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With this issue, ALR begins monthly publication. We aim to appear each month from February to November inclusive. The reasons for the change are the new political situation and the need for a journal which can more directly and continuously assist the left in these circumstances.

We will continue to be a journal of marxist theory, but more emphasis than previously will be given to practical experiences and their analysis, aiming to more directly serve political and movement activities.

In addition to a continuing concern with questions of socialist strategy and promoting debate on this, we will publish regular comments and analysis of ongoing political and economic events.

Our focus will be international as well as national and will cover the workers', women's and ecology movements among others.

To carry out this project well, we will need a wide circle of contributors and we ask readers to consider how they might help. We also seek support in efforts to increase circulation, which has held up very well despite little attention in recent years.

While maintaining a thrust in content in line with the thinking of the editors, ALR will continue to be open to views on national and international questions which do not necessarily coincide with ours.

As always, criticism and suggestions will be welcome.
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Notes of the Month
by Brian Aarons

1975 was not only the year of the Kerr-Fraser coup and Labor's electoral defeat - it was also the year of revolutionary victory in Indochina, of final collapse of the last remaining colonial empire (Portugal's) and of turbulent struggle in Portugal itself which ended in set-back for the left. And it was the year in which the deep social malaise continued inside America - keystone of the world capitalist system - a malaise for which the US establishment can still find no lasting solution.

All these developments influence each other and have their impact on Australia. The limits and framework of Fraser's policies and actions are set by the chronic crisis of world capitalism. The crisis is all the deeper for having many aspects - economic, environmental, relations between the sexes and races, moral and ideological. The relative importance of these different aspects varies from one period to another, but there is a tendency for all to develop and grow in intensity as the system finds it impossible to solve any in a fundamental way.

The aspect which dominates at the moment is the economic. Capitalism's basic organising principle is the pursuit and making of profit, not the satisfaction of human needs - so if it cannot 'deliver the goods' on the economic front it is in serious trouble. The current economic crisis, worse than any since the war, is therefore exercising the attention of policy makers, while environmental, quality of life and social problems are neglected. The problem for bourgeois economists and politicians is that no-one knows how or when the economy can be brought back to health.

According to the most recent figures from the Bureau of Statistics there is no sign of an early recovery in industrial production. And in the world economy what signs of recovery there are point to it being slight and short-term. As a major exporter of raw materials, Australia depends on the world economy. Without a strong recovery in foreign markets, and in demand at home, there is no reason for business to invest and so we get the circular argument as to whether the recovery should be 'consumer led' or 'investment led'.

In this uncertain situation it has been capitalist policy everywhere to adopt policies which will provide funds for investment, boost profits and keep down the system's overall 'costs' - ranging from wages and salaries to social welfare programs, environment and resources protection programs etc. With this general aim, the Fraser government in its own specific conditions and with its own particular political philosophy, has mapped out a plan to revive Australian capitalism.

The outlines of this plan are already clear. Industrially, Fraser has opted for a confrontation with the workers and the union movement in the indexation case. This despite earlier signs that a sophisticated low key approach would be adopted, as seen in Fraser's willingness - after consultations with Bob Hawke - to reconsider his election 'promise' to abolish the Prices Justification Tribunal. This in itself was hardly a real concession since the PJT has long been recognised as a useful 'justifier' of price rises which takes the blame off companies. As even
the Financial Review noted, continuation of the PJT "would allow the ACTU to maintain the fiction that there is some form of price control to match wage control, while equally allowing Mr. Fraser to appease his supporters by pointing out that the promise to abolish the PJT has not been entirely dropped." (AFR, January 19). As for the real role of the PJT, the same editorial noted: "No doubt the Government, in deciding on the 'future' operations of the PJT, can turn it much more into a prices registrar, or prices notification body, than a price control agency, a function it has largely dropped in the last year anyway."

In these two actions Fraser has shown that his strategy has both its carrot and stick sides. On the one hand there will be attempts to reach 'sweetheart agreements' with union leaderships to co-opt them into the government's plans; on the other there will be a constant testing of the unions' mettle and preparedness to act as in the stand on indexation.

The most obvious economic move so far has been to resume the wholesale sellout of mineral and energy resources to capitalist interests, both local and foreign. National Country Party leader Anthony, for several years now the chief lobbyist and agent for the oil and mineral multinationals, is almost tripping over himself in his haste to turn over resources to private interests and to arrange profitable contracts for them overseas, especially in Japan. In the case of uranium not only have environmental arguments about mining it been ignored, but it has been taken out of the hands of the government's Atomic Energy Commission and given to business.

This policy will make huge profits for the corporations, but will not even help build an all round and independent economy, let alone preserve resources for future use or avoid the great dangers to earth's environment posed by the building of large numbers of nuclear reactors before the problems of waste disposal have been solved.

To provide the money to pay for the 40 percent investment tax allowance and various other revival measures Fraser has embarked on heavy cuts in government spending in vital social areas. This is just one way in which workers and other oppressed sections will be made to pay for 'economic recovery' - but they may wonder what sort of 'recovery' it is when public money is used for private good.

In foreign policy the government has lost no time in returning to the reactionary line of its Lib-CP predecessors. 'All the way with the USA' has been restored, but this time as one link in a wider policy in which Japan and the ASEAN nations, particularly Indonesia have an important role. Behind these moves lies the intention to preserve reactionary regimes against the growing threats from their own people, keep the area open to imperialist exploitation, and develop 'mutual support' amongst the anti-communist forces in South-East Asia.

Close relations with Japan have become an economic necessity, for Australia now relies very heavily on the Japanese market for its raw materials. This is one of the major flaws in the whole 'economic prosperity through raw materials exports' strategy. It depends on healthy overseas markets, now by no means a sure thing. It also leads to one-sided and uneven economic development in Australia itself. And it cannot provide watertight economic security: "A major trading nation such as Australia is hostage to forces beyond the total control of even the best equipped government." (Financial Review, January 27).

With the 'red-yellow hordes from the North' myth in disrepute with many who learned the cost of such lies in the Vietnam war, Fraser has moved to resurrect an old standby: the 'Russians are coming' myth. The theory is that the Russian naval and military presence in the Indian ocean is becoming so large as to pose a serious threat to peace and security in the region. First put forward by the US to justify its naval base at Diego Garcia this theory has now been taken up by the L-NCP government to provide the excuse for new 'defence' measures. Apart from the murky exercise of using China, the great bogey of yesterday, as almost to-day's ally against the revived Soviet bogey, the whole theory is based on fictions and misrepresentations. In the Financial Review of January 29, Geoffrey Jukes, senior fellow in the Department of International Relations at the Australian National University, debunks the 'Russian threat in the Indian ocean' myth. He points out that the USSR has only four to ten warships in the ocean - hardly a sizable threat.

******
These are the main elements of the Fraser strategy which have emerged so far. Whether it can be carried through depends on how much room for manoeuvre is allowed by the objective situation, and on the response of the various mass movements to Fraser’s initiatives. The impending areas of struggle will involve continuation of ongoing campaigns or defence of the limited gains made in various areas under Labor. As the government continues with its “rolling” expenditure cuts it will increasingly come into conflict with movements which challenge the ways money (and social effort) are directed. Women’s health centres will be in jeopardy, while on the other hand one of the first actions of the new government was to give the go-ahead to urban expressways which had been held up by resident and union struggles and by Labor’s Urban and Regional Development department policy.

The impending struggle will therefore be about social priorities and a redistribution of productive and social effort as well as a redistribution of wealth between the classes. In general the two overlap since a struggle for public as opposed to private transport is also a struggle to invest in areas which benefit the poor rather than the wealthy.

The degree to which the anti-Fraser movement as a whole can see the need for this wider struggle about social priorities will decide the extent to which the struggle will take on the aspect of a class struggle for social change. If, in the fight against Fraser’s offensive, the various movements confine themselves to sectional interests alone, then the ruling class and its government will be able to divide the movement and play off one section against another. This can happen, for instance, if the bosses economic offensive is met by more powerful groups of workers going it alone, ‘getting in for their chop’ and not seeing the need for a struggle in the interests of the class as a whole. Or it can happen where an environmental struggle by residents in one area ignores the needs of other areas, or is posed against the jobs of workers in a related industry.

An example is the coming fight to save Botany Bay in Sydney from destruction by a proposed huge port and industrial development. One part of the development is a coal-loader and the companies who stand to improve profit margins if it is built have already engaged in manipulation of miners to oppose the residents’ demands for a proper enquiry before the loader and other developments go ahead. Miners have been told that their jobs will go unless the loader is built (a highly dubious claim) and were enticed into going to a residents’ meeting on company-provided buses with free beer laid on. Whatever the rights and wrongs of the case, it is impossible for a political class struggle to take place while important sections of workers can be manipulated in this way. With even rightwing unions such as the AWU becoming at least verbally militant about the wages struggle, the task of the left is to find the ways to give new forms and content to it, so that the working class can really begin to take a social view.

---

Botany Bay residents demonstrate against the proposed coal loader.
The continuing crisis, the new political situation and the need to combat Fraser's offensive all pose the need for a debate within the labor and radical movements on how to proceed. The ALP, as the party commanding the support of workers and most who want change, will be a focus of debate from inside and outside its own ranks. The Kerr-Fraser coup and the inability of centre-right Labor leaders to respond effectively came as a shock to many sincere left reformists and militants. The reality of the system behind the democratic facade suddenly became apparent to tens of thousands and many are now looking for new ways and answers different to those given by the ALP leaders.

Answers will only have meaning if the experience of the Labor government is analysed and its mistakes understood. The basic point was that, faced with an economic crisis, the government either had to rely on and mobilise a big mass movement on an anti-capitalist program or it had to cave in to the pressures of those who really control things - the local and multinational corporations. In a sense it was inevitable that the latter course would be chosen given the predominantly rightwing caucus and Whitlam's domination of policy. Yet matters cannot be left there. The lessons of what happens when such policies are adopted must be fully drawn, and alternatives to them explored.

It was shown once again that a government wishing to introduce even mild reforms cannot rely totally on parliament and the powers of government. If it wants to challenge in even a small way the real interests of those who control the economy, it must be prepared to call on a mass movement outside. This is all the more true of basic or large scale change - so much so that mass action and organisation outside parliament will be the determining factors in whether the resistance of ruling class and conservative forces can be overcome. Realisation of this is widespread amongst activists and militants, but few parliamentarians or other ALP leaders show much recognition of the need to grapple with the problem. If there is no debate and discussion on this point, then Labor is doomed to repeat old mistakes.

In particular the ALP left can only pose a challenge to the dominant rightwing if it becomes more clear on its own aims and ideology and develops its proclaimed adherence to socialism and an alternative platform on which to fight. It was the unwillingness and inability of the left to open up a struggle within caucus on these lines which led to its capitulation to the rightwing, pro-business line of Whitlam. The key moment in this capitulation was Cairns' performance at the Terrigal Federal ALP conference. At this conference he was used by Whitlam to push through a substantial dilution of the socialisation platform. A permanent justification of the existing state of things was written into the platform with the words 'Recognising that ours is a mixed economy...' so that the ALP no longer even stands for socialisation, let alone fights for it.

Cairns justified this stand by posing a 'vicious circle' problem: there can't be a socialist society without a society of socialists. This epigram at least had the merit of putting the traditional reformist argument in very clear and succinct terms. But as an argument for the course adopted it suffers from the apparent belief that people will somehow one day become socialists without any effort by already convinced socialists and that in the meantime all the latter have to do is administer the system in the most humane and efficient way possible. The experience since Terrigal shows the deadend to which this approach leads. Had Cairns stuck to principle and fought for at least an opening towards socialist policy and practice, he would not have been so easily dumped by Whitlam and after Labor's defeat would have had high stature in the party and be in a position to exert wide influence towards socialism.

It is worth recalling these events because they have direct relevance to current debate within the ALP. The issues of policy and ideology must be tackled - party reorganisation, new shadow cabinets and a struggle for leadership between personalities will never change anything on their own.

In the meantime, those who do have a socialist perspective have more favourable conditions than for many years, though the difficulties are still very great. The objective crisis and the new political situation following the establishment coup and Labor's defeat can, with much effort and a well thought out approach, help to build a much wider consciousness about the need for fundamental change.
Trade unions and the election by Hugh Hamilton

The purpose of this report is to try and make some assessment of the political consciousness of those people employed in the building industry.

