

## September 1993

Sept. 11 - bloody anniversary for Chile and Turkey .....	3
Mabo and Black self-determination .....	
Defend the Communist League .....	4'
Kashmir, Pakistan and India .....	5`'
What about Anarchism? .....	6

## Bougainville. The war made by Australia

THE WAR IN BOUGAINVILLE IS Australia's *hidden* war. Hidden because of an almost complete media blackout. Occasionally the odd human interest story surfaces e.g. the Sun-Herald report on Rosemary Gillespie's persecution by cops for carrying drugs (i.e. medicines) destined for blockade-effected Bougainville. Media attention concentrated on her personal crusade, in effect denying the broader political movement she is part of.

ABC TV's Foreign Correspondent didn't obey the media blackout. Instead, it went one step further and deliberately falsified and distorted the situation. It made a big deal of a few anti-BRA dissident forces in an attempt to paint the war as a civil war with the PNG armed forces as saviours. No mention was made of how little support or territory the anti-BRA Bougainville forces actually have. Statutory Declarations testifying to human rights atrocities gathered by Rosemarie Gillespie were "repudiated" (George Negus would have us believe) on the basis of one single opposing claim to each allegation. One of the so-called witnesses was not present as claimed, nor was his connection with the PNG armed forces mentioned. It was shown whilst Rosemarie Gillespie and Bougainville Interim Government representative Mosses Havini were in Vienna at the U.N. Human Rights Conference, effectively silencing their objections. No mention of Australian intervention was made. No other media attention has focused on Bougainville.

This is deliberate. The Australian Government has a direct interest in suppressing news because it's a war made by Australia. The PNG armed forces are backed to the hilt with Australian helicopters, military advisers, and mortars made in suburban St. Marys. Australian imperialism is also responsible for the economic and political causes of the conflict. Last century, Queensland, a British colony, acting on behalf of the British Empire, annexed Papua. After the First World War, the League of Nations made New Guinea (until then a German colony which included Buka-Bougainville from 1899) an Australian protectorate after Germany's defeat. Meanwhile Britain administered the Solomon Islands. The Bougainville people became part of Australian New Guinea because they were colonised by Germany, not Britain, as their Solomon Island near relatives were. Australia has never recognised their national identity.

The Australian state became even more opposed to the Bougainville people's national rights when the copper mine was established at Panguna. It undertook a paramilitary operation - Australian colonial administration police moved in with tear gas, rifles and shot guns to assist British multinational Conzinc Riotinto's expropriation. The mine is administered by Australian subsidiary Conzinc Riotinto Australia (CRA). They generously offered compensation, initially, a mere \$20,000--peanuts! This, for a mine, which after a then estimated life span of 30 years, would be a massive hole in the ground with the Paguna people's land and fishing destroyed.

When the Whitlam Labor government, elected in 1972 on that promise, granted independence to Papua New Guinea, it was only a formality. Economically, Papua New Guinea was still dominated by imperialists, including Australian companies Burns Philp and R.W. Carpenter, who had a strangle hold on the local economy. The social imperialist Whitlam government was confident the PANGU Pati would act as their loyal servants. Just before independence Somare brought in the troops who quelled striking miners with tear gas. Over 900 were arrested, with 800 crammed into jails. 150 apprentices were released when it was established they were elsewhere at the time of the strike! Arrest first with tear gas, ask questions later. This was the gung-ho approach of the Whitlam Australian government and their PNG lackeys. With such loyalty from Somare, the Australian bosses knew they had compradors who would keep Papua New Guinea safe for plundering.

Bougainville beat PNG to the punch by first declaring its independence on September 1, 1975, 15 days before the mainland. Somare, however, was not about to tolerate an independent Bougainville. He rationalised the move for PNG control by putting on a left face and arguing that an independent Bougainville would be powerless against a strong CRA. This argument was supported by others on the Nuigini left and even in Australia by **Tribune**. It was, in effect, a left rationalisation for chauvinism. Somare fully supported state repression against the workers on the copper mine. He had already shown his governments support for CRA by his actions. In the end, independent Bougainville meekly submitted rather than suffer violence. History has shown that this capitulation has only delayed the conflict.

