

September 2000

#49

Contents

2 Bougainville: prospects for peace

3 George Speight Coup in Fiji.

4 Smash all immigration controls

5 Splits in the Liberals and Labor Party over Black rights

6 IVF Howards attack on women's rights

campaign's procapitalist reformism. Nevertheless the logic of a campaign against

## **September 11**

### **anarcho—stalinist alliance bringing Seattle to Melbourne**

As with the Olympics, the international spotlight is on Australia with the World Economic Forum in Melbourne. Basically this is an imperialist conspiracy to defraud the colonised majority of the world's population ('third world' by forcing them to suffer near starvation wages for extremely arduous highly exploitative labour. They also have to endure barbaric dictatorial regimes who bring in the tanks and the guns if they were to rebel or even go on strike. Of course their interests will not be represented in any way at this forum. It is totally an oppressor's forum. It should be smashed. However the point is to smash the whole system of imperialist exploitation — by mobilising the workers internationally around and international programme. This, the protesters are unable to do.

Attention will also be focussed on the opposition outside which (despite press talk about 'Trotskyists') is mainly Anarchist and Stalinist. Also present will be the solidarity popular frontist internationalists Groups who have support nationalist struggles and give support to struggles in other countries. The point should be to be consistently internationalist, from a world outlook — not merely support other nation struggles in other countries.

The anarchists want to bring to Melbourne, the experiences of Seattle Washington and Davos. Thanks to the internet they now have a massive social base which can be coordinated internationally. Their way of "fighting multinationals" is to mobilise as many of their feral lumpen social base as possible to disrupt. Some argue that the organisation solidarity etc achieved prefigures the new society "anarchy in action". They are hostile to both Trotskyism "paper sellers" and any orientation to the workers movement. We have downloaded an internet message urging fellow anarchists to exclude Trotskyists. Irrespective of what we think of ISO, DSP, Workers Power etc. we defend their right to be present and sell papers. The self-proclaimed ultra democratic anarchists oppose workers democracy in political practice — when other currents in the left and workers movement challenge them.

Paper selling is an important revolutionary activity. Through newspapers we learn the political lessons of experiences and movements we are not necessarily immediately involved with. Through a newspaper we can understand the totality of capitalism, nationally and internationally, Anarchist hostility to paper selling reflects their hostility to politics or their petty bourgeois individualism.

Anarchists (for example Angry People have built campaigns targeting the big malignant capitalists. MacDonald's, Nike, Bill Gates and Margaret Thatcher have been their targets. Their blatant arrogance and immoral behaviour have made them easy targets. Of course it is often fair enough to take an example of one of the more malignant capitalists to show that this behaviour is the logic of the system and how it operates. The point is to show that to fight MacDonald's and Nike effectively you must oppose the system in its totality. Unfortunately anarchist supported campaigns do not do this. It could easily be interpreted from the leaflet handed out by anarchist London Greenpeace (who MacDonald's sued) that MacDonald's are bad but are merely a blot on a fundamentally acceptable system. The current single issue campaign against Nike footwear does not fundamentally object to Nike's right to exploit. It merely wants Nike to be a "good corporate citizen". Anarchists would no doubt object to the

The stalinists are fitting into to September 11 very comfortably, hand in glove. They have traditionally had an antimonopoly strategy. Basically they target the big malignant capitalists, the monopolists. The overthrow of the system comes secondary — as part of the second stage of the revolution. Using this rationalisation the supported bourgeois governments (who took "antimonopoly" stands) and "nonmonopoly bourgeois companies (such as East West Airways). So they can adopt their programme very easily to the new spirit of targeting individual multinationals.

The stalinists have learned to be flexible. They are prepared to accept the ultra left tactics of the anarchists because they don't challenge either their minimalism or their nationalism. They realise that if they don't rock the boat and cooperate with the anarchists they can win over the more liberal and concrete wing of the movement.