The opportunity for this assessment comes with the involvement of all the building trade unions with other unions affiliated with the Trades and Labor Council of Queensland in the campaign to re-elect a Labor government to Federal Parliament on December 13.

To my knowledge there has been no other occasion or no other issue where the trade union movement has been so intensely involved in a political campaign.

The building unions, particularly the BWIU, were involved in the anti-war, anti-conscription movement during the Vietnam war. However, it never reached the great heights this campaign has for the return of the Whitlam government.

The Building Trades Group of unions has never been more united on a political campaign for decades; and never more united on broad social issues (including democracy).

* The Building Trades Group has produced over 100,000 leaflets - 7,000 of these were in Greek, Italian and Russian.
* The Building Trades Group has distributed or sold over 1,000 Daily Tribune.
* Distributed 3,000 Building Worker.
* Produced 30,000 helmet stickers for Queensland.
* 1,000 posters.
* Distributed many thousands of ALP leaflets.
* Submitted advertisements; shared cost with Trades and Labor Council and other unions in a half page advertisement re Fraser's policy for the trade unions.
* Shared in numerous quarter page advertisements submitted by the Trades and Labor Council.
* Made a direct donation of over $1,000 to ALP Fighting Fund.
* Donated more than $1,000 from central meetings and job collections.
* Put $1,000 into the Building Trades Group $2,000 Fighting Fund and have had further expenditure up to $2,000.
* Have employed two full-time organisers and a part-time office worker.
* Have visited 51 jobs in the metropolitan area. Had dialogue with thousands of building workers. Besides these, on the bigger sites we held 57 job meetings in Brisbane and Ipswich.
* Have visited 20 jobs in Ipswich - hundreds throughout the rest of the State.
* Made one radio broadcast and had our position explained on television programs.

Everybody - office staff, organisers and job delegates have participated in this work. The collective contribution has been outstanding.

The best form of activity has been the job meeting and dialogue between union representatives and workers on the job. This has revealed varying attitudes amongst
building workers. A majority of workers support what the unions are doing and support the return of the Labor government.

However, there is a substantial minority that strongly objects to the unions being involved in a political campaign.

It is a romantic myth to think that because the workers are a class in society, they reflect a class consciousness that is a working class consciousness.

The reality is that this is not so. Even with many Labor supporters, the ideology and the values are not based on working class interests, but are based on the capitalist ideology and capitalist values.

In the struggle for ideological hegemony the capitalist class per the media and other forms have impacted the working class to the degree that workers identify in a thousand and one ways with their ideas, their way of life, their values.

The fact is that in the building industry the capitalist class and the capitalist system exercise considerable influence. This is related to the fact that work in the industry lends itself possibly more than any other to selfish values of the system - doing your own thing - the self-made man theory, getting to the top by being a cockroach contractor, a system that is very much encouraged by big building companies. The incidence of self-employed persons in the building industry, labor only contractors, piece-workers, persons who work for an all-in hourly rate and cannibalise award conditions - all these are very prevalent within the building industry. A large section of these workers are anti-union and anti-Labor.

Along with those methods and the form of "status" that it gives the worker - that is, he assumes he is not a worker but self-employed or a sub-contractor - with this comes the logical outlook of the capitalist system and a... attitude that traditional union men are "bludgers" or weak persons who cannot look after themselves.

Among this group, but not only there, are large pockets of Liberal and Country Party supporters who are quite vocal about their political position, particularly with their anti-communist, anti-socialist and anti-union attitudes.

The dialogue and the meetings reveal many weaknesses in relation to the union's activities over past years. The most noticeable is that we have not been getting out enough propaganda to members explaining the basic issues to them. More so, we have not been holding enough job meetings with the rank and file whereby a form of dialogue could pass between the union representatives and the rank and file. This would have enabled some assessment or gauge of support or opposition to the union's actions and policies on various issues. Many of our past assessments have been made from the hilltop with fleeting knowledge. Here I refer more to the broader social and political issues than to job conditions or award matters.

Reflecting on many of the wage struggles and other disputes that have taken place in Australia over the past ten years, particularly in Queensland on the major construction projects, a large number of struggles have been based purely on self interest certainly not on a principled trade union attitude. Such struggles have been far removed from any form of working class loyalty.

Other disputes have been ones to get the highest possible rates for job "A" and the workers haven't given a damn for others, often doing the same type of work, in the same area, but receiving up to $50 to $60 to $100 per week less.

On other occasions, there have been elitist groups within the various industries and also within unions who want to be "prima donnas" whereby, instead of joining in the general trade union struggle for wage justice, have, because of their strategically placed position within an industry said "To hell with other workers - let's grab what we can for ourselves".

This attitude and the consensus politics of union officials, including myself, who have gone along with this for varying reasons, has helped to add to the general corruption of workers where they by-pass traditional trade union and working class loyalties and set out on the path for naked selfish interests.

My point in dwelling on this is that I think in some areas the unions have helped to encourage such selfish interests in workers. In other circumstances we have looked at the situation with a Nelson eye. This is a part of the reason (a small part but nevertheless a part) for the backlash.

The best results the Building Trades Group has achieved have been on jobs where there is
union organisation, where there are job delegates and job committees - more so on those jobs where job delegates and activists have participated in the union's trade union education courses.

The unions' experience in this political campaign in the building industry is similar to some of those in other industries. For example, in the meat industry some of the sheds are substantially for Labor. However, in some of the country areas such as Murgon and other places the sheds are supporters of the National Party.

There is little or no trade union organisation in the countryside. It would be few indeed who belong to a union other than in the organised sugar and meat areas. Few leaflets or other forms of literature would go to these areas.

Yet these areas have been inundated with newspapers, particularly a monthly paper got out by Bjelke-Petersen and organisations whose basic aim is anti-communist, anti-socialist government in Canberra; and basically anti-worker.

Labor Party supporters get a rough time in some country areas. Attempts have been made to chase Labor spokesmen out of town.

A recent trip in the north coast area of Brisbane revealed hardly one ALP poster, but thousands of posters put out by the National Party and the Workers' Party.

Within our own industry we have found that loyal union job delegates who have made valuable contributions to the union over the years have presented themselves as National Party or Liberal Party supporters. This is besides those minor, but in a relative sense, large pockets of Liberal-National supporters referred to earlier in this report.

As I said in the beginning of this report, this is not an attempt to make an assessment of the current political situation, but to use the experiences in this campaign to make a general assessment of the consciousness of building workers to political and social issues and their attitudes to the wide stream of political philosophies and parties that prevail in our society.

It is for this reason that the report has dealt more with the negative attitude of the workers than the positive. The negative, more precisely conservative to extreme reactionary right wing, does not outweigh the positive position of the thousands of rank and file building workers as can be seen from some of the selected portions of reports from organisers who have been involved at the grass roots level of this campaign. The report is an attempt to look reality square in the eye.

Some quotes from organisers' reports:

"Rockhampton has been saturated with the leaflets and all jobs I have been on to I have had political discussion with them relative to the election."

"I haven't received any resentment in regards to the union’s involvement. In fact the leaflets have been received by all workers with the comment that the BWIU is doing a good job and the leaflets are great."

"Some of these young people are still under the impression they cannot have their say at union meetings. I had two young people on a job at Coronation Drive tell me they would not attend a meeting at Trades Hall in case they would be beaten up."

"My impression is that most of those in the Brisbane area, who are engaged in work in the industrial, commercial, high rise and social building sections of our industry will vote for the ALP - 75 per cent for and 25 per cent against. Leightons 3 jobs at the Expressway are all OK. The three jobs at QCL Pinkenba sound alright; Stocks and Holdings very good; Block 7 pretty sound; AMP is overwhelmingly pro Labor."

"I feel that on some or the majority of jobs the main problem is that most just don't seem to care either way. You naturally get some people who are completely opposed to us but that is to be expected. Therefore I think that more education at job level would overcome this uncaring part of the people. Bringing more people on side. If you get them thinking, with a little prompting you must get them on side."

"Jobs with a well informed delegate are easier to hold discussions on. Stickers are a popular form of publicity. Newspapers are far better than leaflets. They are kept longer. The BTG should hold more meetings after this campaign, to encourage our members towards this form of communication."

"On the jobs under private enterprise I find it hard to judge the support as the vocal ones have been LCP supporters and there appears to be an antipathy to these type of meetings -
this being expressed by either non-attendance or the irritation at being interrupted in their card games. It has become evident that the average voter on the job has made up his mind.”

This report, or more precisely, the activity around the current political crisis has revealed that we have a long row to hoe with many obstructions on the way.

The essence of the struggle must surely be the radical social change in our society, the awareness by the rank and file members of a socialist alternative, the need to be free of exploitation of man by man for power, greed and profit.

These are the type of aims which must be fought for by the trade union movement if it is to be viable and have a real use value.

Quality of life issues are the basic issues for the trade union movement. This is not to say one must neglect bread and butter issues such as wages and conditions - it means integration of all these issues into the aims of the trade unions, into the fighting policy and the new work style.

An attitude has been prevalent, particularly amongst officialdom of unions, including our own of “look after the bread and butter issues and the workers will tolerate officialdom’s attitude of being ‘way out in front’ on many of the broader issues”.

That is a form of elitism which is like the front engine of a triple header doing all the pulling and puffing whilst the other engines are passive partners with many of the carriages being pulled being casual observers, and other carriages rolling along the tracks with their brakes on hoping that the train would stop so they can get off the track.

This attitude and method of work must be corrected whether the Labor government or a Liberal-Country Party government is elected to office on December 13.

The campaign has revealed the importance of the trade union education program, limited and all that it has been. Officials and delegates have commented on the contribution made by the union in this area.

New initiatives, including new forms of presenting the workers’ cause must be developed. Ways must be looked for and found as to how we involve far greater participation of the rank and file.

The report reveals that there are pockets of workers who would very readily lend themselves to the extremes and excesses of the Fraser policies, particularly his union bashing policies.

Also organisations on the extreme right would find a ready response to their anti-communist, racist and sexist policies.

This can only be countered by a labor and trade union movement with strong ties with the workers - unions with a strong understanding of the cause and effect of reactionary policies like those being enunciated by Fraser and more so by Bjelke-Petersen.

Fundamentally the basic issue in this election campaign whether revealed or not is - who is going to control the country?

The workers must be made aware of the connection between the Fraser policy and reactionary policies generally, and the base and superstructure of capitalist society. (By base we mean social production on the one hand and private ownership of the means of production on the other - and by superstructure we mean the institutions that are there to protect the base, to protect the exploitation of man by man).

It is important that an effective rank and file organisation be developed, an organisation that has more say in the decision making processes of the union than at present, a rank and file that is developing initiatives on mass issues that affect the members and workers generally.

Essential to this is the promotion of socialist ideas through a movement for workers’ control raising the basic questions of who should control industry, who should control people’s lives, who should be the decision makers in our society - people, young people, old people, useful working people or the directors of big industrial, financial, commercial and multinational companies.

This is a contribution attempting (hopefully) to initiate a dialogue as to what we are all about in the building industry.

I thank the organisers and others who detailed their experiences around this campaign thereby assisting me with the report.
A number of important anniversaries will be marked in 1976, some by this journal.

The highly publicised United States bicentenary seems likely to become a major public relations exercise for the "American way-of-life" and an opportunity for considerable public spending in the interests of that theme. Whatever other economies are on the list of the Fraser government, its "great and powerful ally" isn't one.

Most people engaged in official celebrations will be left unaware of the fact that the bicentenary marks the "Declaration of Independence" adopted on July 4, 1776.

The first shots in the American War of Independence were fired at Lexington in April 1775 and the struggle raged for years before the independent United States emerged in 1783, but the revolutionary framework dates from the anniversary that will be celebrated this year.

Two hundred years later it is worth recalling that this framework was:

- All men (not, note, women, who had a longer and separate struggle ahead of them) are created equal and endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, among which are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.
- It is to secure these rights that governments are instituted, and they derive their powers from the consent of the governed.
- When any government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the right of people to alter or abolish it, and to institute new government, laying its foundations on such principles and organising its powers in such form as to them shall seem most likely to effect their safety and happiness.

