

For Women's liberation through socialist revolution

Capitalism is a system of commodity production for profit. But, as well as being a system of production, it also has created political and social relationships which affect every aspect of our lives. This includes sex, sexuality and child raising. The family is a very important weapon in the arsenal of capitalism. It has many purposes. For the capitalist class the family is a private institution and this declaration of privacy enables the responsibility for certain types of labour to be taken away from society and placed on the backs of married women. This includes housework, child raising and childcare. Many women are estimated to do a hundred hour working week, continually having to do cleaning, cooking, washing, looking after the children and many other household chores. Some women might claim that this isn't really work, that this is what they choose to do and that they do it for love. Irrespective of how they feel, they have this lifestyle institutionally imposed on them. They do receive some payment for labour. The family wage is supposed to cover their food, shelter and maintenance. What the housewife gets from this family wage depends on how much the husband is prepared to give her. The family wage, which is supposed to maintain four people, is in reality not enough to maintain one.

During the sixties and seventies, in Australia, a significant number of married women joined the workforce. They were and are involved mainly in light process work. They were employed because the boss found them easier to exploit. After all, the chauvinist union movement believed that the woman's place was in the home and therefore they were not real workers. Women remained unorganised or underorganised. It was only in 1969 that equal pay for women was brought before the Arbitration Commission. Equal pay is in force in many industries, but how the bosses get around it is by reclassifying jobs so women are not paid less 'because they are women', but "because they're doing jobs of a lower classification". Either way they are paid less. Meanwhile, they are still expected to do housework,

As well as women, the family is an important institution for rationalising the exploitation of children. Many companies - McDonald's being a vanguard get away with paying a discount wage because it is the family which is supposed to maintain young people. Incidentally, McDonald's do pay award wages. It is just that the Award permits this super-exploitation. It is disgraceful that the whole union movement permits this wholesale robbery. This is, of course, part of the process for undermining the wages of all workers. If you are a boss and can get discount labour from young people then why employ adults? The union movement has accepted this massive discrimination against young people because it accepts the family as an institution. The family is also meant to be an institution for law and order. At a bi-election in Bankstown the Unsworth Government (which was in office then) campaigned on a programme for more police force to repress young people. The Liberals promised a law and order programme which would put more onus on the family to discipline youth. Neither, of course, had any solutions to the fact that young people had not future, except poverty.

The family is an institution of capitalism but within it men get privileges. Women are considered their property. The men are given clear privileges at their expense. This is true, not just within the family, but within society itself. These privileges are real, but they blind working class men so that they won't see that they are exploited by the system as a whole. The Communist Tendency supports unity between male and female working class people to fight the system but, as long as male workers consciously identify with gains from the system, there can be no unity. Male chauvinism

consistently undermines unity by treating with contempt at least half of the working class and who are both at home and in the factory the most exploited. It is tragically often the most oppressed and exploited males who are the most brutal in maintaining their power. Often this is because this is the one small privilege that they have so they fight for it. Chauvinism cannot be condoned. However, to break these working class men from chauvinism communists must act from an understanding of their whole material conditions to address this question. Many middle class activists who look down chauvinists within the working class do so from a position of material superiority. It is easy to be "ideologically pure" if you have a comfortable lifestyle or live in a trendy ghetto. The middle class consciousness of these people often a more serious barrier to revolutionary consciousness than the more blatant chauvinism that they despise.

The sixties and seventies meant affluence for the petty bourgeoisie. And, because of this affluence, a desire to develop their personality. Individuality was the hallmark of this period. It saw the petty bourgeoisie develop their art, their philosophy and their ideas. The repressive nature of bourgeois sexual relations was of course a barrier to their individuality. Free sexuality because the order of the day. Women's liberation was in the early days, in many circles, as merely considered to be free sex. It was in the early seventies that Women's Liberation developed into a radical social movement which raised very important demands. However, it only became a movement for reform under capitalism led by the petty bourgeoisie. Protest movements only try to treat the symptoms and not cure the disease. These demands raised by the women's movement can only be achieved by the overthrow of capitalism. But capitalism is not overthrown by "movements", but by classes. The capitalist state is an instrument of the ruling class for suppression of the working class. It is not good enough merely to raise demands which capitalism cannot accommodate. These demands only become revolutionary when they are linked to drawing class lines and the struggle to overthrow capitalism. This the Women's movement has refused to do.

