

October 1999 #46

Contents

3 East Timor Indonesian bloodshed. Australian complicity. UN imperialism

5 The Carr Government Zero tolerance for young people.

6 The Carr Government sacks railway workers

7 Rural revolt against Jeff Kennett

8 China 50 years of stalinist counter-revolution

Reith's Second wave. War against the trade unions.

Reith is a man who never forgets what side of the class line he is on. He made it clear to a meeting of Perth businessmen that he is on the side of capital. He certainly lives up to his rhetoric. Reith has already introduced some pretty oppressive legislation with the help of the Australian Democrats. So far the legislation only makes effective unionism extremely difficult. Preference for unionists is outlawed. The point of this new legislation is to make unionism impossible.

In a nutshell the legislation (if it is introduced) makes closed shops illegal. And a closed shop is defined as 60% of the workforce. So if 60% of your fellow workers are members — you can't join the union by law. And the Office of Employee Advocate will police employers so they enforce deunionisation. Australian Workplace Agreements will be given priority over awards which will remain only as safety nets.

Banned from Award agreements is any talk of superannuation, long service leave bonuses and tallies, union picnic days, recording of the hours employees work, training and education provisions, maximum or maximum hours a part time employee can work, long service leave, paid leave or jury service.

There is not much left. But even that will be impossible to defend. You will need to give written notice — by an extremely slow secret postal ballot. The IRC is ordered to order industrial action within 48 hours. Unions can be sued for damages and the legislation makes this much easier. More and more industrial questions will be dealt with by a civil court. This will mean higher costs involved which will usually go against the employee it is extremely difficult to get a union official on the job. They can only enter with the request of an employee. Organisers better watch out lest they be charged under the Act, for the mere talking to workers trying to persuade them to join the union.

Reith, of course, wants individual Contracts. These allow the boss to put a gun at the head of workers "accept long hours, low wages and poor conditions or its out the gate." This is of course in the context of massive unemployment and massive attacks on the unemployed. Organising the unemployed, fighting the attacks on them should be part and parcel of a strategy defending the unions.

Make no mistake! Reith's legislation amounts to a wholesale attack on the existence of trade unionism outright.

These facts are now very well known within the labour movement. The point is what are we going to do about it? Well basically what the ACTU offers is polite protest rallies and appealing to the Democrats. The Democrats were, of course, fully consenting to the first wave. They merely opposed the rate of deunionisation. But fundamentally they agree with the agenda. Appealing to the Democrats, in any way, exposes the weakness of the working class. It is the green light for further attacks.

The rally held in Sydney consisted of 15,000 workers and students. Some unions such as the MUA and the CFMEU had sizeable contingents. Others such as the TWU had merely token representation (a contingent of three officers). ACTU, TLC and union leaders were present. But none of them spoke. The rally was chaired in a spirited way by entertainer "sleazy" Sue Cruikshank. Rank and file workers (such as Telstra) spoke on their horrific experiences with job contracts. The lessons were important. But because of this format, the leadership let themselves off the hook. They avoided addressing workers and therefore being confronted with what they propose to do. In reality they offer nothing.

The Maritime Union of Australia is proposing to do a lot more. They want to internationalise the struggle. They have support from international unionists from the USA Japan and Indian unions. Any European solidarity will depend on the Transport Workers Federation. The MUA realise that they are a major target for Reith for the fact that they exist and still maintain "a monopoly on the waterfront". This they do despite being forced to sacrifice many members out the gate and the loss of many conditions. They are currently instigating a court case against Corrigan for contempt of court and conspiracy. From this they hope to win back lost conditions.

Apart from strike action, The MUA are planning a major rally in Canberra. They realise the folly of the Accord (somewhat belatedly). They are however, acting one out and not as part of a united working class.. The union movement is uneven. Most unions are capitulating. But rank and file are angry. The MUA leadership may be critical of other unions . But they don't wish to offend other leaderships by organising against them. But this is precisely what is needed for a generalised campaign. The CFMEU realise that after the MUA, they will be the next in line. They are preparing action also. So are other unions. But there is no generalised action. The role of the ACTU led by Jenny George has been disgraceful. A political attack requires a political response. And this poses the question of what politics should dominate the union movement. Currently the politics which dominate the union movement are reformist and stalinist. This is a serious problem. The notorious Accord was not some aberration. Reformism stands for unity with the capitalist state. But the capitalist state is antagonistic to class interest.