The practice of the United States, both internally and internationally, bears no relationship to these ideals, but the ideals, then and now, are important.

By the date of the bi-centenary, Vietnam will be a reunified nation carrying out principles far closer to the aims of the Declaration of Independence than those who rule the United States.

1976 is the 20th anniversary of several events which traumatised most communists.

1956 was the year of the 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union where Khrushchov gave his "secret" report. It was also the year when Soviet troops entered Hungary. In that year, many long-held and strongly defended beliefs wavered or disappeared. The reasons why socialism had been so deformed had to be sought. It was, and is, a painful experience and not everyone wanted to try. Some gave up, some sought a different framework in which to work, at least until the war in Vietnam many opted for a "plague on both your houses", others continued to assert that any criticism of the Soviet Union is simply CIA propaganda (some of it is) or "anti-Soviet", which is deemed to be the same thing, some assumed that criticism was all that was required.

After a rough start - including an attempt to sweep the contents of the secret report under the mat and expel those who circulated it - the Communist Party of Australia became one of the parties which has tried to come to terms with the meaning of the 20th Congress, to work for a socialism with a democratic practice.

This month, the 25th Congress of the CPSU will be held. Within the Soviet Union the problems of socialism with democracy still await an answer.
One other event of 1956 was particularly significant in the ongoing struggle for liberation although, at the time, it didn't receive much attention. On December 2 of that year, a few revolutionaries in a ship named Granma landed in Cuba. Thus began the renewed battle which 25 months later made Cuba the first territory in the Americas free from imperialist control. For a world locked in "cold war" postures, when all liberation struggles seemed impossible, given the power of the United States, when many revolutionaries had become tired and cynical, Cuba became a symbol of a renewed and optimistic struggle. It is fitting, therefore, that the recently concluded first Congress of the Cuban Communist Party has named 1976 the "Year of the 'Granma'."

Nine months after the fall of Saigon, the defeat of US imperialism in Indochina continues to exert its effects on international politics. The changed world balance of forces which followed the collapse of US strategy in Indochina set the stage for a renewed round of struggle by national liberation and revolutionary movements in which the power of imperialism to intervene and get its own way has been seriously curtailed. As the US policy makers struggle to find a viable new strategy around which they can unite and which can be sold to a reluctant electorate, their problems multiply and in many cases they are unable to act.

The prime example of this is Angola. Even one or two years ago it would have been impossible to imagine that the US and its allies would have to stand by virtually helpless while the Soviet Union and Cuba aided the revolutionary forces against reactionary interference from South Africa in a country far away from their own borders. Ford's and Kissinger's inability to push military 'aid' programs through Congress to stop the rot in Angola reflect serious divisions within the US ruling class over imperialist strategy and tactics in the post-Vietnam era. Angola in 1976 is a long way from the Congo in 1960 and even further from the British-French-Israeli intervention in Egypt in 1956.

The war in Angola also reflects a changed situation within Africa. For years the racist regime in South Africa relied on the USA and the West to carry out the imperialist policy in southern Africa and protect it from the 'Black Hordes' to the north. With the decline of western power in Africa, Vorster turned to a more subtle strategy involving 'detente' with rightwing regimes in black Africa in order to obtain guarantees of non-interference in South African politics. Vorster's carrot was his willingness to barter away the Smith regime in Zimbabwe (Rhodesia) in return for 'detente' in southern Africa. That particular scheme has foundered on Smith's own obstinacy and self-interests and in any case the whole detente strategy has been overtaken by the Angolan events.

Events in Angola were themselves accelerated by the Portuguese revolution, which in its turn resulted from the long and unsuccessful colonial wars in Africa. But the Portuguese revolution has not had the same favorable outcome as the revolutions in the former colonies. For the first year after the overthrow of the fascist Caetano regime, the revolution advanced from strength to strength and went further left with each passing month. In early 1975, it seemed that a socialist outcome was quite possible and that correct tactics and strategy by the revolutionary forces would be able to utilise the defeat of the right and the temporary immobilisation or imperialism to bring about a socialist solution.

But mistakes by the revolutionary forces and confusion and division within the ranks of the left allowed the social-democratic and rightwing forces to regroup and counter-attack. With the defeat of the leftwing paratroopers' revolt in November, the right is well and truly in command for the moment. This serious setback for the left in Portugal poses again important questions of strategy and tactics for revolutionary socialists, just as the fascist coup in Chile did before it.

The first weeks of 1976 have seen an incredible upsurge in Spain. Francoism without Franco continues to be the policy of King Carlos and his advisers, but they are faced with mass demands for a fundamental break with fascism.

Many diverse forces have joined hands to ensure a genuine amnesty for all political prisoners and exiles, freedom of association and the right to legal political parties and trade unions.

Strikes of railway workers and postal
workers brought forth solidarity actions in Australia. Railway workers organised petitions, deputations and meetings. Postal workers banned Spanish mail deliveries for a week.

 Strikes and demonstrations continue in Spain. A notable feature is the engagement of women acting for their own liberation in the context of democratic renewal.

 Despite a strong unity in the Spanish opposition there will be attempts to divide it - to offer legality to some parties, but not the Communist Party. The Communist Party cannot be ignored and to remind the fascists of this fact, some of its leaders managed to hold a "secret" press conference in Madrid recently.

 The Spanish communists, according to their general secretary, Santiago Carrillo, "... do not want any solution that would provoke bloodshed, another civil war. First of all, because the wounds of the past war, which bled even after it was over have still not healed, and also because this new generation of Spaniards which does not know what war is, is made up of the sons of those who fought for the Republic and the sons of those who had been with Franco, whom time and events have mixed up and who today live together. We have this situation within the Communist Party itself ...... We think that this new birth of democratic forces is not only political and social, but biological too, and all this permits us to believe that it is possible for the transition from the dictatorship to democracy to take place without a civil war, in a peaceful way."

 It is perhaps external factors, as much as internal factors, which will determine whether the Spanish people can impose far-reaching democratic reforms without bloodshed.

 To take one example: United States investment in Spain (in millions of US dollars) increased from 31 million in 1950 to 758 million in 1970, and we all know what the United States did to preserve their investments in Chile.

 The centre-right government in Portugal still has its great problems and a resurgence of the left is possible. This will depend on events in neighbouring Spain which, with increasing tempo is beginning to emerge from the long night of Franco fascism.

 Solidarity with the left in both Spain and Portugal is an important task for the international left and workers' movement in the coming period, because events there will have their positive or negative effects throughout the capitalist world and especially in Europe.

 ****

 The Indonesian generals have been carrying out the genocidal invasion of East Timor for two months.

 The East Timorese people have been holding out against much superior forces. They have not yet resorted to guerrilla warfare in the traditional sense - they have instead defended all towns except those directly on the waterfront. Those towns that have fallen have been evacuated by the people, and guerrilla war fought on the occupying troops.

 The Indonesians hold little but the towns of Dili, Baucau, Manutoto, Aileu, Viqueque and on the southern coast the town of Betano. Supplying the inland towns is a major difficulty, given the poor roads and mountainous terrain.

 But the war is not yet over, and by wilfully destroying crops by chemical warfare the Indonesians hope to starve the Timorese into surrender. Moreover, the East Timorese have only a finite supply of ammunition, and so must rely on capturing supplies from the Indonesians.

 The anger of people throughout the world will be increasingly focussed on the Indonesian generals. While they may even silence, with the help of Fraser and Peacock, Fretlin's voice to the world, they cannot silence the anger of workers and students in Australia and the world.

 Fraser, like Ford and other imperialists, hopes the world will quietly forget East Timor and its heroic people. It is a major task of the progressive forces in Australia and elsewhere to see that East Timor is not forgotten, any more than the Vietnamese people were forgotten.

 The massive mobilisation in Australia of workers, students and all sectors of the population horrified by this genocide, is only the prelude to similar mobilisation throughout the world.

 Solidarity with the East Timorese is also an act of solidarity with the 160 million Indonesians who are under the military-fascist repression of the Jakarta generals.
Where is the Portuguese Revolution heading?

by Dean Ashenden

Lisbon in December was a city very different from the one I had visited in August. In the Rossio (the main square) the throngs of revolutionaries and political connoisseurs had been replaced by even larger throngs of unemployed, restless Angolans. The Mercedes and BMWs are appearing on the streets again, their owners now safe from the cries of "Fascist!" which had put their status symbols up for sale or in the garage for a year or more.

It may be too soon to mourn over the dead body of the Portuguese revolution. Yet it is hard to hope that the left in Portugal can recover from its now desperate situation.

For months the political crisis persisted, an impasse which everyone knew would last only so long as neither side felt confident that it could knock out the other .... or while neither side made a slip, an error which, however slight, would allow the opponent to tip the balance, release the deluge and surge to power. The paratroopers made that slip on November 25 and within hours the MFA was purged of 100, perhaps 200, left wing officers. In their place have stepped the released prisoners of March 11 - Spinola's mistake.

Left wing journalists have been sacked, radical administrators and managers in the state and the nationalised industries replaced, and the leaders of parties left of the PCP seem to have escaped only because the BBC announced their arrests before they were, in fact, secured. The right is making the most of its luck, spurring on a backlash which threatens to stop well to the right of even the PS. The PCP is cowed, and only 18 months after emerging from its long clandestine battle against fascism is talking once again of the construction of an anti-fascist front as "the main task".

If the working class of Portugal has been defeated, it will be a bitter defeat not only for the Portuguese, but for working people and the socialist movement everywhere. There will be an immediate consequence for the developing struggle in Spain. In the capitalist west the defeat must increase fears that the economic crisis is producing a world-wide swing to the right.

One of the most exhilarating things about the events in Portugal was the apparently irresistible speed with which anti-fascism became a movement for socialism. Most palpable to the visitor was the radical attack on one of the cruellest consequences of fascism -
the massive inequalities in knowledge and understanding. The revolution was a giant classroom. I was told “It used to be football - now it’s politics!” I met workers who were illiterate only three years ago, and who are now elected representatives of their workmates on the Workers’ Commissions, who can discuss and analyse their own situation and its place in the revolution with an insight and fluency which would put most of us to shame.

Fascists were purged from top jobs in government industry and finance. Basic democratic freedoms were implemented. A rash of nationalisation removed up to 60 per cent (estimates vary) of the most basic economic institutions from the direct command of capital. The most exploited sections of the working class gained considerable increases in their real wage. Wage differentials have been reduced, and intricate job hierarchies have been greatly simplified. Workers’ assemblies and their commissions have greatly reduced the untrammelled control of management. Trade unions have been unified in Intersindical. In education this attack on structure has gone further than in any other social sphere, with basic relations between teachers and students, student and student, learner and knowledge coming in for radical criticism and in some cases, revision. The military went far towards changing its class loyalties, and in the process brought into question both its own structure and its role in society.

These spectacular gains were made in the wake of the sudden and comprehensive collapse of the old regime. The old regime paid above all for its failure to resolve the African wars. But why couldn’t the Caetano regime solve the colonial question? This is no place to try to provide a comprehensive answer, but it can be said that by 1974 Portuguese fascism could not change itself, or Portugal or Portugal’s fatal imperial embrace. It had become both internally rigid and badly isolated. It was isolated not just from the great bulk of the population, but within its own class and its small elite of educated servants and mendicants. The Caetano regime had become a clique, and maintained itself in power only because extensive repression was effective in the political confusion and inertia of a society cloistered for 40 years. Unable to reform Caetano and his henchmen were swept away at the last hour by people of their own kind. The insurgents of April 25 acted for fear that if they didn’t the fate of the Caetano clique would be the fate of their entire class.

It very nearly was. The Portuguese ruling class - a hybrid of bourgeois and landed aristocracy - was badly discredited. When it abandoned its entrenched methods of fascist rule it had no other to replace it. There was no new program. There were no new men organised to take over. There was only a space, a political vacuum, and into it rushed the myriad (and sometimes charlatan) representatives of contenders for power: bourgeoisie; petit bourgeoisie; working class; peasantry; landowners; imperialists.