What Left Connections /Search Foundation does is provide a conducting medium between political activists and the trade union bureaucracy. The "left" trade union bureaucrats oppose multinationals — from the point of view of reactionary economic nationalism. Their slogan "Fair trade not free trade" endorses capitalist trade — as if it could possibly be "fair". Ted Wilshire Left Connections aligned academic rationalises an alliance between "progressive internationalists" and economic nationalists by claiming they are all part of the same movement "challenging globalisation".

What trade union bureaucrats like Doug Cameron want to do is lobby for government assistance and protection for both local capitalists and multinationals based locally. This sells out workers in Asia and the Pacific and internationally.

Left Connections attack One Nation for "opportunistically cashing in" on the movement against multinationals. But fighting for merely "Aussie jobs" effectively denying jobs to workers elsewhere plays into their hands. For both the bureaucrats and the extreme right Aussies deserve jobs yet others don't. Bogifying Asians is the next logical step.

Doug Cameron admits that the union movement played soft under Hawke, Keating and during the first term of Howard. This indeed is a damning admission. Now he informs us, the gloves are off.

What this newly found fighting power means is lobbying for protectionist and economic nationalist policies in marginal electorates. There is no talk of a new party. Doug is proudly a member of the Labor Party. Cameron is going to be out of luck. Neither the main bourgeois parties offer anything but total submission to “market forces” read capitalism. But he is pushing for a reactionary option. Perhaps he will attract the Australian Democrats.

Most anarchists are virulently hostile to lobbying parliament and the trade union bureaucracy. But our point is that their campaigns which single out the most malignant capitalists and companies plays right into their hands.

Capitalist internationalism can only be fought by communist internationalism. This requires working class action (to close down the conference) and working class solidarity to fight capitalism internationally. Even if you close down every conference international finance capital will still continue its plunderous ways. It is the actions of the capitalists that really matter not the talk fests.

A workers campaign would go out to working class areas and explain how workers in Australia have a common interest with workers in Asia, the Pacific and elsewhere and have the same common enemy — international finance capital. Both the anti working class feral internationalists and the trade union bureaucratic protectionists are a barrier to such a movement.

### **Bougainville: prospects for peace**

The only major attention payed to Bougainville by the Australian media this year has been a mimicking of Gay and Lesbian Mardi Gras by Australian troops there. Yes there are Australian troops still occupying the island of Bougainville even though we are informed that there is a decision to scale this presence down. All Australian troops must be opposed outright. Australia has imposed imperialist domination of both PNG and Bougainville enabling CRA to extract billions of dollars in mineral wealth at the expense of poorly paid workers and peasants whose land has been destroyed. Australia is part of the problem not part of the solution.

Recently on ABC TV there has been some heartening news. The PNG negotiators have conceded the need for a referendum for the people of Bougainville to determine their future. However there are still many obstacles as this has to be ratified by the PNG Parliament We wish the Bougainville people all the best.

Self determination for Bougainville!

### **George Speight's coup in Fiji.**

Small businessman George Speight became famous internationally when he with some friends burst into a Fijian Cabinet meeting and at gunpoint held as hostage the elected Prime Minister Chaudry and his cabinet. They were released many weeks later only after the armed forces agreed to most of the demands of the Speight Gang This included a government weighted towards ethnic Fijians. In instigating his coup George Speight was following the precedent of colonel Rambuka who, in 1967, overthrew the elected government of Bavadra at gun point. Rambuka claims to be a changed man, recognising the importance of Fijian Indians to the Fijian economy. He is of course talking about the Indo-Fijian petty bourgeoisie. He has no regrets about attacking the union movement nor union representation in parliament. Rambuka didn't act so Speight did.

There were, however, two key differences. Rambuka was part of the Fijian state apparatus and Speight wasn't. Rambuka was representing Fijian capitalism and Speight merely represented himself and his rightwing clique. The popular front did attack some of the excesses of certain capitalists and that included George Speight. George Speight businessman was hoping the coup would protect him from charges concerning the illegal removal of currency from Fiji. Speight has achieved most of his political objectives. His future however lies languishing in a Fijian jail.