To gain what was the appearance of power through the Hawke Government, unions agreed sell out their historic role of fighting for higher wages and conditions. Hawke betrayed even his promise of minor gains (which are usually promised by reformist governments without an Accord). But the unions kept on sacrificing. It is no wonder that workers lost faith. And also unions effectively counterposed lobbying to organising their members. They lost their roots on the shop floor as academic career unionists took their place as organisers. The union movement is in a bad way and ripe for Reiths offensive.

Many unions have now made a break with the Accord. But they do not see that the Accord was merely the log of reformism and stalinism — politics which they still hold. This includes the MUA. Labor is not an opponent this offensive. Labor, on the whole supported the offensive against the MUA. In parliament, Labor is moving amendments but not opposing the legislation outright. A complete break is required to fight this offensive.

It is extremely important that factory committees be built to take the struggle out of the hands of bureaucrats. Factory committees are not ends in themselves but important forums where a revolutionary programme can be fought for on the shop floor. They also facilitate the rank and file taking control of their struggles. You can not trust the bureaucrats irrespective of how “left” or militant they sound.

A key demand is a shorter working week with wage rises. The working week should be continually reduced until there is a job for everyone seeking work. This will do three things. It will give the unemployed the right to work and therefore a decent income. It will give those in work more leisure. And it will strengthen the working class in its fight against capital making it easier to resist the bosses offensive.

What is needed is the construction of a revolutionary communist party based on the shop floor. This must fight openly for a revolutionary programme and not hide behind names and liquidated banners such as “rank and file”. Farmers have been strong opponents of the MUA because they believe bosses lies blaming workers for inefficiency. A revolutionary communist party must have a programme to win small farmers over. A revolutionary programme unites workers with all exploited and oppressed to fight for proletarian power. Communist Left is committed to the building of such a party which is a life or death question for the working class.

Timor. Indonesian bloodshed. Australian complicity. United Nations imperialism.

If there is anything that Suharto and Habibie have learned from Chairman Mao it is the dictum that ‘all power comes from a barrel of a gun’. They certainly do not believe in niceties such as “international law, ‘self- determination or ‘democracy”. The Indonesian Army rule. And they will only surrender this rule through force. If they allow democracy in Indonesia it would be because they fear the alternative — revolution. They also know that “international law’ is a cover — for the world domination of imperialism by force. Since the coup in the sixties which overthrew Sukarno, they have been well aware that imperialism has been very much on their side. They have been allowed to get away with mass murder against their own people as well as against minority nationalities such as West Papuan and Timorese.

In Fretin, the Indonesians face an opponent which does not seem to understand power relationships. Before declaring independence Fretilin did their best to lobby Portugal, (their previous imperialist masters), the United Nations and the then shadow foreign affairs minister of Australia Andrew Peacock(Liberal Party) in the hope that these respectable forces would prevent an impending Indonesian invasion. The only people who lifted a finger were Australian unionists who blacked Indonesia and held militant protests, despite being heavily involved in fighting the Kerr coup.

The imperialists not merely did nothing, they helped the invasion. According to John Pilger, a Jakarta CIA clerk told him that the invasion was delayed a couple of days so Ford and Kissenger could leave

Jakarta before it happened! When Fretilin broadcasted that there was bloodshed in the streets of Dili with Indonesian troops indiscriminately killing women and children, they received no widespread publicity and no widespread support from governments with only a few including Vietnam and Tanzania even recognising Timor's independence in the first place.

The Fraser Government expropriated Fretilin's radio communication base in Darwin. Pilger has also exposed how the imperialists, both British and American have armed Indonesia. Australia's role has been far more criminal. Gough Whitlam has argued for Timor's incorporation into Indonesia in the United Nations.

Fretilin has learned nothing from their diplomatic failure to prevent invasion. They have continued their campaign. Indeed they have been successful in drawing many governments, church bodies and institutions attentions to the plight of the Timorese. These have been many moral expressions of support and a degree of small scale assistance. But the problem is that the Timorese are disarmed. Respectable people either do not have guns or alternatively do not want them to be used against Indonesia

The result of Fretilin's manoeuvres has been a disarmed Timorese workers and peasants ripe for the slaughter by Indonesian sponsored militia. This has happened right in front of world media coverage. The militia have astounded the world by their arrogance. They don't even respect the Churches or Red Cross as any sought of sanctuary. Indonesia has played the game of pretending they have nothing to do with the militia and that these killings are merely "Timorese against Timorese". Paddy McGuinness has swallowed this lie. But a lie it is. Indonesia's full collaboration is now fully exposed. It is pretty clear where their guns and food are coming from. Of course Indonesia will give the militia a degree of freedom —so they can disown their extreme acts and not be seen as responsible. They might even make token arrests. Meanwhile the Timorese are disarmed and being murdered in cold blood. Indonesians have even brought in trucks and stolen furniture from the people of Dili. Dili has now been burnt and looted. There is also a serious shortage of food and water for the Timorese people.