When Spinola fled to Spain it seemed that the radical insurgents were perhaps on the eve of becoming the working class in power. But the Portuguese ruling class had enormous reserves to fall back upon. The first of these was the monopoly it had held on the political and social life of the country and the myriad links which this had forged between its members. Portugal is a small country, and Lisbon a small capital. The elite of the country went to school together, go to dinner together, intermarry, meet in select restaurants, hear of each others’ movements, share business interests and political connections. They are both intimately organised and effortlessly exclusive, and the combination produces a bizarre brand of politics.

For example, I was at a dinner party in Lisbon three weeks ago where two of the eight guests had been in prison under the Caetano regime and another had been imprisoned by Salazar, while a fourth was a close personal friend of Caetano who had just returned from visiting him in Brazil. The hostess was the daughter of a former President of the Salazarist industrialists’ syndicate and yet had worked closely with the PCP at her workplace. They all knew each other well and got along famously.

Another strength is the Church. For a time the Church seemed in eclipse, overwhelmed by more modern ideological apparatuses in the hands of its enemies. But now that the radical left has lost control of the media, the Church - an institution which has remained absolutely untouched by the left - is resurgent. The sacking of the PCP offices in the north is
only the tip of a vast iceberg of social power which is undividedly and unhesitatingly dedicated to reaction, and here lies no small part of the reason why the apparent hegemony of left ideas over the past year or so has now revealed itself as relatively superficial and fragile.

The State has remained largely intact. Perhaps most centrally the armed forces - nearest of all state instruments to "going over" - are now returning to the fold. It is hard to see how the MFA can find its way back to even the ambiguous ideology and strategy of a few months ago, much less to the significant power which it held within the armed forces. The return of the forces "to the barracks" is their return to the service of the bourgeoisie - nothing more, nothing less.

The civil arms of the State also remained relatively unscathed. Of course, there were many changes in the personnel, but it is now clear how transient these changes are when the political climate which sustained them has gone. Of the old apparatuses, only the paramilitary PIDE was dismantled. The rest stands, and it may be that in some ways the internal coherence of the state machine has been strengthened. The connections between the political sphere and the bureaucracy, for example, are now much more vital than they were in Caetano's last days. It seems likely that nationalisation will strengthen relations between the economy and the State while at the same time maintaining a capitalist organisation of production.

Finally, the ruling class of Portugal has had a trump card to play: foreign capital, both actual and potential. The last decade of fascism was open slather for the multinationals in Portugal. As in Australia they command both a significant proportion of the economy as a whole and the most crucial sectors of it, ranging from 100 per cent of oil refining to 30 per cent of manufacturing. This has all been taboo in the welter of nationalisations, but that hasn't stopped extensive sabotage ranging from withdrawal from Portuguese operations to denial of credit, sales, and spare parts. If this is the stick, there is also the carrot, disguised as "economic aid" for "democracy" and held out by EEC politicians for their multinationals and monopolies.

So these were the forces arrayed against a rising and, for a time, threatening working class. What of the working class, its allies, and its organisation? Did the people of Portugal ever have a sporting chance? If so, why have they lost?

The PCP remains at the centre of the organised working class. Like a magnet, its power of attraction and repulsion has imposed its shape on Portuguese politics.

It is impossible to mistake the central place which the PCP has occupied in the minds of the Portuguese working class and of its enemies. To understand what has happened to the revolution, it is best to begin with the PCP.

The PCP emerged on April 25 as the only organised left political force. Its 5,000 cadres were well trained and placed to conduct the saneamento in the unions, local government and the state machine. It had the prestige and respect earned in 40 years of dedicated and unflinching resistance to fascism. "One of the Communist Party's claims in the run-up to the April 1975 elections", reports Antonio de Figueiredo, "was that their 247 candidates for the Constituent Assembly had served between then 440 years behind bars."

It was this which drew over 90,000 new members into the Party in the flood-tide of Revolution. Amongst these was Maria Velho da Costa, one of the "three Marias" whom I met on each of my visits to Portugal. Da Costa was fiercely proud that the Party had drawn "the best" of the young workers, intellectuals and writers into its ranks.

But if it attracted "the best" it has certainly not retained them. Many of the dozen or so left political groupings in Portugal had their origins in dissent or expulsion from the Party, some dating back to splits originating in the 20th Congress, others much more recent.

Some of those who joined after April 25 are leaving again. Together with those whose experience of the Party was earlier and longer, they are constructing an increasingly systematic and telling critique of the Party. It is a critique which draws in various degrees and ways on Maoist, Trotskyist and anarchist traditions. Of course, there is nothing like a consensus. Nor is there a new, rival centre of gravity for the organisation of the working
class. But there are a number of themes which run consistently through criticism of, and opposition to, the PCP. It is criticised for attempting to dominate or even monopolise the revolution and for misconceiving revolution as a process which can be controlled and directed from above. It has been attacked as cautious, defensive, conservative, and as being manipulative and anti-democratic.

Perhaps no part of the PCP practice has drawn quite so much fire as its attitude towards the various organs of "people's power". The Party had been lukewarm towards proposals for work-site and neighbourhood committees when they were first floated by the left wing of the MFA. The PC did not come out against the new organs, though many who were in contact with it reported that the Party's cadres were hostile to the councils, especially where they seemed to threaten the hegemony of syndicates and municipal government controlled by the PCP.

When the Councils began to take hold (the critics maintain) the Party moved in, using its very considerable organisational and political skills to achieve control wherever possible, and often in ways which attracted hostility and active opposition from workers and residents.

It does seem incontestable that office has been the first priority of the PCP. This has not only generated widespread hostility and mistrust but denied the Party and the revolution some crucial developments. The Party has numbers and energies without rival in working class politics, or indeed in Portugal as a whole, yet so far as I could see those energies have been spent in a narrow and eventually stifling way. The PCP has not been primarily concerned to agitate, organise and educate. Its concern to dominate and control, to operate from above has had the paradoxical effect of reducing its impact and restricting its influence. In consequence of its choices it has maintained its strength as a political organisation but has failed to spark off a self-generating and self-expanding movement across a wide front of the Portuguese revolution.

For example, the PCP has not sponsored a women's movement. I asked Velho da Costa what her feminism had brought to the working class struggle. "Nothing", she answered. She went on to explain that the condition of the country both now and when she joined the Party left the women's movement very low down on her list of priorities. She refuses to discuss the women's movement.

Yet women are of quite central importance in the working class itself. Women make up an important proportion of the "new" working class which is badly organised and low in consciousness, and women are concentrated in some of the most important sectors of Portuguese industry, especially in electronics and textiles. They are discriminated against in their conditions and wages, and oppressed in their lives both inside and outside the factories. The PCP has no policy to deal with the special problems and conditions of women, either in the workforce or outside it. It has not been notably purposeful or successful in stimulating and co-operating with struggles for better education, health and housing. Perhaps most damagingly, there has been no policy at all to win over, or at least neutralise, the peasantry in the north of the country.

Finally, there are many critics who maintain that the PCP has been the disciplinarian of the labor force, that it has stifled legitimate struggles, opposed legitimate strikes - even political strikes - and has thus slowed the development of the consciousness and organisation of the working class. The PCP has argued that many strikes have been the work of leftist adventurers, agents provocateurs, and workers in already over-privileged sectors. It has insisted that workers limit their demands to those which the economy can bear. It was often more prepared to face up to Portugal's economic plight than some of its critics.

But in practice a policy has been implemented by a party which has compromised itself in many eyes by holding, for the most revolutionary period, the Ministry of Labor. These aims have been pursued by a party which has been seen by many as encouraging or discouraging strikes, as the case may be, according to its own immediate interests; which has had an ambiguous attitude towards overthrowing capitalism; and which has often been seen to oppose other forms of workers' struggle - such as the workers' commissions.

This is where one is most likely to hear criticism of the PCP over its "Moscow Connection". The PCP has been vulnerable to the pressure of a great power which is, in the
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nature of things, more concerned to further its own foreign policy interests than to advance the Portuguese revolution. The PCP has lost heavily from the suspicion that it has tailored its policies, whether reluctantly or not, to suit the strategies of Brezhnev's detente. This has furthered long-standing fears that the PCP would not end foreign domination but would substitute Russian control for western exploitation.

***

In the heat and dust of the day-to-day revolutionary situation there is a tendency to reify the PCP, to see it as a force with entirely its own logic, an impetus generated by particular individuals and/or ideologies or ideas. Both its cadres and its critics tend to overlook the ways in which the PCP and its policies have been shaped by its history and by the course of events since April 25. It is often forgotten that the long years of underground struggle against fascism required a heavily centralised, tightly disciplined party, and that the old regime collapsed almost without warning, without a chance for the habits and attitudes of 40 years' resistance to be unlearned, and for the quite different skills and capacities of "open politics" to be learned.

The PCP is not an independent force standing outside or above Portuguese history, but a product and reflection of it. To ask the important question "Could the working class and its allies have carried through a successful socialist revolution?" is, in this discussion, to ask how different things would have been under a different kind of leadership. This is, I think, a sensible and important question if we are to learn from the Portuguese experience, but it should not be an excuse for moralistic outbursts, for "blaming" the PCP - a now popular pastime in some maoist and trotskyist circles. Quite aside from anything else, a moralistic approach usually assumes an answer to the central question - it assumes that, yes, of course there would have been a socialist revolution "if only it weren't for the PCP".

Certainly the obstacles to a successful socialist revolution were formidable. The Portuguese working class has a history of organisation running over most of this century, but it was not strongly placed when Caetano fell. It was organised into syndicates which fragmented the class and integrated it both structurally and ideologically into the State. Long years of anti-communist propaganda and Catholic indoctrination left the working class ideologically weak. A considerable proportion of workers were first-generation members of this class, coming to the new factories of international capital after boyhood in the countryside and young manhood in the army. These men were vulnerable to all the reactionary propaganda which surrounded them, and even more so were the many women who have recently left home and village for the factories. Another major advantage for capitalism is the huge number of Portuguese "guest workers" in Western Europe. Up to three million Portuguese live outside Portugal, leaving only eight million in the country. The "guest workers" are driven by the poverty at home and the high levels of consumption around them, and cannot learn as do their fellows at home from the struggles of the past two years.

The rural population is still large, and is deeply divided between the rural proletariat of the south and the small-holding peasantry of the north. The petit bourgeoisie remains, in an under-developed industrial society, numerous and powerful, its ranks swelled by 300,000 refugees from Angola. The sizeable stake, both direct and indirect, of EEC and US capital gives the relatively weak and undeveloped Portuguese bourgeoisie a strength far beyond its own, and the Church is strong and well organised.

It may seem, then, that the "conservatism" of the PCP was, in fact, responsibility, a sober recognition of the possibilities and of the dangers of trying to wish them away. This is the explicit claim of the PCP, especially in the wake of the disastrous events of November 25. I met PCP cadres who were convinced that here above all was the vindication of the leadership's policy; didn't the paratroopers' disastrous failure prove that the revolution was not yet on the agenda?

So far as I can see, this begs the question, namely: how far has the Party's policies of the preceding 18 months contributed to a situation where the left could be so devastatingly defeated? It seems to me unlikely though not impossible, that a socialist revolution could have been carried through in the immediate aftermath of the collapse of fascism but the possibility was probably greater than the PCP allowed, and ought to have been discussed more widely and
seriously than it appears to have been. But the “top down” approach of the PCP is both unsuited to a real exploration of the potential for revolution and to making the most of that potential.

It is true that a strategy which might be summarised as “revolution from below” runs the risk of populism, of adventurism, of ill-coordinated or ill-timed actions which could cost the working class dear. But can the PCP claim that its policies have avoided or prevented precisely these dangers? What’s more, the Party’s policies have, I fear, left the working class markedly less able to defend itself now that it has lost the initiative, and less able to press on, in the new conditions, with attacking capitalism and of creating socialist practice and ideas in that struggle.

What will happen in Portugal now? It seems unlikely that the working class will be able to recover its position. Nor do I expect a civil war, though until November 25 I thought it a distinct possibility. Its outcome probably would have been a heavy loss of life and a return to fascism.

