

30 cents

DISCUSSION BULLETIN

Published by the RED EUREKA MOVEMENT

No 4

13 July, 1979

CONTENTS

- # EDITORIAL
- # "MOVEMENT FOR INDEPENDENCE & SOCIALISM" (MIS) DRAFT PLATFORM
- # WORKING CLASS LEADERSHIP VITAL TO WIN SOCIALISM
- # REJECTION OF INDEPENDENCE STRUGGLE?
- # HOW NOT TO BUILD A COMMUNIST PARTY
- # SOME BRIEF COMMENTS ON THE DEBATE OVER THE THEORY OF THE THREE WORLDS
- # HOW THE CPA-ML HAS RESTRICTED THE GROWTH OF ML IDEAS AMONGST WOMEN
- # ON THE SLOGAN "NATIONALISE THE CAR INDUSTRY"
- # ON PROLETARIAN DICTATORSHIP
- # PROLETARIAN PARLIAMENTARY CRETINISM IS GENUINE PARLIAMENTARY CRETINISM
- # LETTER FROM ALBANIA

SUBSCRIPTIONS and copies of DISCUSSION BULLETIN
are available from AFTERHOURS BOOKSHOP

(open Mon.-Fri., 5pm-9pm)

118 Hoddle St.,

Abbotsford, Victoria 3067

Individual copies..... 50cents, including postage.
Subscriptions (10 issues)..... \$5.00, including postage.

Number 1 (October 1, 1977), Number 2 (January 15, 1978),
and Number 3 (March 17, 1979) are now available to the public.

CONTRIBUTED ARTICLES to DISCUSSION BULLETIN can be sent to the
same address.

Donations to help cover costs are naturally welcome.

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~
~~CONFIDENTIAL~~
~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

EDITORIAL :

"Red Eureka Movement" (REM) was formed in Australia in April, 1977 following the attacks by the leadership of the Communist Party of Australia - Marxist Leninist (CPA-ML) on Mao Tsetung's closest supporters in China, the so-called Gang of 4.

REM is not a Communist Party but, recognising that no successful revolution has occurred in any country without one, is committed to help create conditions for the eventual formation of a genuine Communist Party in Australia.

'Discussion Bulletin' welcomes articles from contributors analysing important questions on the local and international scene. For example, political economy; the nature of the Australian revolution; class analysis of Australia; the Women's question; revisionism; the ALP and the trade unions; uranium mining; the ASIO Bill 1979 and other aspects of Fraser's march to fascism; the new war in Indo-China; international questions... are just some of the questions that need analysis and action in Australia right now.

Individual articles are the views of the contributor. Signed articles use pseudonyms. Contributions from outside REM are welcome.

Editorial comments are the views of the Editorial Committee and are not necessarily REM policy.

Policy statements are made formally by the REM Executive or membership and will be signed as such in 'Discussion Bulletin'.

Articles hostile to REM policy and Mao Tsetung Thought may be published in the Discussion Bulletin (eg. see "Letter from Albania" in this issue). REM members may air their views verbally outside the organisation for the duration of the discussion.

Discussion Bulletin, no.5, will be available from Mon.30th July and will be a special issue devoted to refuting E.F.Hill's (Chairman of the CPA-ML) revisionist book, "Class Struggle Within the Communist Parties", Subtitled, 'Defeat of Gang of 4 great victory for world proletariat'. Get your copy now from your local CPA-ML bookshop before they are removed from the shelves !

Discussion Bulletin, no.6, will focus on political economy, the economic crisis, unemployment etc. Deadline for articles is 13th August. It will be available from Mon. 20th August.

DEBATE : THE NATURE OF THE AUSTRALIAN REVOLUTION.

Editors note: We include in this issue three documents emerging from discussions which have taken place in the Melbourne organisation MIS (Movement for Independence and Socialism) over the last few months. While MIS was discussing its draft platform, some important questions were raised concerning the nature of the Australian revolution and the struggle for national independence and socialism. The documents are reprinted in this Bulletin by kind permission.

M.I.S. Draft Platform (Sept. 1978).

MIS is about changing the social system we live under. The capitalist system which exists in Australia means exploitation of the working people and periodic economic crisis.

Whilst MIS contains a range of views, we do all agree that what Australia needs is a revolution to replace capitalism with socialism. We are fighting for a system where economic production is planned on the basis of need, not profit, and the factories, mines, farms, shops etc. are owned by the Australian people, instead of a small group of exploiters.

Winning socialism will include establishing our country's independence by kicking out the foreign monopolies which dominate our economy (and, at the moment, it is the United States which is dominant) and not being drawn into the brewing world war between Russia and America.

Our aim is to be an activist organisation which takes up the particular issues that concern people. At present MIS' main focus is the economy, with special emphasis on unemployment. Whilst we would encourage as many people and groups as possible to come together to fight on such issues, our orientation is one of doing things and actually trying to change the nature of society.

To win socialism, the people who have not got power - the overwhelming majority who do the work in this country - will have to take power. We have learnt, from our experiences, that we can achieve precious little through Parliament and the parties represented in it; and that positive gains will only be achieved by involving people in fighting for change in a creative and consistent way. As it is extremely improbable that the exploiters will hand power over graciously, it is likely that it will have to be seized by force.

As regards our own organisation, we aim for maximum membership involvement in decision making, and an atmosphere where everyone feels free to express their own point of view.

WORKING CLASS LEADERSHIP VITAL TO WIN SOCIALISM !!

" FREE ENTERPRISE FIGHT BACK IN CANADIAN MAG.