The women's movement argues that as all women are in some way oppressed therefore all women are sisters. In arguing for their position they point to wives of ruling class being deprived of money and suffering physically from their husbands. No doubt the examples they mention are real. However, by ignoring the class struggle, we are betraying the liberation of women. Ruling class women exploit thousands and sometimes millions of men and women. Middle class women too gain from the benefit of the exploitation of men and women. A movement which ignores the class struggle betrays the liberation of women. Middle class women and men can join the revolution but only on the condition that they repudiate their gains from the system. The fact that the women's movement refuses to confront this in the name of sisterhood is alone enough to make it unrevolutionary.

The women's movement has never been homogenous. It has been a coalition of tendencies. The political wing led by the Socialist Workers Party has argued for a mass movement uniting as many women as possible around single issue demands, all of which are theoretically achievable by capitalism, but only a few of which are likely to be carried out. The S.W.P. opposes any divisive attempt to draw class lines. This is reformism. There also has been a very strong personal politics wing which thinks mainly about immediate personal relationships and organising rural communes "womensland". This group is often strongly lesbian separatist. The working class male or female do not have the luxury of "personal politics", which, as long as the system of exploitation exists, remains an option for a small minority. Some supporters of personal politics do oppose capitalism.

But this opposition is moral. They have no perspective of overthrowing the system. The most militant section of the personal politics wing has embraced Anarchism. The capitalist system will not be changed by personal rebellion.

Some in the women's movement oppose capitalism and call themselves "Marxist Feminist". Marxist Feminism in practice has various meanings. For some it means recognising the "Independent" Women's Movement to fight for women's liberation and recognising the working class movement to fight for socialism. This both adopts to the bourgeois reformist nature of the women's movement and the chauvinism within the working class. It is the class struggle that is decisive contradiction in society from which a revolution will be created. Any terminological concession "Marxist feminism" obliterates this and degrades Marxism. Marxism is not merely about class struggle, it is a science which explains every aspect of our society and, in fact, the universe. This includes women's oppression. The most sophisticated advocates of "Marxist feminism" are the Freedom Socialist Party, which calls itself the happy marriage between Marxism and feminism. They use this terminology to differentiate themselves from the tradition which they correctly call "radical laborism", which identifies the working class as Trade Unionists and often meaning in practice the white, male highly organised section. They are right to differentiate from this tradition, but wrong to degrade the method of Marxism. What is needed is dialectical materialism and not a "happy marriage" between Marxism and feminism. The F.S.P. elevates the women's question to a far greater programme than it warrants. Its publication contains poetry from proletarian women. Poetry can be an admirable medium for expressing experience and relating it. But isn't the experience of proletarian men equally valid? The task of communists should be to fight for a proletarian consciousness amongst women and to show that male chauvinism is a barrier to this consciousness in male working class people. To promote "women's consciousness" is a barrier to class consciousness.

For the Communist Tendency the women's question is not a secondary question, but fundamental for the establishment of a class—conscious working class. It is the task of communists to fight for demands which establish the basis for class unity. Talk of unity in any form which ignores chauvinism is the unity of subordination and not the unity of class struggle. To establish a principled unity we must break down the enforced division of labour between male and female work, the institutionalisation of sexual relationships through the family and all chauvinist privileges given to male workers.