Australian public opinion has been horrified. No other issue has pricked Australian public conscience. There is widespread cynicism and disillusionment. Australians not merely hate Indonesia, they realise that both major political parties are responsible. As an insurance against widespread demoralisation, John Howard acknowledged the guilt of both parties in ignoring the Timorese.

The guilt of both political parties is beyond question. But the point is what alternative? It is to be hoped that some will realise that both parties betrayed because they serve, in different ways, the interests of capital. However, at the moment they appear to be searching for a ruling class which plays by the rules and doesn't betray to nasties such as the ruling junta in Indonesia. No such ruling class exists. This leads them to the reactionary conclusion of supporting a United Nations invasion of East Timor ostensibly for the benefit of the Timorese.

The United Nations is a thieves picnic. An invasion could make East Timor subordinate to the imperialists. An imperialist invasion would only facilitate the subordination of Indonesia to imperialist domination. This would be hardly worth the minor gain of defending a few Timorese. The current invasion could actually strengthen the hand of the Indonesian armed forces as some sort of defender against imperialism.

Australia has signed the Timor Gap Treaty guaranteeing it a large slice of the oil in the Timor Sea. This Treaty gives the Timorese nothing. UN Troops will ensure Australia defends its oil. This is indeed blood for oil. Even if the UN should do merely as promised and merely, defend the Timorese it won't solve anything. There is no talk of independence, and Indonesia could simply bring back the militia when convenient. The only solution is Timorese self-determination. For this they require arms. Arm the Timorese!

The radical left has organised against the bloodshed, for the first time they have the majority of Australians on their side. According to one poll 90% of Australians support intervention of some sort. Indonesia out! UN in! was a main slogan shouted at rallies. This slogan corresponds to the sentiments of Australian public opinion. It was endorsed by Fretilin reps who led the chanting but also the radical left notably the Democratic Socialist Party "UN in now any delay costs lives" the Greens and the Progressive Labour Party as well as the two solidarity groups AETA and ASIET. According to Alex Mitchell (Sun Herald) Bob Gould is a changed man. Before it was "troops out" now it is "troops in" Whole sections of the left have become the left wing of imperialist intervention.

Far more impressive has been the actions of the working class. Many unions including Maritime Workers, CFMEU and Transport Workers have taken action against Indonesian shipping, air transport (Garuda) telecommunications and other companies who have dealings with Indonesia.

Communist Left has consistently urged a working class campaign and all this is an impressive start. The problem is that the working class action has been subordinated to the popular front. The consequence of this war shown

clearly when on radio station 2JJJ a representative of the Transport Workers Unions announced that his union was lifting bans on freight to Indonesia because of the UN troops arriving in Dili. Other unions are not so treacherous. But this is the logic of where popular frontism leads. The popular front demanded UN troops. They got them. So hasn't all been achieved?

Union bans must stay until East Timor gets independence. There can be no faith in the imperialists in granting East Timor independence. They must both demand and arrange guns for the Timorese. Military victory to Fretilin!

Since 1975 Communist Left (and predecessor Committee for Labour solidarity with the East Timorese Revolution) has urged solidarity based on class lines. We have pointed out that Fretilin abandoned its working class roots to become a petty bourgeois nationalist party. And it betrayed the national struggle of the Timorese people.

We have consistently urged labour solidarity and military victory to Fretilin. The Timorese people are not responsible for these betrayals and do not need to be acquainted with the Indonesian way of death. In 1999 we urge guns to Fretilin despite their political betrayals. We urge a working class movement to act in solidarity with Timorese workers and peasants. We urge workers to act in their own interest and not as an appendage of the popular front and certainly not as an appendage of the United Nations Black Indonesia now!

Military victory to FRETILIN No faith in treacherous FRETILIN leadership!

Arm the Timorese!

Defend East Timorese right of self-determination!

For proletarian revolution in Indonesia! No faith in udemo.. cratic" bourgeois forces!

Build a workers movement in Australia in solidarity with the East Timorese revolution.

Black ban Indonesia until self-determination is granted

No to Australian backed UN (or any) imperialist intervention!