" Around 150 major companies in Canada are backing a new national consumer magazine 'Odyssey' in an effort to loosen the grip of the left on Canadian society. The aim of the magazine is to 'strengthen the voice of the private sector on issues of national importance and to support the business community when it puts forward realistic courses of action for the country.' 'Odyssey' will be published 6 times a year and distributed free to 450,000 blue-collar workers in over 60 companies which include General Motors, General Foods and Goodyear."

The above quotation taken from the December edition of "Advertisers Weekly" (Aust.) is a ruling class admission of where their priorities lie. If MIS is to be a revolutionary organisation it should do the same. Rather than direct our fire one way this day and another the next we should clarify our position and direction. Rather than be a vague broad united front that tries to be all things to all people we should decide that we are going to accept the leading role of the working class and direct the major part of our propaganda, work and direction into this area.

It is not enough to hail strike struggles etc. from the sidelines after they have occurred but get in there and establish contacts and give real support to people who are already agitating in their workplace situations. A militant MIS should be seen to be out in the thick of things and should consciously be working to extend contacts with fellow workers and be promoting younger people to come forward to positions of leadership and responsibility as a matter of extreme importance.

We should not be afraid to state our working class orientation, in fact, such a clear cut, unequivocal stand will earn us more support.

In an "Age" poll last year the majority of people interviewed said they considered themselves to be working class and on issues like uranium bans etc. proved themselves to be more militant than middle class people who tended (as history has shown) to vacillate on such things. The Government Statistician figures stating that 80% of the population earn less than \$200 per week indicates that the Australian working class is not dwindling or becoming middle class as some would have us believe. The ruling class and all the old and new varieties of revisionists claim that speaking of classes nowadays is obsolete. We cannot afford to do the same.

INDEPENDENCE BULLSHIT

To get people to fight for some vague form of 'independence' as a prelude to the establishment of a socialist Republic, is almost as bad as encouraging people to believe in parliamentary politics.

To talk about some form of democratic people's government is to mislead people that somehow a revolutionary seizure of power through people's violence is no longer necessary. History has shown that struggles that are diverted into 'People's Democracies' without

the working class firmly in control already are betrayed. We can't afford to repeat the mistake of Chile here !!

For all these reasons I recommend that the amendments to the draft platform be adopted, namely that (a) "To establish a socialist Australia, the people who have not got power - the overwhelming majority who do work in this country - will have to take power, led by the working class", and that a new sentence be added at the end of paragraph 5 : "Considering the advanced level of capitalism in Australia, it is also unlikely that there would be any transitional period prior to establishing a Socialist Republic".

Also that (b) "In line with MIS recognising the leading role of the working class, and the need to fight for a clear-cut line for building a movement to fight for socialism without reference to some obscure form of 'independence', the name be changed to Movement for a Socialist Australia (MSA) or Workers for a Socialist Australia (WSA)".

Footnote : In reference to motion (c) which reads , " That MIS rejects completely the opportunist theory of the three worlds and believes that a single stage revolution is correct for Australian conditions." Although motion (c) was not moved by me I would like to add that the fault of the theory of the three worlds is that it too fails to precede from a class analysis of society .

REJECTION OF THE INDEPENDENCE STRUGGLE ?

In a recent leaflet ("Working Class Leadership Vital to Win Socialism !!") it was stated that the struggle for independence is "bullshit" because the "two-stage revolution is a theory inapplicable to present Australian conditions.

The problem with the line of reasoning pursued by the author is that support for the struggle for independence does not necessarily imply (and for many people has never implied) support for the theory of a "two stage revolution".

FACTS SPEAK LOUDER THAN THEORIES

The author correctly points out that independence without socialism is nonsense (a point which I thought was a fundamental agreement upon which the establishment of MIS was based). S/he also correctly points out that the working class must be firmly in control of any revolutionary movement for it to be successful in moving along the path to socialism (again in basic agreement with MIS).

But the author begins to give the game away when referring to the need to avoid "the mistake of Chile." The mistakes of Chile which must be avoided are many, and not the least of these is the mistake made by Allende as well as many "communists" when they virtually ignored the reality of Chile's dependence on the U.S. (and the U.S.'s dependence on Chile as an underdeveloped capitalist nation ripe for exploitation). As a result the U.S. dominated media, the C.I.A., and many U.S. corporations, were left largely untouched and able to undermine as well as directly attack the "revolution". Equally crucial was the fact that the U.S. trained and equipped armed forces were left untouched by Allende. A more healthy respect for the problems of dependence and the need for independence might have helped a great deal (it might also have underlined the myth of the "Peaceful Road to Socialism").

As an aside it is interesting to note that the introductory note about "Canadian" capitalists "fighting back" quotes 150 companies, including "General Motors, General Foods and Goodyear." We could safely predict that 60-70% of these "150 major companies" are in fact U.S. multinationals "fighting back". Canada, like Aust. (or Chile) is obviously dominated by U.S. capital. The ruling class therefore is not as clearly united as in the case of countries like West Germany - it is comprised of two major sections: the comprador bourgeoisie and the national bourgeoisie. These are important facts and must be continually recognised.

There are objective contradictions between the national and comprador bourgeoisie (eg. as shown in the present controversy over G.M.H.'s proposal to establish an engine plant if the local content requirements for cars are dropped). Of course there are

other contradictions, especially those between capital and labour. I am convinced that at least for the present the contradictions between capital and labour are more severe and will ensure that the ruling class will not fight too much amongst itself, hence denying any real possibility of the type of "class alliance" that Australian Independence Movement (A.I.M) claims to be striving for (a good example of this is the rapid way that A.I.M.'s paragon of the national bourgeoisie, Mr. Eric Sykes, denounced and fought against the workers and the Unions in the transport strike a few months ago).