We do this through the means of class struggle and not through class collaboration. Therefore, we reject all censorship by the capitalist state, even when it is ostensibly anti-sexist. Capitalism only opposes pornography because it stands for some form of sexual activity outside the family institution. The term 'pornography' is used to define exposure of the human genitals. It is not defined in terms of exploitation. To bloc with the right wing on censorship is a dangerous trap for the left. Censorship laws also threaten artwork, which contains the human, body in a non-exploitative way, for example, a picture of lesbian lovers and also even sex education. The Dean of Sydney made this perfectly clear when he stated that the page three pictures in the Mirror were all right because they didn't threaten the family (because they were wearing a full one-piece swimsuit), but those who were only dressed in a bikini, or alternatively were topless, were threatening the family and were to him objectionable. Capitalism will only support censorship to defend the family unity. In no way must we support the capitalists, or their state, to control what we read. Communists want to abolish the family, but this cannot be done mechanically. It is not our aim to

separate people who are living together happily. We want human relationships to be voluntary and not institutionalised. We want the drudgery of housework to be the responsibility of society, to be done in an organised way so everyone can have the time to develop their personality. Until then the personal development is a luxury for those in a materially privileged position.

For the Communist Tendency the women question is fundamental for the establishment of working class unity. For a principled unity to fight the capitalist class male workers must repudiate identification with those privileges given to them by the capitalist system - male chauvinism.

To achieve principled class struggle unity the Communist Tendency Fights

Against all discrimination based on sex or sexuality

For the Socialisation of housework and childcare

For free abortion on demand

Against all state interference in the bedroom

Down with capitalist censorship!

Equal status for women - in relation to Social Security - the same rights to an independent income irrespective of whether they choose to get married, or live in a defacto relationship.

For women's right to work with equal pay

INDOCHINA. TEN YEARS OF THE THIRD WAR

February marked the tenth anniversary of the Vietnamese invasion of Kampuchea. And, after ten years, Vietnam has announced its withdrawal date, "September 30", "subject to the Khmer Rouge not returning to power". Whilst this prospect seems unlikely the Khmer Rouge "Democratic Kampuchea" are not to be sneezed at. They are the most significant component of the resistance bloc which includes the forces led by the Buddhist Son San and those led by Prince Sihanouk. Prince Sihanouk is the nominal head of this bloc. According to Sihanouk, both China and the Soviet Foreign Minister Shevardnadze came to an agreement in support of free elections, a multi-party government and the exclusion of Pol Pot subject to Vietnam's withdrawal. Of course putting this principle into practice is far more difficult. Vietnam is concerned that any serious weakening will lead to reprisals against supporters of the Vietnamese sponsored Hun Sen regime. But Vietnam knows that whilst its forces occupy Kampuchean soil there can be no political resolution, as Hun Sen and Vietnam do not have sufficient force to make the resistance forces capitulate. So what is proposed and agreed to by all parties is to allow Peace-keeping forces to supervise Vietnam's withdrawal and elections. But there are differences on what should constitute this International Control Mechanism, as it was called during the February Jakarta Conference. Prince Sihanouk wants the United Nations to provide forces. Hun Sen and the Vietnamese want a force consisting of Poland, India and Canada. This is, of course, not a distinction based on principle. Both sides want imperialists to supervise Kampuchean affairs. Then there is the question of how much China should be involved. China has pledged military support to the resistance forces until Vietnam does withdraw. Vietnam is afraid that even after withdrawal aid to the resistance forces will continue.