For the past twenty four years, Bougainvillians have tried to pursue every peaceful and legal avenue to get satisfactory compensation. Meanwhile CRA has made billions, destroying their land and polluting their water. Their final use of direct action was a last resort and in November 1989 they again declared independence. The PNG Administration responded with armed force. From the onset it was clear, despite the denials, that Australia was backing

them. The Australian working class have a duty to *act*. *For workers' direct action against Australian intervention! All military supplies must be declared black by transport workers, seamen and wharfies. Black bans and strike action against CRA and any imperialist company who profits out of Bougainville! This type of action is a matter of urgency. It must begin now!*

Australian workers acted in 1969 when CRA, assisted by the Australian administration, expropriated the mine. Queensland TLC moved a resolution condemning Australian imperialism. Wharfies blacked a ship destined for Bougainville. This could have been the beginning of a consistent working class movement. We need that sort of action and more *now!*

Why isn't there any? First, some view this as an internal PNG matter. Some don't understand the national question and Bougainville. More importantly, the labour movement has degenerated politically. In 1969 Australian workers' militancy was charged by Australia's impending defeat in Vietnam. This forced the Whitlam-led ALP and the trade union bureaucracy left. With the injustice in Vietnam clearly visible to Australian unionists the case for Bougainville was easily shown. Finally, the Australian working class has suffered because of its leadership's degeneration over the past 20 years, culminating in the election of the Hawke Government with its Prices and Income Accord. Because of their allegiance to the Hawke and Keating Governments, trade union leaders are more reticent to act on the Bougainville issue. We must demand the leadership act. They may act, although this is unlikely given their ties. Keating Labor is committed to a "stable" (read imperialist) Papua New Guinea. CRA makes regular donations to ALP election campaigns.

If the leadership fails us we must go to the rank and file. Working class people must be shown why they have a direct interest in Australian imperialism's defeat. **CRA is part of the same comprador imperialist capitalist class which is attacking workers' wages, conditions and jobs in Australia. As long as workers accept Australian comprador imperialism in Bougainville than they can't consistently fight the boss's offensive here in Australia, now.** The revolutionary vanguard's responsibility is to draw and publicise these conclusions so workers will act on Bougainville self-determination.

War is an acid test of revolutionary credentials - especially for those who claim to stand for the traditions of Lenin and Trotsky. Genuine revolutionaries are obliged to respond decisively, against the class ruling their country. This is especially important in an imperialist country or a country like Australia which plays a mini-imperialist role. Unfortunately the left's record is very poor: the Socialist Labour League's current campaign in the Broadmeadow by-election makes no mention of Bougainville; there is no article on Bougainville in the latest issue of **Militant**; the last two issues of **The Socialist** have devoted only half a column, restricted to police harassment of Rosemarie Gillespie. (One ISO member justifies this by saying they must concentrate on important issues such as Mabo or the Budget or be marginalised, an opinion which reflects the ISO school of propaganda i.e. **The Socialist** concentrates on the issues featured in the mass media or among students from a "revolutionary" point of view. So when there is a media blackout on Bougainville, it effectively goes along with it).

The lefties who want to do something are involved in the popular front solidarity group, the Bougainville Freedom Movement. This is supported by and led by the Bougainville Interim Government and its supporters: church people such as Pax Christi; Greens and peace activists; Stalinist organisations such as the Socialist Party of Australia and the Communist Party of Australia (Marxist/Leninist); the Democratic Socialist Party; the revisionist Communist League and International Socialist Organisation. Moses and Marilyn Havini, representatives of the Bougainville Interim Government, are devout Christians and BFM's method reflects their ideology. They spend as much time with church groups as they do with unions. A recent Bougainville teach-in featured Australian Democrat Senator Vicky Bourne, Amnesty International (who said they were against both sides), the International Commission of Jurists, Pax Christi and the more radical Marylyn and Moses Havini, Rosemary Gillespie and Hannah Middleton. This hardly amounts to a movement that will fight imperialism. They certainly don't believe in drawing class lines. BFM's method is the moral persuasion of respectable people who will not be a party to anything which challenges CRA or Australian imperialism.