The point is that Australia is a dependent nation, and that the demand for independence and socialism raises the question of the class struggle as well as the question of defense against imperialist attack (as in Chile) and the question of the particular form of class oppression Australian workers suffer, namely oppression in the interests of both local and overseas capitalists. To explain the dual nature of our exploitation is scientifically correct and strategically important. It also has the tactical advantage of providing extra avenues for mobilising people. It in no way implies acceptance of a two-stage theory of revolution in Australia nor that the independence without socialism is a possibility in Australia.

John Williams .

HOW NOT TO BUILD A COMMUNIST PARTY .

For those who sincerely want to build a genuine Communist Party in Australia it is necessary to look at the negative example of some of the practices of the Communist Party of Australia (Marxist-Leninist) (CPA-ML).

Learning by negative example can be a painful experience. This is especially so when the behaviour we are now rejecting is something we previously went along with because it came from those we formerly regarded as close comrades.

When this writer expressed the opinion that China was turning revisionist, after the re-appointment of the twice discredited Teng Hsiao-ping in July 1977, I was told by one of the Party leaders in Adelaide:

"You should read the Peking Reviews like a Christian reads the Bible"

When I protested at such a gross appeal to blind faith I was then told:

"I think your ideology is as weak as West End beer."

Other evidence and some reflection leads me to believe that such appeals to blind faith followed, if necessary, by abuse of those who refuse to wear "correct line" blinkers has been typical of the way in which the CPA-ML has been built in Adelaide over the years.

One principle that the revisionist Liu Shao-chi pushed within the Chinese Communist Party was "do what the Party tells you to do." This was revived when Hua Kuo feng came to power : "Obey Chairman Hua in all your actions".

Likewise, in the CPA-ML blind faith is now being pushed as the height of revolutionary integrity. In Adelaide the CPA-ML has failed to develop a correct policy towards developing communist cadres.

The CPA-ML has failed to educate its members in Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tse-tung Thought, its theory and practice. There is gross neglect of study and application of communist principles and neglect of summing up of revolutionary experience.

The CPA-ML has failed to develop cadres who can think and act independently.

In Adelaide comrades who show sign of independent thought have been told "don't think you are the repository of all wisdom" and criticised for "individualism" for showing initiative, "anarchism" for rebelling and "careerism" for offering leadership.

There is a tendency in all of us to be reluctant to take on responsibility, to be reluctant to offer leadership, to be inclined to play safe.

By subduing independent thought when it appears, by exploiting these feelings of self doubt amongst the rank and file Party members, the present Party leadership consolidates their leading positions.

The never stated but clear implication is that the present leadership is "the repository of all wisdom" and is not guilty of "careerism".

My opinion is that the present Party leadership in Adelaide is "careerist" and that the thought of stepping down is too much for their ego's to take. In the name of their incorrect "correct line" they rigidly suppress the development of independent thought amongst the Party membership. This is a completely wrong way to build a Communist Party.

Dimitrov laid down as one of his 4 criteria in selecting cadres :

"Third, ability independently to find one's bearings and not be afraid of assuming responsibility in making decisions. He who fears to take responsibility is not a leader. He who is unable to display initiative, who says: 'I will do only what I am told', is not a Bolshevik. Only he is a real Bolshevik leader who does not lose his head in moments of defeat, who does not get a swelled head at moments of success, who displays indomitable firmness in carrying out decisions. Cadres develop and grow best when they are placed in the position of having to solve concrete problems of the struggle independently, and are aware that they are fully responsible for their decisions"

(from the booklet 'On Organisation' by Stalin, and other, pp. 27-8).

Mao Tse tung is alleged to have said:

"Once we give into blind faith our minds become cramped and our thought cannot burst out of its confinement. Unless you have a conquering spirit it is very dangerous to study Marxism-Leninism."

(Mao Tse-tung Unrehearsed, p.115).

"... if we take our desire for unity as our starting point and adopt a helpful attitude, then sharp criticism cannot split the Party; it can only unite the Party. It is very dangerous to leave unsaid things that you want to say....."

"Those who are afraid to speak out are afraid of being called opportunists, afraid of getting the sack, afraid of being expelled from the Party, afraid of being divorced by their wives (and thus losing face), afraid of being confined to the guardroom, afraid of having their heads chopped off. I feel that as long as you are prepared for these eventualities and are able to see through the vanities of the world, you need be afraid of nothing. If you make no psychological preparation, you will not dare to speak. But should fear of martyrdom seal our lips? We must create an environment in which people will dare to speak out and reveal what is in their hearts."

(Mao Tse tung Unrehearsed, p.p. 121-2).

Reading E.F.Hill's writings over the last 10 years it appears to me that he was once an independent thinker who tried, with some success, to apply Marxism to Australian conditions. But in recent years he has become a blind follower of the Chinese Communist Party. His revisionist book 'Class struggle within the Communist Parties' (Jan. 1977) makes one appeal after another to blind faith unsubstantiated by analysis. Refutations of this book have been made and will be published.

What is happening now within the CPA-ML is monstrous and criminal. We can see that some CPA-ML members are becoming disillusioned. Many are worried, eg. by the Party's slavish worship of the revisionist takeover in China or their cliched and melodramatic sloganising about Soviet penetration inside Australia (as distinct from the main danger of Soviet war preparations).

But the problem is: what to do about it? Tragically some are drifting away or dropping out of organised political work.

REM members have been called "fools" (and worse) for actively speaking out. But the Party leadership is to blame! The "wise men" remain silent. When the "wise men" remain silent then the "fools" have to speak out. It is the "fools" who have always made history and not the "wise men".