Carr Government. Zero tolerance against young people.

As we pointed out in Red#44, the last New South Wales state election were a law and order election. Chicarovsky, playing the hysterical concerned middle class woman failed to convince electors — because Carr showed he was doing the job and had done his homework. He could portray himself as the man whose reasonable measures did the job. He could disassociate himself from Chicarovskys extremism.

Carr has indeed kept his promise on law and order. And young people are suffering the consequences.

One fine winters day, Marrickville looked its usual peaceful self. Men were playing cards in the square, single mums pushing prams, old people drinking coffee and chatting in the restaurants. There were a few kids hanging around but in no way did they look like being any threat to anything. It was just an a normal winter Marrickville midweek midday. Then the coppers came. They didn't pick on everyone. Some who an eyewitness considered 'looked like drug dealers' were not touched. They picked on young people , mainly teenagers who were frisked against the wall as permitted by Carr's antiknife regulations. And especially those with home boy fashions. Marrickville is overwhelmingly non Anglo Saxon. Well so are the kids which they picked on. This was a racist attack on migrants.

No drugs or knives were found. Yet at least twenty teenagers and young people were charged — with offences such as "obscene language" etc. Under the "zero tolerance" philosophy cops are required to charge people, even children, with whatever they charge they can find to make stick — even though it may ruin a young kid's life with a criminal record

The idea of zero tolerance comes from America. The idea is that big criminals break the law in small ways. so if you police the law on small things you also catch big crims. Let us concede that they probably do pick up more big crims. However the price is a regime of state repression. For kids in Marrickville it means criminalisation.

There have been a few reasonable magistrates who realise that the c word and the f word are perfectly normal for life on the streets. They realise that cops (who use those words too) are either hypocrites or want a pretext for arresting someone. Revolutionaries organising amongst youth would organise the best defence. We wish these kids luck in their legal defence. But even the experience of dealing with cops and going to court can be very traumatic for anyone let alone teenagers.

Marrickville is only one suburb. The police campaign is throughout the western suburbs including most of the inner west. The cops have been through Canterbury, Drummoyne, Campsie etc behaving in exactly the same way. Attacks are even more frequent in suburbs such as Cabramatta and Campbelltown. There is a wholesale attack on young people by the Carr government. The workers movement in this city must respond.

Firstly there must be a revolutionary youth organisation. This would organise with workers to form workers defence. We may not have the force for a political confrontation for some time but we can at least see that every attack is witnessed and exposed.

For the moment we must concentrate our actions on the Carr government. An occupation of Mr Refshauge's office would be a good idea. No concessions should be made because he is supposedly on the 'left'. All this means is that he provides a left cover for a reactionary government. He is the local rep for a government which should be embarrassed and totally exposed as offering young people nothing but state repression.

There are no doubt some who think that what is needed is a campaign to reform the police. The aim of such a campaign would be to educate them on the problems of youth, migrants etc. This would be the wrong direction. The police force is the instrument of a racist reactionary capitalist system. We have no interest in presenting the police force in other way. Some no doubt lament the break down of police youth liaison. If anything this is a progressive by-product of the raids. Police liaison offices are at best useless or worse doobers who cooperate in arrests. Their aim is to present the police force in a favourable light to young people — while the cops continue their youth bashing ways.

In any case, this campaign was not initiated by racist cops but by the Carr government who must be made to take full responsibility. Capitalism offers youth nothing except a Mac job or a pittance for a dole and state repression.

Carr Government sacks railway workers.

Since being elected with an increased majority, Carr has continued his reform of the public transport system. Unfortunately none of this reform benefits us. The first thing he did was to put up rail fares. Even Chirarovsky (hypocritically) could score a point off this. It is hardly an incentive to use public transport as opposed to roads which are chock a block. It is also another way to make the poor pay. Free public transport should be a right.

Often, governments justify the extra revenue on the grounds that it is required for a better service. Carr offers no such rationalisation. You see whilst fares are rising, Carr is making cutbacks to jobs on the railways. Over 430 face the sack.

For the workers concerned this will mean massive hardship. If the railways is the only employment you have ever had then it is difficult to get work elsewhere. If you have a family to support it is almost impossible to live off the dole.

It will be also a massive inconvenience for the general public. It will affect security. Despite the governments employment of security guards (their remedy for social problems) these cannot be at every station all of the time. An empty station is a temptation for any gang of kids to take out their frustrations and boredom on ordinary passengers.