The real question now seems to be whether or not there will be some form of social democracy, or a return to a modernised fascism. The right is on the rampage; reports of polls giving the PCP 56 per cent of an electoral vote also claim that the right wing “social democratic” PPD has now taken over from the PS as the largest single vote-getter. Soares will pay a heavy price for his virulent anti-communism. Looking beyond the (rumored) state of “public opinion” it is obvious that capital in Portugal is banking on an influx of investment and state aid from abroad. It is equally obvious that foreign capital will want its guarantees: a quiescent and disciplined labor force, a “stable political situation”. If the working class seems clearly unable to carry through a revolution, it is nonetheless fairly well placed to defend itself. Breaking its will and organisation could require a return to fascism.

On balance, the most likely solution seems to be something like Greece - an economy deeply penetrated by foreign capital, especially that associated with multinationals. A population of low living standards and great inequalities - though not as low and not as great as those before April 25. A political regime which relies on political and ideological dominance and the threat of force and repression rather than their systematic and consistent use.

What are the lessons of Portugal? I am certainly not in a position to give anything like a full answer to the question, and I will restrict myself to a few brief points which come fairly directly from my brief experience of Portugal.

First, there are some important implications for the structure, situation and role of a vanguard party. The Portuguese experience does seem to lend further support to the argument that a vanguard party must not become heavily centralised or bureaucratise, and that its leadership must not be protected from the criticism and influence of either members of the Party or those outside it. A vanguard party must not aspire to dominate or control the whole revolutionary process. It must learn to co-operate with all possible allies, going out of its way to neutralise or to avoid antagonising groups such as the small-holders of the Portuguese north. It must encourage active participation by people in workers’ and residents’ organisations and they must remain outside the control of the Party. It must be independent of any control from outside the country.

Second, I caught a glimpse of the astonishing power of a revolutionary situation. No one who has been to Portugal could fail to recognise the extraordinary speed with which even the most entrenched attitudes change, the most powerful institutions quake, the most “impossible” feats are achieved. History does change its speed, and in revolution the dialectic of change attains an extraordinary impetus. Everything comes up for grabs.

Precisely because this is so, there is, I think, a third lesson. Just as hopes and achievement rise to extraordinary heights, so can failure be extraordinarily bitter and costly. Revolution poses questions which come faster and larger than most of us are used to. Bravado and revolutionary machismo are poor substitutes for a sober political ethic.
"The maximum of profit is, therefore, limited by the physical minimum of wages and the physical maximum of the working day. It is evident that between the two limits of this maximum rate of profit an immense scale of variations is possible. The fixation of its actual degree is only settled by the continuous struggle between capital and labor." 

Here, in Wages, Price and Profit, Marx is posing the rules of the game presently being played out in the National Wage Case. Of course, whatever decision is brought down will not settle the matter. The struggle is, as he remarks, continuous.

Not only does it include what goes on in the National Wage Case, it also involves individual wage agreements, both award and over-award. Taxation policy is important also. All these separate struggles determine the rate of exploitation* and hence the "actual degree" of profits.

The boss can increase the rate of exploitation by lengthening the working day, by speeding up the work process, by cutting wages or by introducing new methods of production. If prices are going up all the time, he just has to hold wages constant in money terms, to get the same effect.

The worker can decrease the rate of exploitation by fighting for a shorter working day on full pay, by fighting speed-ups.

* The rate of exploitation is the ratio of surplus value produced to variable capital employed in the production process. Or, in other words, the ratio of surplus labor time (during which the worker produces profits for the boss) to necessary labor time (during which the worker produces value equal to her/his wages).
TABLE 1

Employers, Self-Employed and Employees as a percentage of the workforce.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employers</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Employed</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees</td>
<td>74.2</td>
<td>80.3</td>
<td>82.1</td>
<td>83.2</td>
<td>85.4</td>
<td>87.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

demanding a share of the extra product she/he creates and by fighting for higher wages. Worker and boss also struggle over the rate of exploitation when they fight to determine the country's taxation policy.

To see this working in the past, and now, we need to refine these notions a little, and compare them with quantities that are measured. The Australian Bureau of Statistics collects and publishes data on wages, gross domestic product, and so on. However, what they choose to investigate and the categories they use, are determined by concerns other than ours. While they are worried about the rate of exploitation, they can see the ideological problems of talking about it in these clear terms, so there is some mystification and confusion that needs to be hacked away before we can get from their numbers to what is important.

The quantity used in discussions of labor's share of the national product by bourgeois economists and statisticians is the national accounts category "wages, salaries and supplements". Variations in this quantity as a proportion of the gross domestic product do not, however, directly indicate changes in the rate of exploitation. There are a number of reasons for this:

1. The class structure of Australia is changing, and in the period for which we have good national accounts data - say, since the Second World War - it has changed dramatically. The size of the traditional petty bourgeoisie - people who are self-employed, has fallen, as Table 1 shows. The increased proportion of wage and salary earners in the workforce will itself account for a greater share of wages, salaries and supplements without any underlying change in the rate of exploitation.

For example, the income of a corner shopkeeper is regarded as 'profit'. When she/he is forced out of business, or taken over by a supermarket chain, and becomes an employee, their income goes on the other side of the equation.

2. A worker is only productive for capital if she/he contributes to capital's self-expansion. In other words, her/his labor must both transfer value to the product equivalent to wages received, and add additional, surplus, value. A worker who does not do this is unproductive for capital, even though she/he may do things useful to the capitalist. In fact, he may, and does, pay workers to perform such services as keeping his books, selling his products, or even managing his factory, rather than doing it himself.

However, these unproductive workers (and they include some of the highest paid executives in the country) must be paid out of the surplus value created by other workers. Hence we should subtract their wages and salaries from the figure given in the official data, and add it to the figure for the surplus.

It is in fact impossible to do this in practice. For one thing, the figures when they are collected are not classified in this way, and are all added together. Also, the line between productive and unproductive workers is not an easy one to draw in many cases. Some engineers, for instance, do design work, which is productive; others, like foremen, provide discipline and supervision, while some do both, for different proportions of their time.

Despite these conceptual and practical
TABLE 2
Selected occupation groups as a percentage of all employees. 1966 1971

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation Group</th>
<th>1966</th>
<th>1971</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional, technical and related workers</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative, executive, managerial workers</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical workers</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>17.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales workers</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members of the armed services</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>40.3</td>
<td>42.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>59.7</td>
<td>57.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

difficulties, however, we can still extract some information from the official data, as in Table 2. Changes in class structure will have effects on the quantities measured by the statisticians; but the more short term our view, and the slower these changes, the more valid it is to exclude them.

The tax system collects a portion of the incomes of both workers and capitalists, and redistributes this between the classes. Total social variable capital is what the working class can exchange for commodities on the market to maintain and reproduce itself. Hence, it is what is left after taxation, and after the distribution of social services.

Thus Fraser's policy of cutting company tax liability through implementation of the companies' part of the Mathews Committee recommendations, and through investment allowances, will leave more of the burden on income and indirect taxes, which fall in large part on the working class. This represents an increase in the rate of exploitation, even if all other quantities remained the same.

All we can really see and measure are changes in these aggregate quantities. It would be fairly complicated to use the income tax data, together with information on class structure and on government spending to determine just what these redistribution effects are. The Asprey Committee, both in its full report, and in a series of commissioned studies, has carried out an investigation of the effects of the present tax system, and it includes some data on redistribution.

Some of these practical difficulties disappear, however, once we further refine our basic categories. What matters is after-tax income, plus social service benefits, all the rest is part of the surplus. It does not really matter whether this part of the surplus starts off in a wage packet only to be taken by the Taxation Department. Thus the same result could be achieved by workers paying no taxation at all, and all government revenue being raised through company tax. Wages, of course, would be much lower, and pre-tax profits much higher.

There are historical reasons why the situation evolved differently. Each change in taxation practice is the result of struggle between the classes; the present situation is the result of hundreds of such struggles where, in particular, the capitalist class, to maintain its position in the face of an assertive working class, has successfully used the state to force workers to carry more of the tax burden. It's an easier option than lowering wages, though Fraser now seems bent on trying both.

There are additional advantages in raising taxation through Pay As You Earn Income Tax. During inflation the government obtains automatic tax increases as people on the same real income move into higher money income brackets. Also, periodic capitalist crises introduce wild fluctuations in profit levels; a corresponding instability in government revenue raising would make managing a capitalist economy even more difficult than it is.

THE EVIDENCE

The Department of Labor and Immigration last year published a discussion paper called Labour's share of the National Product - The Post-War Australian Experience. It is an attempt to discover what happened to labor's share in the period 1948/9 to 1970/1, the period for which the authors had good national
income data. They discuss both long term trends, and short term fluctuations.

THE LONG TREND

This study attempts to solve the problem of structural change in the economy by constructing a number of series, excluding some industries that offer conceptual difficulties.

They also give series in which the industrial structure has been "frozen" by weighting and adjusting the data to conform to the actual structure in a chosen base year. In all they present 32 different series, most of which show similar behaviour. Figure 1 shows two of these series, the ones preferred by the authors. (Gross domestic product at factor cost measures the value added by the factors of production and in turn represents the income available for distribution. Gross factor incomes is defined as gross domestic product at factor cost less an allowance for the consumption of capital equipment, that is, depreciation. Because of their treatment of unproductive labor, and because capitalists lie on their income tax about depreciation, these categories should be taken with a grain of salt.)

The overall trend is at first sharply downwards, and then slowly upwards. Since 1948/9 labor's share has shown a long term decline; however, if the analysis begins in 1953/4 the conclusions are the opposite. This is because of the substantial decline in the period 1948/9 to 1953/4.

This period saw big defeats for the working class; the defeat of the coal strike, Chifley's defeat by Menzies, the start of the Cold War with its attacks on trade unions and militants. The victories won by the working class in the immediate post-war period were in part negated, and capital was able to recommence production again in the mid-fifties with a higher rate of exploitation, and hence profitability.

It was the start of the long post-war boom, and although the economy faltered a number of times, there were no big crashes.

The trend increase in labor's share after 1953 is, by any measure, very small. If we take into account both the decline in the size of the traditional petty bourgeoisie, and the increase in unproductive labor during this period, it seems that the rate of exploitation actually increased.

UPS AND DOWNS

Figure 1 also shows some cyclical behaviour. During each cycle, the rate of exploitation gradually decreases, or in other words, labor's share gradually rises. Boom conditions with full employment mean workers can win wage increases, with less threat of the dole queue at their back. Productivity increases sharply in the early part of the recovery as previously unemployed workers, and idle capital, come back into production.

However, workers win a greater proportion of these gains in output in more confident

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quarter</th>
<th>Average weekly earnings</th>
<th>After tax earnings</th>
<th>Consumer price index</th>
<th>After tax real earnings</th>
<th>Labor's share</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>September 73</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>58.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 73</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>-0.91</td>
<td>59.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 74</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>60.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 74</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>4.99</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>68.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 74</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>12.60</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>7.50</td>
<td>68.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 74</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>63.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 75</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>-1.27</td>
<td>69.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 75</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>-2.61</td>
<td>71.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 75</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>0.8 or 2.9*</td>
<td>1.17 or -0.93*</td>
<td>69.0 (est)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*depending on whether the effect of Medibank is included.
struggles. At the same time, capitalists seek to invest more and more of their surplus to cash in on the good times. Eventually the projected return on these new investments falls below not only what the capitalists had come to expect in the recovery phase, but what they are prepared to tolerate. Investment dries up, and productivity begins to falter. Workers are "over-confident" just when capitalists begin to "lose confidence".

As investment slackens, workers in heavy industry and in building and construction are laid off, or have their overtime cut. They do not spend as much, and this affects other industries, clothing, food, and household goods. Soon the downturn is general, and profits plunge further. But not all plants with an empty order book lay off all their workers; skilled workers and staff are kept on, waiting for improvement. Labor's share rises by default, and productivity falls even further as plant and machines stand idle.

Soon though, unemployment has its effect. Wages are held, or cut in real terms. Labor "discipline" is re-established, and production can begin again at a higher rate of exploitation. Thus at the start of each recovery there is a sharp increase in the rate of exploitation, sufficient to restore the "confidence" of investors.