Have the events shown that the Party leadership is scientifically analysing the changing events and leading correctly? Or do they show that the leadership is more intent on protecting their leading positions? I think the latter.

What lessons should we learn from the negative example of the CPA-ML practice on developing cadres?

Every ML organisation has a leadership and a rank and file. Every organisation has its fair share of blind faith and blind following. This cannot be eliminated for a very long time. But it is necessary for REM, or any genuine group striving for Marxism-Leninism-Mao Thought, to elect leaders who can think independently themselves and who actively encourage this trait in others.

SOME BRIEF COMMENTS ON THE DEBATE OVER THE

THEORY OF THE THREE WORLDS

The following comments stem from a reading of some of the relevant literature and from the discussion at the M.I.S. meeting (M.I.S. - Movement for Independence and Socialism is a Melbourne based organisation). I have steered away from the tendency to quote Marxist-Leninist authorities, not because their thoughts and analysis are not important, but because using their concepts and modes of analysis is much better done without ponderous and parrot like quotations, especially when it is so easy to quote out of context someone who wrote in a different era about different (though often similar) problems.

ONE, TWO, MANY THEORIES !

There appear to be a number of different theories involved in the debate, and it might be useful, at the risk of oversimplification, to partly restate them here.

THEORY OF THE THREE WORLDS - CHINESE REVISIONIST VERSION

(adopted by the C.P.A.(M.L.) and many other revisionist organisations)

This theory holds :-

- (a) That the world consists of the First World (the two superpowers), Second World (Industrially developed nations partly exploited by or dependent upon the superpowers, but themselves powerful enough to act in imperialist fashion and exploit those weaker than themselves) and the Third World (industrially underdeveloped nations generally exploited by the other two worlds);
- (b) That the contradiction between the superpowers, propelling us towards world war, is the fundamental contradiction today, thereby precipitating a major contradiction between the superpowers and the rest of the world;
- (c) That the Soviet Union is the more dangerous of the two superpowers, is basically fascist and violently expansionist, hence being the principal aspect of this contradiction;
- (d) That the situation today is analogous to that prevailing prior to World War II, with the Soviet Union being analogous to Nazi Germany.
- (e) That the first priority for revolutionaries today is to work to build a united front with any persons, classes or countries aimed at stopping the Soviet Union, just as was allegedly done by communists to stop Nazi Germany in the 1930's;
- (f) That all Chinese foreign policy (and hence the policies of all sinophiles and other pseudo- revolutionaries) must be geared almost solely towards this aim (which partly explains the growing tendency for China to support, or not oppose, many governments which oppose revolutionary movements while withdrawing support from revolutionary movements themselves).
- (g) that third world nations are almost automatically opposed to the superpowers, and hence are obvious and inevitable allies.

(h) That alliances with governments are an adequate form of alliance (implying, as do a number of other aspects, that the class differences within nations can be ignored for present purposes).

The strong implications of this "theory", especially as expressed in Australia, are :-

(a) Class struggle must take second place (at best) to the united front against the Soviet Union.

(b) An alliance with the U.S. is not only desirable, but crucial to the containment of the Soviet Union.

(c) Hence revolutionaries must stop fighting the ruling class in all areas where to do so might impede the alliance and preparation for "defense" against the Soviet Union (eg. wage demands, strikes, Omega or opposition to U.S. imperialism).

(d) There is no real necessity for "revolutionary independence" within such a united front, eg. it would be divisive and undesirable for the workers to be armed unless they were going into battle against the Soviet Union and its puppets.

(e) There is no possibility of the conflict between the superpowers providing possibilities for the working class in some countries (Australia, Czechoslovakia, South Africa, Rhodesia ?) carrying out a socialist revolution, as was the case in the first world war.

2. THEORY OF THE THREE WORLDS -- revolutionary version .

(as apparently tentatively adopted by a majority of R.E.M.)

(a) As for (a) above .

(b) That the contradiction between the superpowers is one, but not the only, contradiction in the world today;

(c) That both superpowers must be attacked, that both are dangerous, but that the Soviet Union is the more dangerous (though not necessarily the stronger);

(d) That the situation is analogous to World War II and that building a broad alliance to oppose the Soviet Union is crucial, an alliance that may well (desirably?) include the U.S.

(e) That such a united front does not imply a capitulation of class struggle, and that revolutionaries must not only maintain their independence within such a united front but must strive for working class leadership of it (hence introducing class conflict into the united front).

(f) That such an alliance does not mean uncritical, subservient or unprincipled ties with other nations.

(g) That such an alliance does not require that revolutionary aid to oppressed people must stop, although this becomes a question of some difficulty in cases where governments are crucial to an alliance but threaten and are able to leave the alliance (eg. if some major oil producing nation threatened to make an independent peace as a result of a member of the alliance providing arms to revolutionaries there).

3. THEORY OF THE TWO WORLDS - ALBANIAN VIEW

This holds :-

- (a) That the world is basically divided into two worlds or camps;- the socialist world and the capitalist/imperialist world;
- (b) That "third world countries" are generally run by reactionary classes and that alliances with such classes is a betrayal of the oppressed but revolutionary or potentially revolutionary masses in those nations;
- (c) That class struggle is paramount, that class contradictions are the major contradictions, and that alliances should be class alliances based on common class interest.
- (e) That the way to prevent the threatening superpower war is to support revolutionary movements in all parts of the world against their internal reactionary forces, somewhat analogous to the first world war.