It will also mean that old people will not be able to receive assistance getting on or off trains. Trains are extremely dangerous and especially so for people with disabilities. The less staff there is, the more danger for passengers. Toilets are closed due to lack of staff "in the interests of safety". Timetables are virtually non-existent.

The sacking of hundreds of workers puts more pressure on those who remain. Train drivers, for example, now have to announce the train stations stopped at. Before a sign was put up by a station assistant "All stations to East hills except Erskineville and St Peters" etc. The government considers it inefficient that there be only one boss for ever three workers. We agree. That is why more should be employed and not less.

All this is, of course, paving the way for privatisation. This will mean higher fares and less workers as the railways will act for the benefit of profit and not as a service to the public. A private operator has no concern about a person in an outer suburb who needs to come home late at night. If there is not the demand, the service is simply scrapped. The union covering these workers is the Rail Tramway and Bus Union (RT&BU) and is indeed angry. It has threatened to and carried out strike action. It has correctly blocked the introduction of 48 private security guards on trains in defence of the public sector. They will not sit down meekly and accept this. However they lack direction.

Politically they are still affiliated to the Labor Party. This is not merely a bosses party but the party of their boss. The Carr Government claims to oppose Reith's legislation. But has stated it is prepared to use it against the unionists. Labor in NSW is administering the capitalist offensive against the public sector. To fight it workers need a political perspective — which breaks from capitalism. A defence of the public sector requires a break from Labor.

An important demand for this struggle is a shorter working week with no loss of pay. The working week should be shortened to enable all rail workers to remain in employment. And it should be lowered again to force the government to employ more rail workers. In Sydney the Shorter Working Week Action Committee has put up posters around this demand. The poster called for solidarity between workers and passengers to defend the public sector, especially on the railways and urged a decent public transport system.

The Shorter Working Week Action Committee is not a political party but a united front. Yet it raises an important political demand which challenges the Labor Party. Working class supporters of the Labor Party should demand to know why their party opposes such a basic demand which is in the interests of working people. It is a political party which can raise this demand within the working class — to expose the labour fakers. Only communists can raise this demand consistently because we reject the system and any suggestion that working people should take responsibility for their crisis.

Communist Left wishes the railway workers best of luck. They are not merely fighting for themselves but for the safety of all. However, we warn of the danger of reformists whose interests are with the system and of a bureaucracy which, though currently militant has no direction for the struggle.

Victoria: Rural revolt against Jeff Kennett

A month ago, Steve Bracks was a little known man — even in Victoria. Steve who? Many who voted for him admit they didn't know who he was. Well now he could become premier of Victoria if Labor wins a by-election in Frankston East. To remain premier, Kennett would have to win the by-election

and secure the support of three independents who are based in rural areas. This election is one of the major electoral upsets of the century.

In August, a Kennett victory seemed a formality. He was totally in command of the media. He was praised by the bourgeois economists for "Victoria's economic achievements" He was leading the opinion polls by a significant margin. Labor seemed weak and inoffensive with no clear direction. A Kennett victory seemed assured. In Sydney, the Sunday Telegraph was so confident they announced it in their early Saturday night edition. They were left with egg on their faces.

The finger is now pointed at Jeff Kennett. Certainly he is now apologetic and remorseful as opposed to cocky and arrogant. Jeff Kennett is a ruling class bully boy. His arrogance exceeds that of Malcolm Fraser. For those on the left he personifies the type of ruling class figure whom we hate. There are plenty who hate him. And no doubt he lost votes for personal reasons. But others have been attracted to his projection of power and direction.

But an analysis of precisely where he lost suggests that this is not the main reason. Kennett actually picked up support in many of Melbourne's Eastern suburbs electorates. He lost in traditional Labor areas This was expected as Kennett's "reforms" hit working class people the most and traditional ALP voters went back to the fold.

Kennett's main losses were in the regional centres of Central Victoria such as Bendigo, Ballarat, Geelong and the La Trobe Valley. These areas were suffering from the economic rationalist offensive against the public sector. Regional centres in Victoria have suffered from cutbacks in rail services, education, hospitals and other government services. These cut backs have cost jobs. They have been a serious inconvenience forcing people to drive to a neighbouring town. The loss of jobs has meant the local economy has suffered from less custom in the shops. All of this has made rural people angry.

Kennett's bragging about "gains for Victoria" refer to Melbourne showpieces such as South Bank and the Casino etc. He is also referring to high credit rating given to Victoria by banks and economists. Some would indeed question their merit, however, to country people all this meant nothing. What is the point of South Bank development if there is no transport anyway?