George Speight is an astute man from the point of view of understanding Fijian political reality. He knew that the popular front government had no real power and all power was really in the ethnic Fijian dominated Fijian armed forces. He knew that many of these forces were hankering for an ethnic Fijian racist government and would therefore equivocate, if not support him. He knew that the chiefs would do likewise. He also knew that he could project himself as a power leader and mobilise ethnic Fijians on a racist level.

Well the George Speight theory of political power almost worked. He got his Fijian dominated racist parliament. He got his racist constitution. He did this all by projecting force and intransigence. Speight put the pressure on and authorities capitulated. His mobilisation of ethnic Fijians was only reasonably successful. He mobilised enough to create racial tension and a degree of social unrest But not enough to complete the counter-revolution. When the authorities did actually arrest Speight they knew that there would be no major uprising.

However, there was only so far the authorities could go. Speight was a reactionary whose coup was serving reactionary ends, But from the bourgeoisie's (both imperialist and comprador) point of view he was doing something else — exposing the Fijian state as a paper tiger. Imperialists from US, Japan and Australia have billions of dollars tied up in Fiji. They rely on the state to defend these interests, And exposing its weakness could promote uprisings and perhaps revolution. This was threatened if the Speight movement got out of control.

The army have sort of resolved things by instituting a racist government. Making an agreement so Speight would release the hostages and breaking that agreement arguing that Speight and friends did not disarm as promised. They have to jail Speight. They must show they have the capacity to deal with any upstart who may be prompted to defy authority otherwise Fiji might blow up in their faces..

Of course they are not unhappy with the political result. They want a right-wing ethnic Fijian government. Speight did the dirty work. He created the conditions whereby they could rationalise the imposition of such a government in the name of "resolving the problems created by Speight" etc. Of course Australia and New Zealand can tut-tut on the side. But they won't do anything. They don't really want to defend Chaudry. They want to give the appearance of defending democracy when what they really want to defend is imperialist stability. To facilitate this they want democratic credentials.

There has been a degree of sympathy for Speight coming from some leftists because he proclaimed the interests of ethnic Fijians and indigenous people. Speight had a degree of support from some ethnic Fijians. but basically he acted first and entrusted that Fijians would follow him. He made alluring speeches about how Fijians were impoverished and oppressed. But there was no commitment to expropriate the dominant multinationals who are doing the exploiting. In reality Speight was doing those multinationals a favour by attacking the working class. Some Indians in Fiji

do have a privileged position. But they are more on the whole petty bourgeois and not bourgeois. To scapegoat Indians in Fiji is like scapegoating Jews in Germany. The enemy is class not race.

Unfortunately the Fiji workers movement has shown that it has learnt absolutely nothing. Colonel Rambuka smashed a popular front parliamentary government so they tried to form another one. They seem somewhat surprised that this gets smashed too although from outside the official state apparatus, So Chaudry comes crawling to John Howard. It is no surprise that Howard wept crocodile tears but did nothing at all. Any attempt for Australia to intervene must be unconditionally opposed irrespective of its proclaimed purpose. Australia would only intervene for imperialist purposes. Depending on Australia for power (if by chance they should defend Chaudry) would expose the workers movement weak in the eyes of the oppressed. Worse still it would appear as an accomplice of imperialism. Even if there was the apparent short term gain of returning Chaudry, such a gain would be illusory. A new Chaudry Government reinstated by imperialism would be a prisoner of imperialism

Chaudry thought he had learnt the lessons of Bavaria. Like all true reformists he believes Bavaria's mistake was being too left wing, His answer was and is More submission to the system including the acceptance of a Fijian Chief president George Speight has shown the folly of this. A politically weak working class paves the way for bourgeois repression either in the form of state repression or fascism.

In Fiji as elsewhere it is only the working class fighting for proletarian dictatorship which can be consistently democratic. They must fight for a real republic not mitigated by reactionary chiefs. This can only be achieved through workers and small farmer's power — by the expropriation of the bourgeoisie and the smashing of the Fijian state. Internationally they must receive the maximum workers solidarity. All imperialist intervention is reactionary.