The Albanian view is critical of the theory of the three worlds on the grounds that this theory :

- (i) ignores class analysis and class struggle or at best subordinates this to the anti-Soviet struggle, thereby effectively wiping it off the agenda;
- (ii) ignores revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat.
- (iii) implies support for the most reactionary and oppressive regimes and betrayal of the oppressed by not analysing the class nature of the regime and by making opposition to the Soviet Union more important than the advancement of class struggles against reactionary regimes.
- (iv) implies that capitalist governments or capitalist alliances (such as the European Common Market or NATO) can be relied on to fight the Soviet Union - they cannot and it is anti-Marxist-Leninist to suggest that revolutionaries join such alliances.
- (v) That 1 (b), 1 (d), 1 (f) and 1 (h) are factually incorrect, at least in part and as used in the "theory of the three worlds". (the above list of the Albanian view criticisms of the theory of 3 worlds is not complete but covers most of the major ones in one form or other)

N.B. As was pointed out by one speaker at the M.I.S. discussion we have not yet seen an adequate response by those who hold to the theory of the two worlds to the "revolutionary theory of 3 worlds" mentioned in 2 above. The major criticism appears to be directed at 1 above, and as such it has provided an important critique of what is indeed a revisionist and potentially disastrous "theory" (dogma). However, most if not all these criticisms do not apply so clearly to 2 above.

CONTRADICTIONS ARE NOT ABSOLUTE

I would like to make the following tentative comments about the debate so far:-

1. There appears to be a tendency to look for THE contradiction as though this is the magic wand with which to create correct

revolutionary practice - such is the path to dogma & sectarianism.

In the Australian situation, for example, it is rather facile to say that the major contradiction is between various classes and U.S. Imperialism, including especially the national bourgeoisie and U.S. imperialism. It is at least as important to analyse another contradiction in Australian society, namely between capital and labour, including between the national bourgeoisie and the working class. Which contradiction is the more important will depend on a number of economic political and even cultural factors.

No dogmatic assertion about "the primary contradiction" is going to alter these facts.

2. There is confusion about what a "theory" is meant to do. It is not a political platform and is not, in itself, a complete analysis of the problem (at least not in the context we are considering).

A theory can be used in various ways and when buttressed by various other "theories", hypothesis, or assumptions, can lead to different conclusions. Some of these conclusions may be wrong even if the theory from which they appear to be drawn is correct.

It can be very confusing when people arrive at quite different policies and conclusions while appearing to base themselves on the same theory. But this confusion cannot be cleared up if what is being debated is really a set of assumptions that accompany the theory but which have not been articulated.

In the M.I.S. debate it appeared that the assumptions and assertions of the Chinese view (rather than the theory of the 3 worlds as outlined in 1(a) above) were under attack. It was obvious quite early on that the revolutionary view of the theory of the 3 worlds contained quite a different set of assumptions and analysis of related questions, yet these were not really tackled.

3. The purpose of the theory of 3 worlds or the theory of 2 worlds is to give us a framework for analysis, a way of orientating ourselves in our understanding of the present state of the world. Because it is not a manifest or a complete statement of a situation, and so long as dogmatic assertions about "THE contradiction" don't mislead us, there is no inherent reason why the division of the world into 3 parts is not compatible with its division into 2 parts, or the combination of the two and a division into 4 or 5 parts.

The particular theory or model we use is determined by the extent to which we believe it will help clarify or explain certain observations and facts, and thereby give us a clearer guide to action.

The first task in the debate therefore is to see if we agree about the facts (and it would seem that to a large extent we do), and the second task is to determine which facts are crucial to our problem and our analysis. It is this second task which seems to have been largely ignored, leading to two different theories, explaining different sets of facts, being falsely set in opposition to each other.

4. In view of the above, it is incorrect to criticise the "theory of the 3 worlds" for "(leaving) out the role of proletarian revolution, and (having) nothing to say about the theory and tactics of the dictatorship of the proletariat". With regard to the revolutionary view of the 3 worlds this criticism is patently false. A number of implications and policies about proletarian revolution, class struggle etc. are contained in this theory. With regard to the revisionist view, although the criticism is accurate it is misdirected. It assumes that their acceptance of the theory of the 3 worlds results in their abandonment of proletarian revolution and class struggle. On the contrary, it is their abandonment of proletarian revolution and class struggle that has resulted in their particular use of the theory of the 3 worlds.

The point is that the theory of the 3 worlds does not need to mention the "theory and tactics of the dictatorship of the proletariat" in specific terms - that is not the object of such a theory. But any revolutionary platform must mention such things and must therefore go well beyond the theory of the three worlds. Marx's theory of surplus value does not mention or even directly imply a theory of imperialism. Does this make the theory any less correct? No, because it serves a specific purpose within the total framework of Marxist-Leninist analysis, and is not meant to do any more than that.

5. There is a tendency within the "Albanian view" to make real efforts to show the similarities between the 1st and 2nd world in their capitalist and imperialist tendencies, while ignoring the differences between them (eg. the Brazilian C.P. statement is a good example of this). Marxist Leninist analysis must examine both similarities and differences. Of course all capitalist countries are exploitive, oppressive and potentially imperialistic - but that doesn't mean that the differences and contradictions between the Soviet Union and Czechoslovakia, or the U.S. and Canada, are unimportant. The very nature of capitalism ensures contradictions between each capitalist nation and every other. But the existence of the proletariat, of independence movements and revolutionary movements, and of a socialist alternative, creates other, fundamental, contradictions. These various contradictions similarly ensure the creation of alliances between capitalist countries. Some of these alliances serve all its members, some of them serve the powerful members more than the

weaker (thus in turn weakening the alliance), and some are more in the nature of enforced treaties than real alliances.