This increase in the rate of exploitation is resisted by workers, however, and as the economy takes off workers are in a stronger bargaining position. Figure 2 shows both changes in productivity and changes in labor's share from December 1951 to June 1973. Results from every quarter are plotted here, rather than the annual data used in Figure 1. Labor's share is shown only in fluctuations around the long term trend. The mechanism of the boom/bust cycle, and the key role of the rate of exploitation can be read from this figure.

Although workers win some battles during this continuous struggle, the only possible final resolution is to abolish the wages system itself. So long as capitalists confront workers across this class division, the boom/bust cycle and the struggle over the rate of exploitation will continue.

During the recovery of 1973 and 1974, workers were able to win real gains. Table 3 shows the increase each quarter in average weekly earnings and in consumer prices. By subtracting one from another we would get a rough measure of the increase in real incomes. However, this measure would be too large because of taxation; as incomes go up a bigger proportion goes in taxes, so the real, after tax increase is not as big. The third column shows the increase in real, after tax average weekly earnings and the last column shows labor's share.

It is clear that the wage freeze policy had some effect in the last year of Labor's rule. It is also clear, both from Fraser's present policies, and from past experience, that what the capitalist class is looking for to re-establish profitable production, is a sharp increase in the rate of exploitation, and hence an attack on working class living standards.
The CPA in the Thirties
by Dick Dixon

The 9th Conference of the Communist Party of Australia assembled in Sydney on January 10, 1930, at a time of big economic and political changes which gave rise to many new problems for the revolutionary movement. The collapse of share prices on the New York Stock Exchange in October 1929 marked the end of the economic boom of US capitalism. Economic crisis spread rapidly in the United States and throughout the capitalist world. By March 1930, there were already 200,000 unemployed in Australia. With the onset of the capitalist crisis a majority of people turned to the Labor Party for a way out and Labor governments were elected in the Federal sphere and in all State parliaments with the exception of Queensland. But they were unable to find solutions and were soon discredited. By the middle of 1932 the wheel had taken its full turn and they had all been defeated.

In the new Central Committee which the 9th Conference of the Party elected, only L.L. Sharkey, H. Moxon and E.J. Docker had some previous CC experience. Newly elected members included Jean Thompson, active in the women's movement, Joe Shelley, a German migrant, J. Loughran, an Irishman who was in charge of the workers' bookshop, W. Orr from Lithgow, and R. Dixon. Of the members of the retiring Central Committee who had opposed the new line of the Party, E. Higgins then the editor of *Workers' Weekly*, was the only one to be elected, but he began to withdraw from activity almost immediately, and played very little part in the Party thereafter. Among those who lost their positions were Tom Wright and Norman Jeffrey. These comrades were both re-elected to the Central Committee a few years later and went on to make big contributions to the work of the Party and its leadership. The new Central Committee elected L.L. Sharkey as Party president. Although he had no previous journalistic experience he had also to take on editorship of the *Workers' Weekly*. H. Moxon was elected general secretary. He had played an important part in the struggle against the old rightwing leadership, but lacked qualities essential in a general secretary, and most importantly was unable to build a collective and united leadership to strengthen party unity as a whole. Moxon intrigued against other leading party members causing divisions in the leadership. He wanted to carry on the struggle against the old leadership instead of involving them in activity and winning them to support the general line of the Party. These and some extreme leftist mistakes led to him being relieved of his position early in 1931. J.B. Miles was brought from Brisbane to live and work in Sydney and at the 10th Congress in April 1931 he was elected general secretary.

The 9th Party Conference carried a series of resolutions on future work including the need to build Party membership, establish party organisation in factories, suburbs and towns, and to reorganise the structure of the Party. It decided to contest parliamentary elections with communist candidates and to establish the independence of the Party in its policy, leadership and activity in all fields. It also took decisions to combat the activities of rightwing
A group of workers supporting Lang in 1932.

Labor and trade union leaders, to develop independent organisation and leadership of the workers in trade unions, industries and among the unemployed.

The most immediate and pressing question for the new Central Committee however was the situation in the coalfields. The northern miners had been locked out since March 1929 when they rejected a coal owners’ ultimatum for a 12½ per cent wage cut. The NSW Tory Barron government in an effort to break the miners’ resistance to the coal owners’ demands decided to open up and work some northern mines with scab labor and just prior to Xmas 1929, scabs were put into the Rothbury mine. The government sent a strong force of armed police to protect the scabs and the miners decided to picket. The reformist leaders of their union and also coalfields Labor Party politicians tried to play it down, urging the miners to confine themselves to peaceful forms of protest. On the morning of the Rothbury opening, the miners demonstrated in force at the pithead. The police attacked with batons and then opened fire on the demonstrators. One worker, Norm Brown was killed and six others wounded. This shooting down of the miners caused great anger among workers and gave rise to a powerful spontaneous protest movement right across Australia. Meetings and demonstrations were held and protests lodged condemning the police savagery and the position of the NSW Tory government. In Sydney, thousands of workers marched on Parliament House in
condemnation of the Barron government. They were met by police attacks, baton charges which resulted in injuries to many of those present, and widespread arrests. In the northern coalfields, tension was very high.

The new Central Committee discussed the mining crisis with party members from the fields including Bill Orr and Charlie Nelson from the western coalfields. It was decided to step up the campaign to achieve a cessation of coal production in all minefields throughout Australia. When the northern miners were locked out the plan of the reformist officials was to confine the dispute to the north. Coalfields in the south and west, in Queensland and Victoria, continued to work flat out, producing sufficient coal for the needs of industry and for other requirements. The Party view was that this reformist tactic could have only one result - the undermining of the morale of the northern miners, and their defeat.

The Party believed that the only way to bring the dispute to a satisfactory end for the miners was to wage an all-out struggle, to stop production in all coal mines. It was also considered necessary to move past the reformist leadership of the union. The Party called for the setting up of rank and file organisation and leadership in the minefields, at the pitheads, with the aim of taking the leadership of the struggle out of the hands of the reformists. The new Central Committee also decided to send party activists to the northern fields where the struggle was extremely sharp. Among those who went north were E.J. Docker, J. Shelley, W. Orr, H. Huggett, N. Jeffrey, W. Laidler, T. McCowley and some others.

After the Rothbury shooting, police repression in the north increased; demonstrations were attacked and broken up; meetings were prohibited; homes were raided in search of explosives and weapons; many miners were arrested, mostly on trumped up charges. Under Party influence, the miners decided to form a Labor Defence Army to protect the organisations of the workers, their meetings and demonstrations. Each member of the Labor Defence Army took a solemn oath "To protect the working class against armed and other aggression of our capitalist class enemy, to resolve that we will never allow ourselves or our children to be used in capitalist war against the workers of other countries."

One of the first tasks of the Labor Defence Army was to protect a women's demonstration in Cessnock. The Communist Party had decided to hold a public meeting in a hall in Cessnock on January 12. The miners' wives announced their intention to defy the police ban on processions and to march through Cessnock streets to attend this meeting. The Labor Defence Army therefore decided that they would also march in order to help protect the demonstration. More than 4,000 attended the meeting; the police did not attempt to suppress the demonstration of women, or to ban the meeting.

On January 8, Joe Shelley was arrested and jailed after addressing a Party public meeting in Kurri Kurri. He was charged with "incitement to crime", the police claiming that he had advised miners how to make milk-tin bombs for use against the Rothbury scabs. Party members and militant workers were set upon and persecuted by the police and many were jailed.

In Sydney at this time, the International Class War Prisoners' Aid organised a rally of some 30,000 people in the Sydney Domain to protest against the police repression on the coalfields and to organise legal aid for those arrested, and assistance for the families of imprisoned workers. The Sydney meeting was symptomatic of the widespread opposition to the attacks of the Barron government and police on miners.

The Federal Labor Party, at the 1929 elections, had promised to secure an end to the northern dispute on the pre-stoppage terms. After a few feeble efforts, however, the Scullin government abandoned the miners. The Party campaign for an all-out policy won support in the coalfields but not sufficient support to stop the production of coal throughout Australia. As the tension in the north declined, the Miners' Union officials resumed their efforts to get the miners to retreat. In April, mass meetings of the miners rejected the plea to return to work. At the end of May, however, after 15 months of lockout, the reformist leaders were successful and there was a majority vote to return to work on the coalowners' terms.

A positive feature of the miners' struggle was the strong growth of the Party's influence and prestige in all of the coalfields, leading to an increase in Party membership in the north especially, but also in the western and
southern coalfields. Bill Orr, who was a capable organiser and propagandist, played a big part in the miners’ struggle, and he emerged as the most prominent figure on the left in the Miners’ Federation. Two and a half years later, at the miners’ elections for federal positions in the union in December 1933, Orr was elected general secretary of the Federation, defeating his reformist opponent by more than 1,000 votes, and then several months later, Nelson was elected general president.

At the beginning of March 1930, a leading member of the Communist Party of the United States arrived in Australia. He was known in this country as Herbert Moore, in the United States as H. Wicks. It will be useful here to relate some information about Moore that I gleaned from members of the CPUSA whom I met subsequent to Moore’s visit here. Following the 6th Congress of the Communist International in 1928, the US Communist Party was deeply divided on the perspectives and decisions of the World Congress as they related to the United States. The general secretary of the United States Communist Party, Lovestone, was opposed to the line of the Comintern claiming that the decisions were inapplicable to United States capitalism filling an “exceptional” position in the world, which would enable it to avoid economic crisis. In his view the prosperity and economic boom then prevailing in the United States would continue. That was in May 1929. Five months later, in October, share prices on the New York Stock Exchange collapsed signalling the fact that the boom was over; prosperity gave way to economic crisis in the United States.

Herbert Moore, I understand, was in the Lovestone camp. The differences in the American Party came before the 6th Convention of the CPUSA in March 1929. The delegates were divided, they could not reach agreement and so it was unanimously decided to seek a discussion on the issues with the Communist International. A large delegation representative of both views in the American Party went to Moscow. Among those present at the discussion apart from the US delegation and the Comintern representatives, were Stalin and Bukharin from the CPSU, and also communist leaders from France, Germany, Britain, China, Czechoslovakia and Canada.

Lovestone advanced his view that United States capitalism filled an “exceptional” position in the world, which would enable it to avoid economic crisis. In his view the prosperity and economic boom then prevailing in the United States would continue. That was in May 1929. Five months later, in October, share prices on the New York Stock Exchange collapsed signalling the fact that the boom was over; prosperity gave way to economic crisis in the United States.

The Comintern discussion on the American question ended with the rejection of Lovestone’s views and it reaffirmed the validity of the 6th Congress decisions on economic...
crisis and the sharpening class struggle in the capitalist countries. When Lovestone returned to the United States and when the facts and the discussion with the other communist parties were made known, a great majority of United States communists rejected his views also. Moore, who was present at the Comintern discussion, did not immediately return to the United States but remained in Moscow for some time working in the Anglo-American section of the Comintern representing the American Party.

When he was due to return to the US, the Comintern proposed that he visit Australia and work with the Australian Party for a period of time and later return to the United States. He arrived here early in March 1930 and returned to the United States about April 1931 following the 10th Congress of the Australian Communist Party. If Moore adopted a rightist position in the United States, he certainly showed no signs of that tendency here. Our Central Committee was on a leftist line at the time and Moore's approach coincided and in some respects contributed to strengthening our left stance. He wrote regularly for the *Workers' Weekly* during his stay here in which he expounded his views on Party policy and the Australian situation. Moore made mistakes in his estimation of the Labor Party. This was understandable. In the United States, the working class never succeeded in developing a mass labor party as in Australia and Britain, nor a social-democratic party as exists in various countries of Europe. He knew these parties therefore only in their historical or theoretical sense. He also made mistakes on the trade union question. Partly, I think, because of his US background where the trade union situation is different to that in Australia and partly from his attempt to introduce Comintern and Red International of Labor Union's tactics. I will refer to these questions in detail later.

One of the most persistent criticisms of the work of the Australian Communist Party in the early 1930s was our use of the term 'social fascism' in characterising the leaders of the Labor Party and reformist trade union officials, and 'left social fascism' to describe those on the left in the labor movement. It is necessary to say at this point that we ourselves were the first to criticise the use of these terms. We did this in an effort to correct leftist mistakes in the Party. Our criticism has since been followed up by remarks by others which do not always reveal any clear understanding of the problem. The term 'social fascism' had its origin in the Comintern - indeed it can be traced back to Stalin. Prior to the 6th Congress of the Comintern in 1928, Stalin spoke of fascism as the "militant organisation of the bourgeoisie based on support of social democracy". He described social democracy and fascism as 'twins'. It was not long after Stalin's remarks that Comintern publicists began to use the phrase 'social fascism' to describe social democratic leaders and this term began to be used widely by sections of the Comintern.