### **Smash all immigration controls !**

Throughout the world imperialists with the assistance of local reactionaries have imposed on many peoples of many nations brutal and bloody dictatorships Faced with the prospect of brutal imprisonment or even losing their lives many are forced to flee brutal dictatorships such as in Turkey, Indonesia and Afghanistan. So what does Australia offer to these victims of repression ? Prison camps. Thousands are forced to endure confinement waiting on the Liberals to determine whether they are worthy refugees or otherwise. some have to stay at Woomera in the central Australian desert, known for its oppressive heat. hundreds of kilometres from Adelaide. The residents are totally isolated from any contact with their national community.

This barbaric treatment of working people and oppressed has been under attack internationally. And rightly so! This is indeed a question of human rights. But Australia is not alone. Australia is behaving at least as barbarically as many other imperialist and countries who offer victims of barbaric regimes, prison if they dare seek refuge in the particular country whether it be United States, Britain France or Germany.

Howard is seeking to create a division. The "good" immigrants are "real refugees" who went through proper procedures. They are welcome after a period of detention when the government "determines their validity". Other who did not are to be sent home. Often the reason is that they

didn't know what the procedure was as there was no Australian representation in their home country. Anyhow we must reject totally Howard's division between the good and needy as opposed to the nasty illegals. We have one principle. Working people should have the right to travel to and live in any country they please. Smash all immigration controls!

Smash all immigration controls must become policy for the whole of the labour movement. In Villawood, Sydney and in Melbourne leftwing demonstrations have given refugees support. This is good and these demonstrations are supportable. However merely mobilising the left is not good enough. A workers campaign is necessary. We must point out that racist policies have bipartisan support and not as the ISO suggest merely Howard's policies.

### **Liberal and Labor divisions over Black rights**

In August Malcolm Fraser spoke in Darwin. He was speaking in honour of Gurindji fighter Vincent Lingari. He had some tough words to say about Howard on the black question. He wanted Howard to use Federal powers and intervene on mandatory sentencing. He posed the idea of autonomy as has introduced in Canada. He posed this as a way of preserving the Australian nation. He counterposed it to self determination of national secession. He supported an Agreement as counterposed to a Treaty. Howard proclaimed the words of Menzies when he said that the Liberal Party was a liberal party as opposed to a conservative party. Obviously the finger was pointed at John Howard.

Well there were semantic differences. But Malcolm Fraser sounded similar to many politically correct activists. He took pride in walking across the Sydney Harbour Bridge for 'reconciliation Fraser realises that most of the demands raised pose no threat to capitalism. In 1976 the Australian black paper KOORI BINA had as its first headline GENOCIDE. It was their reaction to Fraser's thirty three million dollar cut in black funding. Perhaps this word was an exaggeration. But given the poor quality of schooling, housing education health etc, Blacks were entitled to a strong reaction. Certainly many died from Fraser's cuts. The real record of Fraser has been forgotten and Black demands have moderated. So Fraser can pose as a progressive.

Basically Fraser is concerned with the image of Australia in the United Nations and with Howard alienating the world body by treating it with arrogant contempt. He thinks Australia can have the appropriate image without endangering imperialist interests (such as mining).

Howard has a different agenda. Whereas Fraser represents the ruling class, he is part of the reactionary racist middle class — the class of Pauline Hanson. He is a racist. He also knows the power of racism — as a tool to keep the labour aristocracy and middle classes (some sections) loyal to the system. He knows that much of Labour's base is racist and Beazley Labour is caught between its base and the influential politically correct middle classes.

Howard knows there is a price to pay in terms of international prestige. But he finds this well worth it as he stands to gain locally. He knows that those countries who make noises about Australia will be doing just that. They will sell out when trade with Australia is involved. Nor does he care about Australia's image "racist country" amongst the politically correct.

The divisions within the Labor Party are of a different character. Last week witnessed the first resignation from Labor's front bench on a point of principle for over a decade. Beazley Labor is the aspiring Federal government To win government he hopes to win the "politically correct" middle

classes. The overwhelming majority of those who crossed the harbour in the name of “reconciliation” were inclined to vote Labor or at least not Liberal. Beazley must appear to be progressive on the Black question.