The various differences and contradictions must not be hidden but must be brought forward and analysed to see if and how they may be exploited to further the revolutionary movement.

6. There is a tendency today to "go soft on the U.S." - a tendency excusable for the Czechoslovakians, Angolans and many other Africans, but hardly excusable for Australians, New Zealanders or Canadians. This tendency is especially marked amongst those promoting the theory of the 2 3 worlds, though in some instances perhaps more so in rhetoric and writings than in their practice.

It is my view that both superpowers are dangerous, both are capable of letting their conflicting interests lead to a world war, and both are capable of initiating such a war. The analogy with the second world war, and the view that the Soviet Union is analogous with Nazi Germany in that it is virtually the sole source of aggression, thus requiring a strong alliance for its containment, does not ring very true. An alliance for the containment of the U.S. is equally necessary, especially if the Soviet Union was to suffer some form of setback. Any alliance established with either superpower will be used by that superpower to further conflict with the other superpower (hence such an alliance eg. China and the U.S.A. may itself become the source of war rather than a force for containment or peace).

7. The use of analogies with the first or second world war are useful only up to a point. They can help to remind us of various possibilities, of mistakes made, and of the different types of situations which can occur and which demand different types of responses. But such analogies cannot replace an analysis of today's situation . They can merely assist such an analysis. It may well be the case that neither the 1st World War nor the 2nd World War provide any real guidelines for an impending 3rd World War.

IN CONCLUSION

It is perhaps useful to outline some of the questions that require far more analysis (we should avoid seeing this as a debate over the simple "theory of the 3 worlds", and arguments should be directed not at showing "how many worlds" there are, but at clarifying the list of assumption that accompany such theories and which comprise the overall policy).

(a) Is the Soviet Union the more dangerous superpower ? And if so, does this justify the extension which sees it as the major/sole source of aggression leading to World War 3 ?

(b) Is the analogy with either World War 1 or World War 2 accurate/ useful ?

(c) What sort of alliance is required to prevent World War 3, or at least minimise setbacks for the revolutionary movement?

Various possibilities arise :-

- a broad anti-Soviet alliance (as proposed by the majority of the proponents of the theory of the three worlds, and by China and the U.S.)
- a broad anti- U.S. alliance (as proposed by various revisionist, eg. S.P.A., spartacist, and the Narodny Bank)
- a class "alliance" of revolutionary movements aimed at promoting revolution in their own respective countries (as proposed by most of those expousing the theory of the 2 worlds)
- an alliance of peoples and countries in opposition to both superpowers based on a pact to defend any member attacked by any superpower.
- an alliance in which neither superpower is permitted to participate unless itself attacked by the other superpower. (NATO without the U.S. would be such an alliance - but would it be powerful enough to halt the Warsaw countries ?)

(d) How would revolutionaries work (and survive) in such an alliance? What sort of priorities would we have to impose on ourselves within such an alliance ? How flexible and independent could we be ?

(e) Can we really be so definite (dogmatic?) as to say that the exploitation of "the contradiction between U.S. imperialism and Soviet social imperialism can never become the main component part of the foreign policy of socialist countries, nor can it become an aim in itself" (as stated by Communist Party of Ceylon) ?

John Williams .

HOW THE CPA(ML) HAS RESTRICTED THE GROWTH OF MARXIST LENINIST
IDEAS AMONGST WOMEN .

Editorial note : This article is reprinted from "Unity and Struggle", a theoretical journal produced by the ADELAIDE ANTI-IMPERIALIST STUDY-ACTION GROUP.

The ideas of the Chairman (sic) of the CPA(ML), E.F.Hill, are to be found in his writing on 'The vexed question of women' ('Vanguard', May 18, 1978, p.4).

The present policy of the CPA(ML) on the Womens Question is to be found in the Party pamphlet, 'Womens liberation rests on class struggle (July 1978).

The CPA(ML) has existed for almost 15 years. Over that time it has displayed, at best, a passive attitude to the just struggles of women. At worst, known members and supporters of the CPA(ML) have displayed an openly male chauvinist attitude to women.

Naturally, over this time, and especially in recent years, these backward attitudes and deeds of the CPA(ML) has drawn criticism from both inside and outside the Party.

The present public policy of the CPA(ML) is, in part, a response to these criticisms. Their present policy represents an attack, without qualification, on the Womens liberation movement and a vain attempt to liquidate necessary struggles around specific Womens demands.

E.F.Hill's position on the Womens Question .

Over the years E.F.Hill has not been noted for his writings on the Womens Question. His position has been a passive one, virtually ignoring this important question.

But after reading his one recent writing on 'The vexed question of women', we can appreciate his wisdom in remaining passive and silent over the years. Here are his comments :

" Let us take the vexed question of women. It is absolute nonsense in my opinion to see the solution to this problem in altering 'man' to 'people', 'chairman' to 'chairperson', pushing to the fore rape, contraception, abortion and such things as things in themselves. I doubt if it even has a mechanical importance. Yet it finds reflection in our thinking, our ideology. Perhaps on no single subject has petty bourgeois ideology so easily penetrated the minds of some of our comrades. Why is this ? It is because women are subject to double oppression; there is a growing consciousness of it and the bourgeoisie know and sense this. They put forward the nonsensical solution of altering 'man' to 'people' (when 'man' is scientifically correct), 'chairman' to 'chairperson'; elevate rape to the forefront as a thing in itself. Working class ideology is quite different. It is expounded by Engels in 'Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State' by Marx, Lenin and Chairman Mao Tsetung. Womens liberation doubtless attracted honest people. It has done great damage in diverting

attention from the real questions. Despite its considerable success in altering "Mrs." and "Miss" to Ms, the central fact remains that the double oppression of working women remains. Certainly this is far from a mechanical question. The very fact of the success of the bourgeoisie is a warning to purify our ideology. It must be thought over."
(Vangurad, May 18, 1978, p.4).