The use of the term 'social fascism' however was not the main problem arising from Stalin's remarks. His characterisation of fascism virtually identified the bourgeois democratic form of capitalist class rule with fascism. His statement on social democracy which depended on the system of bourgeois democracy and grew up in it could only mean that they had no role to play in the struggle against fascism. The rise of fascism in Germany and Hitler's destruction of the bourgeois democratic system, and of the social-democratic party and trade unions of Germany, as well as of the Communist Party, was to demonstrate how mistaken Stalin's views were on bourgeois democracy and fascism.

At the 7th Congress of the Communist International in 1935, Dimitrov put forward a different view of fascism. He characterised fascism in power as the open, terrorist dictatorship of finance capital. He called upon the Communist Parties to resolutely come out in defence of democratic freedom, of the liberties of the people in the struggle against fascism and urged the building of the united front with the social democratic masses, leaders and organisations.

Dimitrov's report came much too late for the German Communist Party; already it had been crushed. But it raised important new perspectives for the communist parties and the working people in the struggle against fascism and against the way that was then developing.

The use, or more correctly, the misuse of the term 'social fascist' here in Australia was essentially the mistake of our Party. It became a term of abuse of our opponents. It is necessary, however, to look at the conditions and circumstances of our struggle in which we made this mistake and we will deal with that in a future article.
DISCUSSION

There is much to disagree with in Gary Nicholls' article "Interpretations of Black History" (ALR No. 47, July 1975) but I dissent specifically from his assumption that aboriginal society is "but one more instance of the process that precedes capitalism" (p.51), i.e. simply an earlier stage in the system of human progress leading to capitalist society; and that a reconstituted aboriginal society has no right to existence in the 20th century and has no role in challenging the hegemony of capitalist society (p.51).

The first assumption - that aboriginal society can be seen as an earlier stage in a system of progress towards capitalist society is satisfactorily dealt with by Levi-Strauss in Structural Anthropology where he writes of the intoxification of our society with the belief that all societies preceding capitalism, during tens of milleniums, did nothing more than prepare the ground for its advent. He quotes Marx thus:

"The so-called historical development amounts in the last analysis to this, that the last form considers its predecessors as stages leading up to itself and perceives them always one-sidedly, since it is very seldom and only under certain circumstances that it is capable of self-criticism ...." (Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy. Chicago 1904, p.301).

There is no necessary imperative within marxism to see "primitive" societies as preparing the way for more progressive societies, though there is such an imperative in regard to class societies. There is no imperative to see progress as a universal concept as opposed to "the internal property of a given society". Indeed Marx has acknowledged the unchanging nature of some societies:

"The simplicity of the organisation for production in those self-sufficing communities that constantly reproduce themselves in the same spot, and with the same name - this simplicity supplies the key to the secret of the unchangeableness of Asiatic societies, an unchangeableness in such striking contrast with the constant dissolution of Asiatic states and the never-ceasing changes of dynasty." (Capital: N.Y. 1906, pp.393-4).

Given that they are governed by kinship rather than economic relations, such societies might endure indefinitely - unless destroyed from without (Levi-Strauss, p.337).

Aboriginal society has been substantially destroyed by past and current attempts to impose European values and systems on a non-European people in the name of that "progress" (the same term, if not the same content) which Nicholls would use to 'proletarianise' the Aboriginal population.

Given his premise - that progress is a universal concept - it is easy to see why he regards attempts to revive traditional life styles as 'an attempt, initiated by the bourgeoisie, to maintain a 'permanent living museum' in certain areas (e.g. Arnhem Land) and as a way of mystifying Blacks in areas where militant demands seem more dangerous (e.g. NSW)."

There is, currently, amongst Northern Territory and other Aboriginal people, a trend to move away from contact with European-Australian society back to traditional economy and life styles. A possible consequence of such a trend is the redevelopment of self-sufficiency by Aboriginal people. This in itself would constitute a break from the dependence on welfare, fostered by successive governments in an attempt to find for the Aborigine a place in capitalist society, if only as a consumer of services. This movement, from an "administered life" to a self-sufficient Aboriginal hunter-gatherer economy contains the possibility of establishing conditions which have never existed in the old and advanced industrial societies, in which (given the material plenty of the Arnhem Land environment) self-determination would proceed from the economic base. This is a far cry from "the oppressed and helpless state" which Nicholls envisages as resulting from the revival of traditional life styles.

Ruaric Dixon.
Marx said that man changes himself in the process of changing his circumstances. How does this concept apply in the light of the need for a communist society of which we now must expect something more than in Marx's day? Then, a communist society meant the abolition of the alienation of humans from the product of their labor, and an end to the alienation of humans from each other due to their enforced competition on the capitalist market to sell their labor-power. But a communist society, now, has not only to overcome alienation, but to do so without creating ecological instability.

Humankind has the unique capacity to proceed by way of analysing a situation, projecting into the future a perspective or plan, and then steadily to "work" to transform the present into that plan. This remarkable capacity is so elementary that we seldom mention it.

The creative aspect of this process of exercising the capacity to work towards a planned future is precisely what the slaves, the serfs and the wage and salary workers have been robbed of: it is this which strips their humanity from them. The real inequality between humans, doubly compounded in the case of the female of the species under class society, is not merely inequality of distribution of material goods - that's bad enough - but more importantly there has been the inequality of opportunity to exercise that elementary capacity - in all too many of us an atrophied capacity - to work creatively and cooperatively.

"Working" towards a projected future that commences as an idea in the head, humans, walking on two feet have used first weapons in their liberated hands, then tools, and with the liberation of their brains that this enabled, progressively more complicated machines and now technology to reshape both nature and society itself in the process.

Marx showed clearly that the "capital" enshrined in these machines or technology is not simply material "things" but is part of and cannot be separated from, the social organisation of labor. As one would expect in this system, this proves to be an organisation of the division of labor which best assists the capitalist to control the worker as well as the product, as Mr. Chris Ryan has recently illustrated.

Indeed, each and every time profits are reinvested in further capital growth (which is the whole motive force of the capitalist system), the situation automatically reproduces the social position both of those
who own the capital, and those who are exploited by it.

But, pertinent to our present problems: the same process also typically reproduces, even on an extended scale, damage to ecosystems. Mr. Ryan argues that since the solution of the ecological challenge lies in the direction of low-energy technology, the very social character of the productive process itself must change. It must change to one amenable to self-management and community control as distinct from globally organised, multinationaly owned, bureaucratically controlled production.

To “work at” changing technology is tantamount to saying we have to work at changing lifestyle values, because changing the character of the productive process to one of an impact low enough to sustain ecological stability and one amenable to workers’ control means changing what we consider important in life. To say this, however, is not to ignore that for the masses of people, their values are and will be determined for them by the present system: so the system itself has to be changed. But it does mean that the advanced minority of radicals who reject the capitalist consumerist values should be allies in the task of changing society; that is: communists should look to lifestylers as potential allies, and lifestylers should look to communists as potential allies.

Projection of an alternative system as a goal is unavoidable. Maybe the goal will change as you battle towards it: but without goals there is no battle, only unending class scrimmage within the system. Now, it is typical that any movement has to have starting points that cannot embrace the whole future goal, but begins with small or partial and certainly incomplete objectives. But radicals are out to change the whole system, so for us starting points are not enough. Simultaneously, we have to “work at” the projection of tomorrow’s circumstances for a whole alternative society. For Australia especially, with 85 per cent city dwellers, that includes a whole urban alternative society. Struggling for that bright alternative urban future projected vividly as a feasible human and ecological future that capitalism can’t offer, is the only way to attract the majority of people to the side of a radical alternative social system. We in the advanced capitalist countries cannot expect to get a social revolution first, and only then start to become human, self-managing and ecological.

Moreover, unless the indispensible small and partial efforts of self-management which can have achievable results within the present capitalist framework are given direction, perspective and inspiration by more comprehensive projected goals for the whole of society, the small efforts, even small successes, tend to fizzle out, succumb to obstacles, or even become commercialised and safely incorporated in the established order, serving thus to stave off radicalisation.

Four conditions are therefore suggested:

We need to project a feasible communist Melbourne - not a socialist Melbourne.

Communists for some decades have tended - in my view incorrectly - to project socialism as the big bright be-all and end-all. Yet socialism in marxist terms is a transitional stage between two different social systems: it is only the first necessarily imperfect stage of communism. It’s as if we were trying to enthuse people with some new constructions in course of erection someplace, and we showed them old buildings half pulled down and shapeless new buildings in various stages of erection with scaffolding all around them, saying: “Behold! this is what we offer you!” And at that the images have been from other countries that wouldn’t fit Australian conditions anyway.

So long have we neglected to project the human non-alienating self-managing communist values which we have only in recent years been resurrecting, that communists, in fact, are not typically identified with such values in the minds of workers at large at all. Instead, communists tend to be seen either as good militants who can be trusted to stir things up; or as people interested only in a struggle for power - as if their only objective was to oust the capitalists, stand in their shoes, and subjugate them to authoritarian dictatorship for the sole purpose of redistributing the wealth, simply interchanging the role of the classes. But either image is a caricature of communism - not communism. Either image is distorted because it confuses a phase or aspect of the struggle with the goal being struggled for.

We have to say this to avoid the rejection without consideration of the model which we
will soon project on the grounds of Utopianism, futureology, voluntarism or some other deadly idealistic sin. Long habit inclines some to dismiss anything that seems to look too far ahead on the grounds that it ignores the harsh reality of the multinationals and their compliant state machinery that between them have no other choice but to drive forward the whole capitalist growth ethos, foisting consumerism on us and making environmental destruction inevitable.

Yet, I suggest, the quickest way to assist masses of people (as distinct from radical minorities) to understand what impossible obstacles the big corporations really are, is to project a positive constructive Melbourne as-it-ought-to-be, a Melbourne that people can identify with, and which can be seen as a way to overcome their problems. People surely cannot be enthused by a communism based on freeways and overtime.

To fight for a change in power without a change in values simply plays into the hands of trendplanners who extrapolate the future from the present and present it in the sacred name of "reality", often camouflaged with great academic and scientific erudition, as the fate before which we are all expected to submit obediently.

We need an understandable working model of our future goals - not general phrases of better values.

Despite what I said about communists losing sight of their goals, it is true that, in the '70s anyway, those in the CPA at least have been progressively advancing the goals of self-management, workers' control, community control and, more recently still, ecological goals. Such new perspectives have begun to inspire the beginnings of industrial and political struggles in these directions; workers who say: why can't we run the factory instead of taking the sack, or who refuse to build what is bad for the community.

All of this is tremendously welcome; but my proposition is that a further dimension is needed: something between the necessarily generalised presentation of the long-term goals and the necessarily piecemeal character of the partial industrial struggles or experiments in alternative technology.

What is needed is a model of coherent practical principles demonstrating how a communist Melbourne could be superior to a capitalist Melbourne - an operative model which attempts to translate the spirit of the generalised human and ecological goals into a system of urban living shown to be more workable, and with a higher standard of ecological performance than our present one. We need, in a word, some intermediate-stage alternative society that can be visualised by the ordinary citizen, and sufficiently real that some aspects of it can be fought for and realised right now. Armed with such an overall orientation even the loss of a small struggle over an immediate issue need not sap confidence because it can be seen as a small skirmish in a big war.

Such an attempt is not Utopianism: it does not try to evade the industrial infrastructure of multi-nationals as if they don't exist. On the contrary it says: "Look, the capitalist superstructure of political institutions, science, culture, hidden curricula and consumerist and sexist mass media imagery that shape lifestyles and all the rest - no longer meet human needs. A different superstructure is needed capable of shaping the productive forces, that is, the infrastructure, to our needs - and here it is! Here is the sort of alternative superstructure that we have to fight towards, struggling for power to control the infrastructure in the process in just such and such a way.