But Labor is also in office in the state of Queensland. And to remain in office Peter Beattie must placate the mining interests who control the Queensland economy. It would indeed be very embarrassing if there was a blatant conflict of interest between Beazley and Beattie, Federal and state Labor. Beazley is sensitive to Labor’s needs in Queensland and hence he liquidated Labor’s commitment even further.

None of the mainstream parties offer a serious resolution to the Black question in this country. And that includes the Democrats and Greens. All that is offered is token recognition of Black culture and minor gains (so long as nothing fundamental as property is threatened). Or alternatively overt racism. Whether it’s Liberal or Labor, Democrat or Green, the capitalist system of exploitation with its racist oppression of Black people remains, It is only under socialism that black demands for self-determination can be meaningfully achieved, It is only by overthrowing the profit system that Black people will get the money needed for housing, education health etc they need for decent survival. It is only by smashing the state that the racist police force will be abolished. We are opposed to any sentencing of black people not just mandatory sentencing. In fact our version of mandatory sentencing will be to tell judges to let starving people go free.

This does not mean we must wait for a revolution to happen. Revolutions don’t just happen. They must be made. We must start now. A workers movement which is indifferent to or even supports Black oppression cannot be revolutionary. No class or group of people can be free when they oppress another. Workers have a direct interest in challenging racism because in doing so they are challenging the system antagonistic to all working people. Alternatively by supporting racism they are supporting the system and ultimately attacking their own interests. It is the role of a revolutionary vanguard to draw these vital political conclusions

#### **IVF.Howard’s attack on women’s’ rights**

Recently the question of the right of single women and lesbians to have children through IVF fertilisation. A single woman in Victoria won this right claiming that the ban on her having children was contrary to Antidiscrimination Act. She proclaimed her victory as a major gain for single women and lesbians, We agree.

However this allowed that politically astute reactionary John Howard to make his move. He proclaimed that single women and lesbians shouldn’t have the right to a child through JVF and legislation should be amended accordingly.

This achieved three objectives, firstly it reinforced monogamous heterosexuality as the bastion of capitalist society. If Howard has his way it would be the only way a woman could be allowed to bring up a child. There is even talk of restricting IVF to married couples. This would please Mr Howard. Even greater.

Secondly this promotes the chauvinism in Australian society which Howard seeks to promote. Howard is grateful to Ms Pauline Hanson and her One Nation for raising its reactionary head. He has cashed in on the chauvinist political environment created. Howard wants to extend the chauvinist

agenda to the issue of women's rights. All this ties in nicely with the campaign for single mother's pensioners and welfare beneficiaries to work for their meagre allowances.

Thirdly it has divided the Labor Party. Howard knows that Labor is an unstable alliance between the politically correct and the reactionary Catholic right. The IVF issue has worked beautifully for him. A leading unionist from the Catholic right lobbied MP's and there was even talk of some crossing the floor. Beazley stood firm in defence of single mothers and lesbians. But rightwing pressure for a conscious vote or compromise had its effect. The Labor Party may not split. But Beazley would be exposed as a weak compromiser. The IVF issue shows it is Howard who is dominating the political agenda in this country.

Communist Left supports the right of women to have whatever types of relationship suits them. There are many successful managed and defacto relationships. But women should not be forced to marry or live with the same man lest they be deprived the right to have a child. Single women and lesbians can be excellent child raisers. Some women will tell you that they might be better off being without their husband. But the point is that the type of relationship should be the women's choice and not the governments. And women should not be deprived of their right to give birth by choosing a relationship other than the nuclear family.

The campaign against women's rights is part of the bourgeois offensive in this country and internationally. Traditionally capitalism has demanded that a women's place is in the home. During the radicalism of the seventies many gains for women were achieved. Even though the gains were real they were not fundamental. Of course because there was still capitalism most of the beneficiaries were middle class. But they have pointed to an alternative to domestic slavery. And therefore the ruling class will fight to abolish the — tooth and nail. Women cannot rely on Beazley who will at best be vacillating and useless or worse join the reactionary offensive himself.