Let us take a closer look at E.F.Hill's attempt to "purify his ideology" on "the vexed question of women."

(i) E.F.Hill says that altering 'man' to 'people' is "nonsensical" because "'man' is scientifically correct."

No doubt this classic piece of dogma is based on the observation that the works of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Mao use the term 'man' and not 'people'. We do not know why Marx etc. do this. But our criterion for scientific is what conforms to reality. We feel that Marx etc. are scientific socialists because much of what they have said has indeed conformed to reality. But on the Womens Question reality is that 'women hold up half the sky'. So obviously 'people' is more scientific correct than 'man' when describing the human race.

Likewise when the chairperson is a man, 'chairman' would appear scientific to us, and when a woman, 'chairwoman' would appear scientific. Certainly if the chairperson was a woman, 'chairman' would strike us as grossly unscientific.

In this small example, E.F. Hill appears to display a lack of common sense and rigid inflexibility.

(ii) E.F.Hill 'sharply' condemns the reformist approach to "rape, contraception, abortion" as "absolute nonsense" and a "nonsensical solution put forward" by the "bourgeoisie". He then proceeds to draw a 'sharp' distinction between this approach and the approach of Marx etc. and concludes that "the success of the bourgeoisie is a warning to purify our own ideology."

It is true that Marxist Leninist (MLs) have a duty to strive to link immediate demands and reforms (including specific womens demands like those mentioned) to the broader revolutionary struggle against the capitalist system of the private ownership of the means of production. But the negative way in which Hill dismisses these reforms is quite wrong. The whole style and manner of Hill's article is quite mechanical and inhuman. What is completely lacking is awareness of the crying need for urgent and immediate action on practical questions to alleviate the extreme plight of women in our society.

In fact, women (and some men) have acted and organised against rape, against bashing of women and children by men, against paternalism and male egotism, for abortion and contraception, for equal rights in the workplace and society (eg. pubs) and against

sexist publications like 'Playboy' etc.

Naturally Mlinists should support these struggles as basically good and so get involved in them, learn about them, and fight for their ideas in the course of the struggle.

But Hill's approach is to emphasise their negative side and to take this as a "warning to purify our own ideology."

The immediate practical effect of Hill's policy is to drive away progressive women with a reformist approach to these questions, away from the CPA(ML) and by association away from Mlinism. In short Hill's approach is "purist" and sectarian.

Because Hill so ardently describes his ideas as those of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Mao it is very important to point out that his ideas are actually anti-Leninists. Those who really want to defend Leninism on the Womens Question should make a point of disassociating themselves from Hill's ideas.

In his talk with Clara Zetkin, Lenin stresses both the need to advance specific women's demands and the need to link these demands with the path of revolutionary struggle. By comparison, Hill talks only about the latter and pours cold water on the former.

Lenin said : " It is therefore perfectly right for us to put forward demands for the benefit of women... It does not go to show that we believe the bourgeoisie and its state will last forever, or even for a long time. Nor is it an attempt to pacify the masses of women with reforms or divert them from the path of revolutionary struggle. It is nothing of the sort, and not any sort of reformist humbug either. Our demands are no more than practical conclusions, drawn by us from the crying needs and disgraceful humiliations that weak and underprivileged women must bear under the bourgeois system. We demonstrate thereby that we are aware of these needs and of the oppression of women, that we are conscious of the privileged position of men, and that we hate - yes, hate - and t to remove whatever oppresses and harasses the working women, the wife of the worker, the peasant woman, the wife of the little man, and even in many respects the woman of the propertied classes. The rights and social measures we demand of bourgeois society for women are proof that we understand the position and interests of women and that we will take note of them under the proletarian dictatorship. Naturally, not as soporific and patronising reformists. No, by no means. But as revolutionaries who call upon the women to take a hand as equals in the reconstruction of the conomy and the ideological superstructure." (Lenin, 'On the emancipation of women', p.112)

(iii) E.F. Hill says : "Womens liberation doubtless attracted honest people. It has done great damage in diverting attention from the real questions."

This statement is a condemnation of the Womens liberation movement without qualification. He does not attempt to draw any

distinction between the progressive and reactionary aspects of the Womens liberation movement. He only refers to the "great damage" it has done. He is blind to the great achievements of the Womens movement and -its ongoing potential.

The responsibility for the negative aspects of the womens liberation movement that do exist (eg. radical feminism and reformism) not only lies with the bourgeois and revisionist forces within it. Those like E.F.Hill who are so concerned about contamination by "petty bourgeois" ideology that they stay away to "purify" their "own ideology" are equally responsible. It certainly should be no surprise if the Womens liberation movement is often under leadership hostile to Marxism Leninism. The ideas of E.F. Hill and the CPA(ML) have had a considerable effect on those in Australia inclined to Marxism-Leninism over the last 15 years.

E.F.Hill thinks that Womens liberation has done "great damage". But he does not get involved in it, or encourage others to do so, to fight to change it. He simply wipes it off. E.F.Hill's position here is extremely bad and reactionary .

On the CPA(ML) pamphlet 'Womens liberation rests on class struggle.'

This article was initially published in 'Vanguard' (March 9, 1978, p.10). It must have met with approval from the leadership because it was then reprinted in 'Australian Communist' 88 (March/April 1978). It was given the final 'seal of approval' when it was again reprinted as a separate Party booklet in July 1978.