For Communist Tendency, defeating imperialism requires class principle. The only people with an objective interest in fighting imperialism are the working class because they have an interest antagonistic to capitalism. The Australian Democrats may genuinely dislike the way Australian imperialism is operating but they will do nothing about CRA, or about Australian economic control of PNG or about the Wingti Government because they are committed to the system. Their support for Bougainville will never be anything more than superficial. They will not identify with working class direct action. BFM has a choice: present their respectable credentials to the Democrats or undertake meaningful class struggle against the imperialist war. They can't have it both ways.

Bougainville today should be as much trade union business as it was for Frank Purse in 1969, when he demanded it be raised at the ACTU conference. But the left is not fighting for class struggle - not even in its formal propaganda! Bougainville people are dying because of the blockade and Australia's war. It's time for working class action - now!

**Build a working class movement against  
Australian imperialism in Bougainville!  
For workers' action on Bougainville  
Self-determination, now!  
Expropriate CRA!  
Smash Australian imperialism!**

## September 11. bloody anniversary for Chile and Turkey

SEPTEMBER 11 is a black day in the history of Chile and Turkey. On this day, in 1973, the democratically elected Allende Government was drowned in blood by General Pinochet's Chilean armed forces. And on this day in 1980, Turgat Ozal, in Turkey, established his military dictatorship by bloody military coup. The circumstances were different but the results were the same - thousands of working class people and leftists were imprisoned, tortured and/or murdered. We must learn the lessons of these two coups for class struggle, lest history repeat itself in the same bloody way. Here, in Australia, we can only agree with the apt description of the Kerr Coup against Whitlam as "Chile without the blood". Of course, we categorically reject the direction Whitlam took the ALP as a consequence of this - to become totally subordinated to the system. Our lesson is that we must overthrow the system.

The events in Chile were a graphic illustration of the failure of the popular front and the parliamentary road to socialism. President Allende was elected on the basis of an alliance between the reformist Socialist Party, the Stalinist Communist Party and bourgeois forces. This was a classical parliamentary popular front. As in Australia in 1975, Allende had to contend with a hostile upper house. To placate the upper house, he made deals - deals which disarmed the Chilean working class, exposing their weakness. The Chilean bourgeoisie, linked to imperialism, were not, however, placated. The United States was hell bent on smashing the Allende regime using the Chilean armed forces. What Allende did was hand over a disarmed working class on a platter. Thousands of unarmed workers were brutally murdered and tortured. At the time there was a lot more going on than the reforms Allende was legislating in parliament. Working people were organised and demanding arms. Attacks on the state by organised workers had begun well before the September 11 coup. Allende, prisoner of parliament and the deals with bourgeois parties, was betrayed. Although the main left opposition to the Allende government, the MIR (Movement of the Revolutionary Left), made criticisms on the military level, it did not have a fundamental critique of popular frontism. No alternative leadership emerged.

In Turkey, Turgat Ozal overthrew a bourgeois nationalist government of the RPP led by Ecevit. This party had considerable working class support. Historically it had played a progressive role. It was the party of Mustapha Kemal Ataturk. At the turn of the century Ataturk implemented some important bourgeois democratic reforms such as abolishing the Moslem veil. He was acknowledged by the early Comintern for playing this relatively progressive role. Whilst Ecevit didn't have the same progressive record, he was too democratic for the imperialists. Turgat Ozal took power with their backing while NATO were having a conference in Turkey. Italy was the only country at the conference to make a formal protest. As a result of this coup, thousands have been arrested, murdered and tortured. Repressive legislation against basic union rights was introduced. The war with the Kurdish people was intensified with villages being blown up by the air force.