There are those who think that capitalist politics amount to an all powerful media manipulating a pliable and ignorant public. There is no denying that the very powerful monopolies of Fairfax and Murdoch have their impact. But class forces are still decisive. A strong working class vanguard party can cut through bourgeois lies and false consciousness. In Victoria working and rural people realised that the "Victorian success story" did not mean success for them. And so they voted against Kennett. No amount of lies and rhetoric could compensate for their lack of services.

It is not clear at the moment whether we will have a Bracks led Labor government or not. If Labor gets government it will not be so much a case of them winning but Kennett losing. The only credit they deserve for the swing is that they opened their campaign in Ballarat which is Mr Bracks' electorate. Of course Labor has avoided major issues facing the working class and concentrated on putting over the impression that they were a more humane administration of Victoria. They did not promise to reverse the massive attacks made in the past six years nor the attacks on unionisation. In no way can a Bracks Government be considered a workers government.

There is an important lesson for Kennett (irrespective of whether he scrapes in). And that is that if you treat the country with contempt, you do so at your peril. The left must learn this lesson also. A large percentage of the Victorian proletariat live in rural and regional centres. They must figure in our strategy. Also, small farmers must be won to the proletarian vanguard in a principled way — by taking up issues such as mortgages, cuts in the public sector and privatisation. The small farming community will only listen to the working class if it is prepared to fight decisively. A revolutionary programme is urgently needed.

What appears to be in store is a watered down version of the capitalist economic agenda. We don't want any part of this what so ever. We need a revolutionary agenda.

China: Fifty years of Stalinist bureaucratic tyranny.

In October the reactionary stalinist bureaucracy which rules China celebrates fifty years in power. For many years Mao who led China with his strident rhetoric "all power comes out of a barrel of a gun" (etc) could appear to offer China as the revolutionary leader of at least the third world. Now the counter-revolution is naked for all to see.

These days China has been exposed as a country of massive (tens of millions) unemployment with no social security and workers paid little better than slaves working under barbaric conditions.

It is also a society of massive state repression. Often this is justified in terms of clamping down on counter-revolutionaries. Certainly some support capitalism. Currently the bureaucracy is making massive sellouts to capitalism. It would be difficult to be more counter-revolutionary or more effectively so. But the main victims are the working class. When the bureaucracy makes deals to sell out labour on slave wages, woe betide if you criticise let alone organise against them. China is a police state.

When the Maoist bureaucracy talked left and supported movements overseas, it was supporting class collaborationist national liberation fronts which at least fought imperialism albeit from a class collaborationist perspective. Today's bureaucracy has given up all pretences of condemning, let alone fighting imperialism.

The fiftieth anniversary is celebrated with representatives of such significant capitalist enterprises as Boeing, Ericsson, Pepsico, Coca-Cola, Nokia, Goldman Sachs, General Motors, Fiat and Sony. Also invited are such notable counter-revolutionaries as Henry Kissinger and Lee Kuan Yew. It is hard to envisage anything more counter-revolutionary than this. Basically the bureaucracy is serving up the Chinese proletariat to international business for their super-exploitation.

It goes without saying that these barbaric bureaucrats deserve to be overthrown.— by the Chinese proletariat. Unfortunately there are still some who think that yesterday's China was revolutionary. A Marxist analysis shows that the current cancerous bureaucrats are not an aberration but the logic of counter-revolutionary Maoism.

Communist Left stands for;

*Building a revolutionary alternative to Labor *political power to poor and exploited

through a revolutionary workers and small farmers government

Revolutionary expropriation of capitalist industry (as opposed to bourgeois nationalisation)
A Sliding Scale of hours and wages*Occupations against sackings*

organise the unemployed For rent control* A programme of useful public works

* For women's and gay rights. Free abortion on demand.. Socialise housework and child care. *Opposition to all immigration controls

*Self...determination to the Black (Koorie Murrie, Nungah etc) people of Australia and Torres Strait Islanders

* Class unity with workers of Asia, the Pacific and elsewhere. No to tariffs and protection. Defend jobs everywhere! No to import controls!

* Total opposition to Australian intervention in PNG, Bougainville, Indonesia, Timor, the Pacific, in the Middle East and elsewhere. Workers action against Australia's participation in the US imperialist war drive (including under the banner of the United Nations).

* A new revolutionary communist international

Communist Left RO. Box 119 Erskineville 2043 Australia fueliehead @one.net.au