All sides support elections. Elections which will allow bourgeoisie parties to share power. The main objection Vietnam has to Sihanouk is that he is blocking with Pol Pot. For the past thirty years Sihanouk has been Vietnam's preferred head of state for Kampuchea, Pol Pot was not even invited to the Geneva Conference, where U.S. and Vietnam agree to impose Sihanouk as Cambodian (as it was called then) Head of State. They also agreed that Vietnam was to be divided in two. It took the Vietnamese about twenty years to win back the country they allowed to be cut in half. Thanks to the imposition, thousands of Kampuchean Stalinists died in prison. A direct puppet of the imperialists, Lon Nol deposed Sihanouk. In 1975 the Lon Nol regime was ousted by the F.U.N.K. led by Pol Pot's Khmer Rouge, subordinated behind a bourgeois program. Ever since 1979 Vietnam has indicated that it would accept a Sihanouk regime. Vietnam, therefore, would be quite happy if Sihanouk won. But where there is difference is over the demand made by Sihanouk that before elections are held the Hun Sen regime called Peoples Kampuchea be dismantled. This Vietnam opposes. No doubt, Hun Sen will grovel low enough to dispell any fear that some sort of "Communist" (in reality Stalinist) regime may be maintained. But all this takes time. We are confident that Hun Sen will find a way to bow low enough to appease the feudalists.

Recently the President of the United States, George Bush, came out openly for a Sihanouk regime. Pol Pot's Khmer Rouge had declared its loyalty to Sihanouk as head of the resistance. Both Son Sann and Sihanouk find the Khmer Rouge an embarrassment. But they need their military force and they fear that an isolated Khmer Rouge will go on the rampage like a cornered bull. They know that if they are given concessions they will participate in Kampuchea's capitalist future.

It's a tragedy! Thousands of Kampuchean workers and peasants fought imperialism and its repressive local client regimes, not only to be repressed and butchered by a brutal Stalinist regime, but to be handed back to the feudalists and the capitalists by both the Kampuchean and Vietnamese Stalinists. Stalinism today is significantly to the right of where it was before World War Two. When Stalin's forces invaded Mongolia they at least expropriated under the gun the economy and broke the country from capitalism. In 1979, after almost ten years in occupation, the Soviet Union is withdrawing and leaving behind a capitalist Afghanistan, albeit more liberal than its feudal tribal opponents. Vietnam has the 'honour' of being the first Stalinist state to, by invasion, hand over a state which has broken from capitalism back to capitalists. The Khmer Rouge share in the counter-revolutionary responsibility. The Australian Left appear to be totally oblivious to this. They either support one lot of Stalinists or the other. In this context this means supporting capitalism. Most support the Vietnamese backed Hun Sen and the Vietnamese invasion. This, of course, includes the pro Moscow Stalinists, the Socialist Party and the Association for Communist Unity. It also includes the so-called independent Communist Party, which in reality always was tied to the Vietnamese Stalinists. Vietnam was never included amongst the states such as the Soviet Union, which they called 'Socialist based'. Also included are the fake Trotskyists, the Spartacist League and the Socialist Labour League. The latter is yet to repudiate entirely their pro-Vietnamese stand, which they took so blatantly when led by Mulgrew and Healy. The Socialist Workers Party, with its turn to outright Stalinism, has become craven apologists for Vietnamese Stalinism.

In the April edition of the New York Times there is an article by Elizabeth Becker, acknowledged as author of book "When the War is Over". Her words are revealing and we quote extracts from them as follows:

“Indeed for all roctical purposes the Vietnamese occupation is already over. Gone are the ubiquitous portraits of Ho Chi Minh and the early morning propaganda programmes reminding people of the Khmer Rouge’s Pol Pot.”

“Cambodian nationalism has now returned with a vengeance. Once again there is a Buddhist society with a nascent free market and a nearly complete return to private property.”“The occupation’s main concern with political indoctrination has been replaced by a campaign for economic revitalisation.”

“Taking care not to insult the Vietnamese the Hun Sen regime lost no time in restoring rights that Cambodians consider to be at the root of their identity - first and foremost the Buddhist faith.”

“In another move to restore the Cambodians heritage Mr. Hun Sen pushed through the party the restoration of private property - homes, land and businesses.”