What we must learn from these events is that if working people are politically dependent on the bourgeoisie, bloody consequences will result. This is true either in the context of an organisational popular front (as in Chile) or through liquidation into a national bourgeois party (as in Turkey). Communist Tendency urges workers not only to commemorate the murder of those thousands, but also to remember that the Stalinist strategy of popular front was responsible by agreeing to disarmed the working class.

## Mabo and Black self-determination

MABO is a new four letter word to sections of the Australian ruling class. Fear and panic have spread about the possibility of Black legal claims against mining and rural interests costing the capitalists billions. Others see the Mabo decision as a great breakthrough for Black land rights. Paul Keating declared that Mabo could be important for showing that Australia was doing something about justice for Aboriginal people. Initially he embraced it as a way of getting anti-racist credentials courtesy of the High Court. Under pressure from mining interests assisted by Wayne Goss, he has since been forced to retreat.

The Mabo decision's high profile makes it very important for the revolutionary left to understand what it really represents: Eddy Mabo was, until- he died, leader of the Merriam People who live in Torres Strait. They took the Queensland Government to the High Court claiming continuous occupation and therefore ownership of the Murray Islands. By winning they challenged the racist underpinning of Australian law. Britain's forced expropriation of the Black and Torres St. Islands was generally rationalised by the principle of terra nullius. Basically, this denied that Black people were there at all. It is fundamentally racist.

Whilst repudiating terra nullius is a small gain, it has to be recognised that the Merriam people had exceptional circumstances on their side. They could establish continuity of occupation and exclusive possession. Very few Black tribes or peoples can establish this. Most were dispossessed without record or recognition.

The Mabo decision does not end the issue of Black self-determination. In fact the debate could become a diversion. If Black rights are defined in terms of Mabo then only a minority will benefit. Those who aren't eligible under this decision could end up with no rights being recognised.

By applying to the High Court, the Merriam people were in effect accepting their conquest by British imperialism with its annexation of their home as part of the then colony of Queensland. We must never accept this act of conquest. The Torres Strait Islanders must be given their right to secede and either form their own nation or join Papua New Guinea.

The ruling class panic and hysteria must be fought. This panic shows how threatened they are. The racism of every Australian Government is exposed by the fact that it took a High Court decision to give Black people basic property rights. Black rights should be fought on the basis of national rights not on property rights. It is on this basis that the revolutionary left must defend self-determination of Black and Torres St. Islanders. Of course it is probable that Black people will, in struggle, transcend nationalism and act as the vanguard of class struggle. This is what revolutionaries want. In no way do we want to impose on Black people a national dynamic. But we must show Black people that we recognise their national rights, including the right to secede and form their own nation - if that is what they choose.

## Defend the Communist League

FASCISTS HAVE STRUCK AGAIN by painting the walls of the Pathfinder book shop in Sydney's Surry Hills with swastikas and other vile graffiti. The bookshop is run by the Communist League which is in solidarity with the Socialist Workers' Party of the United States. It sells the works of Nelson Mandela, Maurice Bishop and Malcolm X as well as Marx, Lenin and Trotsky. No doubt the fascists want to repress books written by Black authors "to purify the Aryan race" as well as to attack the communist movement.

Communist Tendency unconditionally defends the Communist League as well as any person or organisation, left wing (Communist or anarchist), Jewish, Gay, Black or even liberal democratic, the fascists might disapprove of. Fascism must be nipped in the bud, now, by class struggle. Unfortunately Communist League members, besides informing the left, appear to be defending themselves by only going to the police. As **RED** has stated previously, is a serious sign of the left's weakness to rely on the state for its defense. This reliance could be used by the fascists to expose the left. It could also threaten the left-wing organisation's internal security if the state has access to its records. We must do our utmost to minimise dependence on the state - now. A united front for class struggle must be initiated - now!