Until we reach the stage of foreshadowing our own alternative future we will tend to chain ourselves and the whole of the working people to the present system, and keep wondering why the Australian workers don't manage to transcend reformist attitudes.

We need a model of qualitatively different human relationships (both productive and social) as well as redistribution of commodities and services to the deprived.

Egalitarianism is not communism. Productivity in Australia at its present level is quite sufficient to sustain the whole population with adequate food, clothing, shelter, health, education and other basic services.

The Labor government's attempts to go some distance in this direction deserved strong support. But if DURD, AAP, RED, Medibank, child care and the rest really accomplished this, the capitalist system would still be with us, still dominated by the big
polluting industries, still investing their superprofits in the only way they can - into still more industry and more pollution. Of course, under socialism, severe inequality of access to goods and services as now exists would have to be rapidly abolished. And, indeed, it is important for ecologists to support such aims for equitable distribution right now to avoid a wedge being driven between those who need more goods and those who support no-growth-economies.

But this is not enough and it is not communism. A re-slicing of the same cake does not fit a communist Melbourne. In the left wing of the labor movement there are sentiments that have their origin in an awakening class consciousness of the early socialists such as “nothing is too good for the workers” or “what's good enough for the boss is good enough for the workers”. Translated literally into a socialist model this could mean simply redistributing the physical wealth and existing class of services from the wealthy to the deprived. This could mean doing what the capitalists are doing - though more efficiently. It could mean expansion of production faster in bigger productive units using more energy. It could strive to attain three cars for every workers' family plus an annual jet-set around the world trip, plus 80 ft. frontages instead of 40 ft.

Neither the boss's personal lifestyle, nor the boss's "productive style" is something to be worshipped and aped so soon as the workers have the power to do so. Egalitarian distribution of something historically outworn may be equality of a sort, but it is an irrelevant and misdirected effort if our object is an ecologically stabilised society free of alienation.
So - the model of Melbourne we need must provide for access by all, including the deprived who have gained their fair share, to a creative, satisfying life, and that means in the field of production as well as outside it.

We need an all-out effort to implement the needs just mentioned - not sparetime attention by a few radical eco-freaks.

To recapitulate, the three needs are:
(a) the goals or value-judgments of a communist Melbourne
(b) a workable understandable model
(c) incorporation of equity to the deprived in the current struggle for superior productive and social relationships.

Such a goal cannot be reached by expending all our political attention to the Russian Chinese, Cuban or Vietnamese people's struggles. Or by confining our perspectives only to immediate pollution or immediate wages/prices struggles. Or by relying solely on global ecological demands such as banning the atom bombs, banning uranium exports and sharing energy with the Third World, important as all these are.

General assumptions used in the construction of the principles for future Melbourne might be:

1. Less energy use
Restructuring the use of energy in industry, transport and domestically to cut down on the scarcer oil and gas, and switch as much as possible to brown coal, as well as reducing overall levels of energy consumed.

2. Responsibility for energy reduction on industry and government.
Consumers are not responsible for the goods and services foisted on them by the capitalist market, any more than the same people, in their capacity as workers - industrial, white collar or professional workers - for the goods made or the production techniques adopted by their bosses. An enlightened minority of alternative lifestylers may succeed in partially by-passing the big corporations, and I say: Good luck to them! Out of all the experimental anti-consumerist producing and living may well come certain ways of existence capable of being popularised and universalised to form part (but only part) of the basis in a technical sense, for an ecologically stable communist society. But it is assumed that, whatever such a minority might evolve, even by way of urban living, the great mass of consumers and nearly all producers cannot do so even if they wanted to. It is therefore assumed that the main direction for energy saving must be by a political effort to change the established order in two main spheres:

(a) production and all that goes with it - distribution, marketing, advertising research and general government administration
(b) functioning of cities - including all the planning, infrastructure services, community services and administration that goes with it.

(The model which follows below is some aspects of (b) only).

3. A higher standard with less effort and less energy.
Defining consumerism as mass production of wasteful and unsatisfying private consumer goods and services based on compulsion and manipulation that arise from the capitalist mode of production, it is assumed that a major effect of restricting energy use could be - with people's control - to actually improve the standard of living. This could be so because, above the level of self sufficiency in food, clothing and shelter at reasonable standards, further improvement of real standards lies in the direction of enriched, unalienated relationships, both on the job and off the job, and not in the direction of continued long hours of alienating work in capital-intensive enterprises making goods or supplying services that further alienate people from each other both as producers and consumers.

4. Collectives on the job and on the concourse
The new, enriched human relationships that will replace alienating conditions with less energy are assumed to lie in the direction of "collectives" - on the job and off. By "collective" is meant a team, for which, since there is a common purpose, there begins to develop a spirit of each contributing as best they can, some with higher skills, others with humble offerings, but all with a quickening appreciation of each other, all teaching and learning from each other, all developing a
more elevated concept of their aims and, with it, incidentally, an increasingly more effective impact on the "tone" or ethos of the factory or community generally.

For historical reasons, Melbourne has a legacy of good radial tram and railway networks serving the inner and middle suburbs, but the newer outer suburban workplaces and shopping towns served by lower-density housing have compelled car access and resulted in a general decline of public transport.

Being a capitalist city from its inception, the whole mode of capitalist production in Melbourne has rested on an unthinking but strong divide-and-conquer principle common to all owning classes towards the working population.

This has resulted in segregation to the point, sometimes, of institutionalisation. So factories are for factory workers, offices for white collar workers, labs for scientists, and none of them are interchangeable or even associated. Kindergartens, schools, housewives at home, and elderly citizens homes stratify into age layers, all of which, of course, are debarred from factory, office or laboratory. And in Melbourne there are plenty of special segregations - Housing Commission ghettos, heavy industries to the west, pubs and football clubs - think up your own example.

So, in place of what might be called a "whole" community, one where male and female, young and old, worker, housewife, student, migrant or not, all feel strongly identified with the community - all feel strongly that they have some part to play, can have their "say", and can do their own community "thing" and are wanted - in place of this, Melbourne gives us segregation and institutionalisation.

Superimposed on this, the postwar car boom has aggravated all these trends to insufferable proportions, because it has added the dimension of dispersal. Result is that factories, shops, pubs, kinders - any facility you can think of - tend to be scattered at random, with a good chance you need a car to get to any of them. "Car access" is the new sacred cow of town-building, but instead of building us urban places for people, the resulting formless sprawl has deprived our outer suburbs of the remotest character of urban life. The result is that children, housewives, sick and elderly are cut off even more effectively than before. Even the "lucky" housewife with the second car is relatively worse off than her pre-war sister. She cannot set off to go to any local centre of activities for it has been scattered or become a regional one where she is a stranger. So the nuclear family, thrown on its own devices, turns in on itself, gets bored with itself, then turns outwards, by car again, to go a hundred miles or so of a week-end to get away from it all.

For the future, the plans of the Melbourne Regional Planning Authority for seven radial corridors and/or satellites for urban growth, with so-called green wedges between, would predetermine Melbourne even more decisively as a car-based metropolis. This is so, because the longer the radial arms grow outward, the further the distances between them become, and the more impossible it would be to service cross-suburban trips from one arm to another with public transport. These trips would also be more and more across open country making them unnecessarily long.

In a sense, the multi-radial arm design is the "sprawliest" design you could think up, and therefore becomes the most car-dependent. Simultaneously, all the socially alienating disadvantages of the outer suburbs will be continued and intensified. That's the official option.

The other option for Melbourne is....

1. Urban design to save transport energy and maximise collectives

Deliberately design all new growth areas, and restructure all built-up areas with two objectives in mind:

(a) Take every measure possible to reduce the need for transport, and also to defeat the car and truck as the predominant mode of transport, and in doing so make an immense saving in fossil fuel energy, reducing the road slaughter and minimising pollution at the same time.

(b) To constitute human-scale mixed communities with strong urban centres of sufficient variety and so organised to attract a wide range of local collectives with strong and efficient public transport connections with other such centres and the city to still further increase access to collectives.
2. A design for neighbourhood with concourses for off-street people-parking

A physical design suitable to carry out these objectives for the urbanised centre and the surrounding residential neighbourhood that it serves would ideally have these features:

(a) the urban centre would be located at the geographic centre of the neighbourhood so that the trip from home to centre becomes as short as possible for as many as possible.

(b) residential density would be lowest on the outskirts of such neighbourhood, with increasing densities as you approached the centre to enable the maximum number of people to walk or cycle to the centre.

(c) encouragement of cluster-house designs both for low and medium density areas to enable more flexible domestic arrangements, superior outdoor amenity while retaining some outdoor privacy, yet enabling somewhat higher densities, and making public transport and deliveries more efficient.

(d) all people-intensive activities to be located in the centre, that is, shops, offices, labor-intensive light industry, schools, pubs, welfare services, libraries, entertainment, indoor sport with mixed use principles, not only within the centre but even within the same building if compatible.

(e) "people-parking" spaces indoor and compulsory for the use of collectives; and mixed among the commercial/industrial/educational etc. functions. The word "concourse" is used to imply just such an all-inclusive set-up including off-job collectives in people-parking spaces.

(f) frequent shuttle service local public transport in the form of mini-bus, dial-a-bus, or taxis; and cycle or pedestrian paths all to be funnelled into the concourse to make it more convenient to go to - or through - that concourse than in
any other direction; and commuter and shopping car-parking to be progressively restricted as alternative superior local transport modes take over.

(g) the mixed-use hub of the concourse to be constructed in compact building complexes built over and around selected suburban train stations. In areas of new urban growth this would present no difficulty. In built-up areas of present suburbs there could be a gradual redevelopment around selected stations with a slow transference into the concourse in the new building complexes of whatever people-intensive functions were scattered throughout the neighborhood and at the same time developing other industrial/commercial/educational etc. facilities previously lacking in the local urban area. This could provide a reasonably diversified range of employment, shopping and activities of all kinds to make it easier for more people to work or do-their-own-thing, getting to know others in the process, and without travelling further.

3. Transport between local district and city concourses

(a) Melbourne has a magnificent network of railway reservations - they are like a freeway system equipped with steel rails - and these, plus tram tracks where suitable, should on no account be sacrificed in favor of any gee-whiz technology, but used to form the material framework for connecting concourses with each other and with the city. These long-haul operations, in order to outdo car transport alternatives, should be as fast as possible (in contrast with local public transport to the local concourse, where frequency and closeness to homes is more important). And, as already described, all local transport modes should be created or updated and reorganised to funnel into the local rail station which would then lie at the very heart of all local people-intensive activity, thus creating the optimum conditions that railed transport could possibly have to re-establish its ascendancy over private transport.

(b) Every 4 to 6 local concourses could be served by a somewhat bigger district concourse with a wider range of choices of all sorts than would be possible for the local concourses. Such district concourses would thus be train-based, not car-based, regional centres.

(c) All concourses on the same rail line would be connected strongly by public transport not only with each other but with the city which should have the concourse aspect that is the aspect of All-Melbourne collectives emphasised to the utmost degree, for this is the place with the greatest access by the maximum number of citizens, lying at the centre, as it does, of the whole rail transport network.

4. Removing the multi-directional advantages of car transport

The dominance of the car rests partly on its superlative capacity as a machine to convey people and goods in any direction on our superlative road system. So:

(a) Linear corridor development for all new urban growth is proposed to rob both car and truck of this singular advantage. A rapid transit rail system, twice as fast as cars, would provide real competition. Linear design also has the advantage of being an entirely new and workable form of decentralisation. It's like a whole series of small human-size country towns, humanised still further because of the concourses at their heart, and all strung together; and, thanks to rapid transit, no further from the city in time than any other part of present Melbourne.

(b) Translating the same principle into built-up Melbourne, each radial rail-line could be regarded as lying in the centre of community corridors confined, not in this case by countryside lying on each side of the corridor, but by what could be called "transport watersheds". That is, with all local public transport directed into the local concourse. Local transport would thus be deliberately deployed to provide a material basis to make conditions favorable, or at least possible to create a local community with local collectives. In this case, cross-suburban public transport could be provided, not, as it is now, indiscriminately by bus in many directions, but only by joining district concourses, possibly by express bus routes.
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