“Mr. Hun Sen said ‘It is as if I’ve just woken up from a very bad dream and I have to reorder everything again. ..’ The question is nation building. We are not looking up to building Marxism or Communism. We are looking to improve the welfare of the people.” This he said requires capitalism.

“And in the past six months he has pushed the economy in that direction by pegging the currency to the international market, requiring industry to earn a profit, or become privatised allowing wages on a piece rate basis and expanding the private sector to include schools, medical clinics and soon banks.”

She then goes on.

“The question now is whether the countries that are involved in negotiating Cambodia’s future will dismiss these far-reaching reforms and continue to demand that the whole government be replaced.”

Yes indeed, the Stalinists are doing their utmost to appease the imperialists - by handing over Kampuchea to capitalism. How explicit can you get? Yet only the Communist Tendency and its predecessor the Communist Left have warned that this could happen through the Vietnamese and the regime they sponsor, as well as from Pol Pot.

Members of the Spartacist League should look at their record. Not only have they failed to warn of this danger, but they have hailed the invasion “Kampuchea now has a future”. As they have continually hailed the invasion they must take responsibility for its consequences.

The invasion of Kampuchea ten years ago was not merely an invasion of one state (which broke from capitalism) by another. The invasion had serious repercussions within what was considered ‘the Communist block’. One month later China began border incursions. Had the Soviet Union honoured its military treaty to Vietnam then a wholesale war between the post capitalist states could have broken out. Fortunately, this didn’t happen. Stalinism is truly the grave digger of revolutions. The Vietnamese revolution, despite its massive deformations, inspired class struggle in Australia. Its gross degeneration has degraded the name of Communism amongst Australian workers and assisted reaction. A Marxist analysis is required of Stalinism. Only Communist Tendency and Communist Left had adhered to such an analysis and fought for true proletarian independence. We welcome serious revolutionaries and proletarians to examine our record.

COMMUNIST TENDENCY MAY DAY STATEMENT 1989

IT WAS TWENTY YEARS AGO TODAY

- that Bob Hawke addressed May Day functions in Sydney and Newcastle. "Remember the debt of unity to the past." "Whatever we enjoy today is the result of our forebears in the Labor movement." "They were not people of one creed or ideology, but when they saw injustice they were united in trying to remedy it, even if the remedy they worked for was not one that all of them saw as an ideal solution." Hawke went on to point out that unity should not be seen as pursuing unity at any costs, a unity on the basis of the lowest common denominator. This would be a type of unity unrecognisable to those forebears whom we honoured.

Then (as Tribune reported it) "Mr. Hawke said that he believed the first plank of the ACTU – for the means of production, distribution and exchange to be publically owned - and there should be a program of education with this in the forefront". Today Mr. Hawke still believes in unity. It is a unity which has enabled the greatest transfer of wealth away from the poor to the rich in Australia's post war history. Our forebears, if they knew, would turn in their graves.

Meanwhile, Clarrie O'Shea announced on behalf of his union, the Australian Tramways and Motor Omnibus Employees Association, that he would not pay outstanding fines incurred for industrial action. He was jailed for this and unionists responded with a massive wave of strike action throughout Australia, which not only secured his release, but effectively smashed penal clauses. Laurie Carmichael was instrumental in developing this action. Today there is not just penal powers, but massive attacks on unions. And not just individual unions have been jailed, but unions have been viciously attacked. The B.L.F., the Food Preservers, the Meatworkers and the Queensland Branch of the Electrical Trades Union. These unions, over the past few years, have been viciously attacked and their members jailed. Yet there has been no serious class struggle solidarity for their defence. In fact, some on the left have been, in the case of the E.T.U., responsible for demobilising solidarity and, in the case of the B.L.F. been a party to the attacks themselves. The difference is staggering.