## Kashmir, Pakistan, and India

IT MAY SURPRISE MANY that in July President Clinton decided not to classify Pakistan as an "outlaw nation".

Pakistan is part of the so-called free west. It has never been very democratic. In fact quite the contrary, opponents of successive regimes have been brutally dealt with. But this is not really the issue. Most of the allies of the USA aren't. It may have mattered when the Soviet Union persecuted the likes of Solzhenitzyn but not when General Pinochet tortures and murders leftists in or out of prison or when Turgat Ozal of Turkey bombs Kurdish villages. It only matters if Saddam Hussein attacks the Kurds when he also attacks Kuwait.

Pakistan has loyally contributed troops to the United Nations imperialist intervention in Somalia. When the Red Army invaded Afghanistan, Pakistan dutifully backed the reactionary Afghan rebels. It has been a prized reactionary ally of the United States.

This reactionary state is involved in a war which goes right back to its formation. It is connected to the people of the Indian state of Kashmir who are fighting the Indian Government.

Pakistan is not really a nation. It was formed on the basis of being the area where those of the Moslem religion were the majority. Pakistan actually divided nationalities. Punjab was divided with the western half becoming part of Pakistan. Bengal was divided with the eastern part becoming East Pakistan.

In 1973 East Pakistan, aided by India, fought a war of liberation to become the independent nation of Bangla Desh. Bangla Desh ("land of the Bengalis") was so named as not to offend India by stirring up Bengali nationalism. The rest of Bengal remains a state of India.

Pakistan is supposed to be the area where Moslems live but Kashmir is part of India. The water from the Ganges flows from Kashmir. Now there was no way that Indian rulers would permit control of the water being in the hands of Moslems. So Kashmir had to remain Indian. As a result, for the last forty years, there have been wars involving Pakistan. The Pakistani ruling elite of fanatical Moslems have been committed to liberating their Kashmiri fellow believers from the control of heathens. Kashmir has been divided in half but this is not a solution.

There has been an internal war in Kashmir between guerillas and the Indian Government. The guerillas are divided between those who want an independent Kashmir and those who want a Pakistani Kashmir. But they all hate India. India, of course considers this to be an internal affair with any Pakistani support to anyone to be aggression. Clinton talks about human rights. Out of consistency India thinks Clinton should be just as antagonistic to what India perceives to be Pakistani aggression as to so-called aggression by Serbia or in Somalia. India is angry that Pakistan has not been declared an outlaw nation.

Pakistan is fundamentally a reactionary nation. It was created as a means of dividing the Indian people on reactionary religious lines. Revolutionaries support a united federation of India with self-determination for every real nationality such as Bengali, Sindi, and Punjabi. The fact that Pakistan has been ruled by military junta for most of its forty-five years testifies to this. However the cause of the Kashmiris is just. The reactionary agreement partitioning India to create Pakistan was supposed to give Moslems a choice. This has deprived the Kashmiris. We must support their military victory against India.

## What about Anarchism?

ANARCHISM is attractive to sections of the radical left because it's relatively undefined and thus open to many interpretations. Some of the least serious anarchists see it as providing a vehicle for "revolutionary" self-expression without the need for revolutionary discipline. Others take their line seriously. It's not clear to an outsider what anarchism really is.

There are various types of anarchists with varying programmes. For anarchist individualists, of which Stennerism is one example, the individual and personal freedom is all important. Some anarchists who emphasise personal life want to intervene collectively through communes, sharing their food, housework and child care and even their sex lives. Some adherents believe in promiscuity as a matter of political principle. Black Rose Bookshop collective is the most serious representative of this trend. Black Rose broke away from Jura Books with the idea of synthesising their practice on every level including trade union, personal and running a bookshop. Anarcho-feminists see anarchism as consistent feminism.

