in no way inconvenience the powerful reactionary forces that rule Queensland.

Bjelke-Petersen was extreme right in attacking the unions and on social questions such as homosexuality and abortion. But by new right standards his was a big spending government. It has been Goss who has launched the war against the public sector, slashing rail services. Many have been saved due to militant resistance from the local people. The Goss philosophy is corporatism as opposed to privatisation. This means the state sector competes with the private sector as a private companies. This is a massive step back. It means that people will have transport or health subject to whether it can be provided profitably on bourgeois terms. No longer do we have the government providing a service. The Nationals now want privatisation. These are the "alternatives" offered to the people of Queensland. On 'law and order' meaning bourgeois state repression, both parties are or a par. Goss is boasting how he will increase the police force. Borbidge, the Nationals leader wants police on the school grounds. This is being rejected as unrealistic. Both parties are fully subordinate to the demands of the multinationals, including the attacks on Black people. Goss stood up for their interests when they felt inconvenienced by the minimalist Mabo legislation. The Goss gloss amounts to full subordination to the most reactionary sections of capital whilst appearing progressive. Goss represents a very right wing "Labor" Government unworthy of any working class support. We suggest that Queensland workers don't give him any but support a party based on class struggle not subordination.