Today it is not just individual unionists, or even unions. The Liberals are talking about deregulating industry and Bob Hawke too has at one stage said that he joo believes that industry is over-regulated. This means he supports smashing unions. Whether he would do it is doubtful. But even by giving lip service he is paving the way for reaction. The Hawke government has been party to massive attacks on unionists Black people, the unemployed and women. The Hawke government has initiated massive attacks on the public sector. The recent mini budget saw massive cutbacks to Social Security and increased State harassment to single parents. Yet neither Robson leadership, nor those who support Trevor Deeming in N.S.W., will do nothing in the A.C.O.A. Nor will the leadership of the A.P.S.A. lift a finger. The New Left Party supports the Caird/Robson faction, which is committed to collaboration with Social Security Minister Brian Howe. Black people are under attack, yet the so-called trade union solidarity group N.U.C.A.M. repudiates strike action in defence of Black people.

In 1969 when working people saw injustice they acted. And not just in defence of Clarrie O'Shea. They defended the Gurindgi Black people of Wattle Creek. They acted in solidarity with the people of Bougainville against imperialist exploitation. They defended working class housing through industrial action. They fought against attacks on the unemployed. They carried out industrial action against the

Vietnam War. Today, twenty years later, we have a responsibility to ask why has the working class movement gone such a long way - backward.

Answers are required because there is a massive ruling class offensive to attack our jobs, our trade unions, our right to organise, and even the existence of Social Security itself. The ruling class may take time to manoeuvre. But, make no mistake - they want to put the boot in.

The Communist Tendency respects the militancy of the late sixties and early seventies. But we don't glorify it. It contained serious political weaknesses, for which we are suffering now. A serious analysis must be made and serious hard political conclusions drawn. p2

Let's take an overview. In 1972 Gough Whitlam was elected with a moderately reforming program. He was also committed to containing class struggle. Even his stated program only amounted to a modest gain. But this was too much for the ruling class who forced him to back pedal rapidly. He also had no answers to the onset of the economic crisis which led to massive increases in unemployment and inflation. In January 1975, at the Terriqal Conference, anytalk of progressive measures were abandoned in favour of total submission. However, it couldn't pedal backlast enough. The GovernorGeneral gave Whitlam the sack. The working class responded with justifiable anger. However, this rage was eventually demobilised, thanks to the A.L.P. leadership and their left allies - notably the Communist Party. The Communist Party virtually jettisoned any independent position to rally the working class behind the Labor Party. This it called the Anti Fraser Coalition. During the late seventies the crisis hit harder. There was a massive attack on the manufacturing sector. The Stalinist Trade Union bureaucrats had no answer, except abandon trade union militancy and crawl to the government for more protection, to 'keep industry in Australia'. This chauvinist perspective plays into the hands of racism. The struggle for jobs must be international. The Right Wing of the Labor Party learned from the sacking of Whitlam that only a Labor Government with Liberal Party policies can be allowed to administer capitalism.

During 1981 there was a wages explosion, partly linked to the boom in mining. This gave Bob Hawke his chance. He could show the ruling class that whereas Fraser's confrontation could not tame the unions, his co—option could. He knew that the metal unions required a parliamentary government for their "interventionist" in reality utopian reactionary program. He therefore could dictate terms. The Accord was supposed to be a major strategic gain. In reality it was an attack on the working class. Having tamed the unions, Bob Hawke has proceeded to abandon anything resembling a progressive commitment on his part. Not only is the Accord dead, but so is any agreement made since. No Accord can overcome the crisis of capitalism. It is the laws of profitability that rule. Hawke is only in office on the condition that he serves the system. When the bosses want to put the boot in even harder Hawke will be disposed of - if he doesn't give up voluntarily. It is no use propping up Hawke to save us from the extreme right, or the Liberals. The only real alternative is a revolutionary one.