Some anarchists see hierarchy as the main contradiction. The struggle for them is between order givers and order takers. Class antagonism is seen as a mere component within the anti-hierarchical struggle. From this logic the bureaucratic trade union leader is just as much an enemy as the boss. The class line is dissolved into personal politics.

Many traditional anarchists have an orientation to the rural peasantry. The famous anarchist Nestor Machno opposed both cities and the working class. These days many anarchists with the ruralist philosophy gravitate towards the green movement although they oppose its electoral orientation.

One of the more serious of the variants is anarchosyndicalism. Anarcho-syndicalism is working class oriented. What its strategy amounts to is a more militant, democratic, grass roots version of trade unionism. Traditionally anarcho-syndicalists have had as their strategy the general strike and industrial sabotage.

Anarchists vary on whether revolution is necessary. Some say the revolution is what you can do every day if you don't obey the system's dictates. Others believe in peaceful transformation, arguing that the police will be persuaded to join the collective. Others believe in an exemplary confrontation with the police to create an atmosphere of struggle.

The common thread to all anarchism is opposition to politics and opposition to political parties. Both are impermissible to any anarchist of any stripe.

There have been many attempts by anarchists to come to grips with Bolshevism. The most serious is Freddy and Lorraine Pearlman's analysis. In **Manual for Revolutionary Leaders**, using the nom de plume Michael Velli (Machiavelli!), they attempt to get to the theoretical roots of the differences between Leninists and anarchists. Leninists, according to them, define their strategy as a theory of consciousness, not in terms of the relationship to the means of production: "According to the theory of class consciousness, individuals or classes are revolutionary if they adhere to revolutionary ideas". Pearlman/Velli conclude that this has totalitarian consequences.

Communist Tendency pleads guilty to the accusation of defining the working class as revolutionary by its consciousness. The fact that the working class exists as a physical entity in relation to the means of production only states what exists. To create a revolution, the working class must do something. They must want to fight the system, to make revolution. To create a revolution workers must not merely struggle but win over other sections of the population to their vanguard.

Now no doubt some anarchists have a great day approach, pointing to circumstances when workers rise up, defy the system and revolt. But spontaneous revolt has to lead somewhere. In Los Angeles, Black people rose up, fought the state, but didn't have a perspective to create a new society. The US State won and "law and order" (read state repression) was maintained.

Many glorify uprisings such as the Brixton riots as "independent creative activity ... against the state". The problem is that such uprisings do not have the balance of forces to win. While Black proletarian militants there were confronting the state, most workers did nothing. Many backed the state because of their racist ideology. The point of Leninist intervention is to draw the link - to argue with (not force) Black proletarians that they need a strategy to win over the rest of the working class. And to argue why the rest of the working class should back the Black Brixton proletarians fighting the state. Anarchists would probably oppose both interventions as "elitist" or "vanguardist", leaving the Black fighters isolated and defeated. Some might say that they support "building solidarity". But as long as British workers support the racist state they won't give it. Revolutionaries must argue that a break from racism is vital to building a class conscious workers' movement that will fight the system.

The problem with the explosive one great day approach is it avoids the political struggle now. Anarchists try to wipe their hands of politics. But politics is not merely what happens in parliament - it reflects what happens on the shop floor too. As long as workers accept Capital's right to rule they accept the Accord, racist immigration controls, privatisation, deregulation etc. Of course not every worker accepts the bourgeoisie's reactionary agenda. But bourgeois ideas have strong support on the shop floor-at the expense of class struggle. In New Zealand some workers on the railways willingly gave up their jobs because they accepted arguments that rationalisation was required for a strong and stable industry. The ideology of these workers - which Anarchists refuse to confront - is directly inhibiting class struggle.

The anarchist group Angry People eulogise the militancy of the British miners and the Poll Tax riots. Yes, the militancy of those miners was heroic, but the problem is that those rank and file miners shared the same ideological framework as Arthur Scargill. He fundamentally accepted the framework of Plan For Coal (a British Government policy document) but argued that jobs needn't have been lost. British miners fought the cops. But this didn't mean that they opposed the British state's right to rule. There is a contradiction between their militant capacity to fight and their ideology. It is the role of revolutionaries to draw out this contradiction, breaking workers from their existing ideology. It is this struggle that anarchists avoid.

Anarchists give us plenty of propaganda about workers defying authority, either the boss's, the bureaucrat's, or the male chauvinist husband's. But don't workers do this every day - in racist white South Africa. They still support the Apartheid state. It is a logic that can be drawn from Pearlman/Velli that in the name of independent creative activity those workers should ignore Leninists when they urge them to give military support to those Black people

(nationalists and otherwise) fighting Apartheid. We don't know whether Pearlman would draw this racist consequence.

In Australia or the US, the racist character of the state may not be quite so clear to white workers. But the US and Australia are definite racist countries. Amongst the left, opposition to racism is an article of faith. But it not obvious to an ordinary worker who merely experiences the trade union struggle and is bombarded with bourgeois crap, from the media, from the boss, and from the trade union bureaucracy. Those who avoid revolutionary political struggle adapt to this reactionary consciousness. "One million migrants, one million unemployed" as the National Front in Britain rant. This sounds logical. And many working class people accept this logic. It is the logic that plays into the hands of National Action. It also appears logical that one man's pay rise means inflation and/or another man's job. This sounds logical to many workers on the job and this logic will dampen militants' capacity to fight for pay rises, supporting the attacks on their living standards.

It is not "totalitarian" to fight for revolutionary consciousness. Leninists believe in workers' democracy. But what the workers decide is not necessarily revolutionary. After the revolution, soviets, the highest form of the united front, will contain workers of all ideas. Proletarian power can only be maintained if there is a section conscious of the need for the working class to undermine petty bourgeois and chauvinist remnants of the previous capitalist society and to defend the revolution. The Leninist vanguard is that section of the working class that understands that to be revolutionary, working people must have an opposition not merely to the boss, not merely to one aspect of the system that oppresses them but to the social relationships of capitalism. Such an opposition does not come through the immediate spontaneous struggle.

Anarchists recoil with horror at the idea of creating a state after the revolution. This is like creating a counter-revolution. But the problem is that immediately after a revolution, revolutionaries and the working class may be faced with a hostile outside world under the control of the class enemy. We may also face the remnants of those who, whilst not being directly the class enemy before the revolution, have privileges at the expense of the proletariat. These include public servants, sections of the middle class, and privileged layers of workers. Contradictions between these classes and strata and the proletariat will simply not disappear overnight. Revolutionaries must, through their programme do our utmost to undermine contradictions. But should we politically fail, we need a state to suppress those who demand power at the expense of the proletariat. A state as advocated by Lenin was one not with a bourgeois police force but based on the arming of the working class.

This is not a complete critique. Some of the variants of anarchism are blatantly petty-bourgeois. By supporting a rural strategy, anarchists such as Nakhno are putting a privileged layer before the exploited, pandering to their privileged position. Working people, faced with oppression and poverty, cannot afford to skip too many days' work. It means losing their job and getting kicked out of their homes. Nor do they have the luxury of sexual promiscuity or the options of a collective lifestyle as advocated by Black Rose.

Politics is not merely what goes on in parliament. The politics a working class person has, reflects an attitude to society. This cannot be avoided by declaring "no politics". Workers will have an attitude to issues such as immigration, whether we like it or not. Many support bourgeois democratic demands such as for a republic. It can be shown to these workers that the only type of republic Australia will have can only be socialist. We must intervene with a form of politics which calls for the overthrow of the social relations of capitalism - revolutionary politics. We urge those anarchists who have a serious attitude to the working class to reconsider their refusal to fight for politics as objectively they are adapting to the reactionary politics which dominate the working class today.