In March a New Left Party was formed by both the Munday and Carmichael wings of the Communist Party, the pro-Moscow adherents to the Accord called Association for Communist Unity (A.C.U.) and former middleclass radicals such as Betty Hounslow, who are Snow integrated into bureaucracies and 'joined the mainstream'. In 1969 at a Left Action Conference one delegate expressed how glad he was that he did not have to bottle up his revolutionary ideas and talk about agreement on limited policy. In 1989, in the New Left Party, it's not a question of bottling up revolutionary energy. The participants, on the whole, don't have any. In 1969 the A.C.U. people then in the C.P.A. criticised the

majority for left adventurism whilst calling for unity and identifying with Marxist Leninism. Today we have all the middleclass aspects of the C.P.A. without the radicalism and the rotten unity of the pro-Moscow bureaucrats minus the formal commitment to Marx and Lenin. This New Left Party combines the worst aspects of both sides. The only reason that these bureaucrats distance themselves from. Hawke is that this government is now too blatantly right wing and doesn't need them. The break is not fundamental. Brian Aaron's exciting vision of the future is government intervention as in Sweden and Japan. Australia, with its colonial economy, will not permit this, even if it were desirable. But all planning under capitalism is at the expense of the working class.

To understand the demise of working class consciousness we have to have an internationalist perspective. The Australian working class have had a tradition of racist insularity. It is a tradition which must be broken from if we are to develop a healthy class conscious workers movement. When the bosses play us off on national lines we must counter with internationalism. Also the Australian working class have been motivated by upsurges against imperialism in South East Asia. The Vietnamese revolution inspired the working class. However, its degeneration has helped the degradation of the name of Communism. And especially its invasion of Kampuchea, which now appears to be resolved by the re-establishment of capitalism. Those who are tainted by Stalinism, who support either the Vietnamese occupation or Pol Pot, cannot create a healthy class struggle tradition; this includes not only the New Left Party but also the S.P.A. and the C.P.A. (ML). It also includes the Spartacist League and the Socialist Workers Party. Also bankrupt are the International Socialists and Socialist Action, who capitulate to imperialism by calling the post capitalist states capitalist. It is the task of revolutionaries to defend these states both against imperialism and against the counter-revolutionary bureaucracies which are strangling them.

The unity of the graveyard is no way forward for the working class. According to the New Left Party you need unity to defeat the New Right. So, to achieve unity, you sell out the most militant sections of the union movement, the unemployed, the tenants and squatters, which were threatened by Sydney's Eastern Distributor, any serious industrial action in defence of Blacks, any opposition to attacks on so-called 'illegal' migrants and the list could go on. It is this unity of submissiveness that will pave the way for the New Right and the Facists. As more and more sections of the working class come under attack and it becomes clear that the "Left" will not stand up in defence, then the Right becomes bolder with every victory.

Over the past twenty years capital has played the tune and the rats of the Labor Party, Stalinists and trade union bureaucracy have followed. As the capitalists want to smash our unions, abolish social security and social welfare, increase state repression, bring wages down to the level of the dole, if we follow them we will get sunk. The only program that will defend the working class is one based on the political independence of the working class — fighting for proletarian state power. Of course this program must address the political questions the working class face to show that these can only be resolved by revolutionary means. However, this does not mean we abandon our revolutionary thrust to our propaganda. Patchwork unity may give you more immediate numbers but if it is unity which sacrifices the interests of working class, Black people, the unemployed and all exploited and oppressed, it is worse than useless. The Communist Tendency fights for a revolution program - our demands include:

- Revolutionary expropriation of capitalist industry (not capitalist nationalisation)

- A sliding scale of hours and wages — a continual reduction of hours with wage increases
- Self-determination for Black people and Torres Strait Islanders
- Opposition to all discrimination (such as sexism) which ties workers to the system
- A revolutionary workers and small farmers government
- International revolutionary solidarity with the workers of South East Asia and the world
- Build a Fifth Communist International.

We suggest all serious militants study our full program.

Had the Left fought for principled Marxist politics over the past twenty years we would have not found ourselves in our present situation, where the ruling class threaten to destroy our wages conditions and even our organisations without serious opposition.