Not surprisingly, the political line of this pamphlet is very similar to the writing of E.F.Hill that we have analysed above. This pamphlet and Hill's ideas represent the dominant position and present policy of the CPA(ML).

In passing, it should be mentioned that, not surprisingly, since the policy of the CPA(ML) is so bad, there is a 2 line struggle within the Party on the Womens Question. The dissident line is vastly superior to the dominant Hill line. The dissident line is expressed in such articles as 'Womens role in struggle for independence, socialism' ('Australian Communist' 86, Nov. 1977).

The CPA(ML) pamphlet 'Womens liberation rests on class struggle' says :-

"Australian working class history abounds with many splendid examples of integration in strike struggles, of action about prices, against hardship of all kinds. Much can be learnt from them. But it also includes many examples of closed doorism - the setting up of 'pure' organisations to cater for the 'special problems' of women, whinge sessions which relate to all the 'evils' of men, holding the opposite sex to be the cause of all evil, proposals of political parties and movements to cater for women because they are women (including we presume, the hangers on of the multinational women). One needs also to look objectively at these negative examples where perspective is lost and any movement such as it was degenerated into the dead end of out and out revisionism." (p.7)

Let us examine some of these statements by the CPA(ML) :-

(i) The CPA(ML) dismisses "proposals of political parties and movements to cater for women because they are women" as an example of "closed doorism".

This is simply a repeat of Hill's attack on the Womens liberation movement which we have already commented on.

(ii) The CPA(ML) opposes "the setting up of 'pure' organisations to cater for the 'special problems' of women" as another example of "closed doorism".

That the CPA(ML) chooses to label all Half Way Houses or Rape Crisis Centres as "pure" only reveals their own obsession for 'purity' and the abysmal ignorance that accompanies their ideological purification. The fact that they place 'special problems' in inverted commas reveals that they consider that women have no special problems.

Again the CPA(ML) departs from Leninism and by revising Lenin's ideas play the role of discrediting him. In his talk with Clara Zetkin although Lenin does say : "We want no separate organisations of Communist women", he makes it very clear that a Communist Party must have working groups, composed of women and men, for the specific purpose of working amongst women .

Lenin said :- "The Party must have organs -working groups, commissions, committees, sections or whatever else they may be called - with the specific purpose of rousing the broad masses of women, bringing them into contact with the Party and keeping them under its influence. This naturally requires that we carry on systematic work amongst the women. We must teach the awakened women, win them over for the proletarian class struggle under the leadership of the Communist Party, and equip them for it. When I say this I have in mind not only proletarian women, whether they work in mills or cook the family meal. I also have in mind the peasant women and the women of the various sections of the lower middle class. They, too, are victims of capitalism and more than ever since the war. The lack of interest in politics and the otherwise anti-social and backward psychology of these masses of women, the narrow scope of their activities and the whole pattern of their lives are undeniable facts. It would be silly to ignore them, absolutely silly. We must have our own groups to work among them, special methods of agitation, and special forms of organisation. This is not bourgeois 'feminism'; it is practical revolutionary expediency."
(Lenin. "On the emancipation of women", pp.110-111).

The difference between the practical revolutionary approach of Lenin and the elitist and sectarian approach of the CPA(ML) is indeed striking !

(iii) The CPA(ML) regards "whinge sessions which relate to all the 'evils' of men" as another example of "closed doorism".

That such a derogatory adjective as "whinge" is used reveals a

sexist mentality and a most unhealthy sensitivity by E.F.Hill and co. to criticism for sexist attitudes and behaviour they undoubtedly display. In their writings (as distinct from their behaviour) on other political questions the CPA(ML) often welcomes the process of criticism and self criticism as essential and desirable. So why do they describe such a process as a "whing session" when it comes to discussing 'evil' male behaviour ??

Of course the revisionists and other bad people use the Women's movement to promote incorrect ideas. But such behaviour should not be overly stressed because it is by no means confined to the Womens movement. To generalise from the negative examples that do exist that women don't have special problems and that the Womens movement is all "closed doorism" is completely and utterly ludicrous.

In this case the "negative example" comes from the CPA(ML). Their ignorance of the Womens movement in turn breeds a fear of it. For some 'evil' men in the leadership of the CPA(ML) the prospect of criticism from women active in the Womens movement is something they fear. Such an attitude is the opposite of the communist outlook. In Mao tsetung's opinion :-

"I don't consider it good for a person to be afraid of being abused." (vol. 5, p.347).

The CPA(ML) pamphlet says :-

" Undoubtedly the wave of feminism which swept the capitalist world in the 60's and 70's, although based upon genuine grievances, greatly clouded revolutionary perspectives. Great attention was paid to symptoms, but very little or no thought was given to correctly diagnosing the fundamental cause. Hence the movement floundered and lost course." (p.5)

There is some truth in this statement. The ruling class promotes sexism and degenerate "culture" in magazines, newspapers, films, TV etc. in order to make a profit and to divide the working class on a sexual basis. Half Way Houses and Rape Crisis Centres provide a necessary and essential service for women in the immediate sense. But unless we combine this struggle with the struggle against the causes of rape and the causes of men bashing women (which means a struggle against the ruling class whose degenerate "culture" promotes these things) then we won't be getting to the heart of the matter and only putting bandaids on the system.

But, unfortunately, the CPA(ML) in criticising one wrong tendency (ie. reformism) makes the opposite error. The CPA(ML) pays great attention, are preoccupied, to the cause, but very little or no thought is given to correctly linking it with the symptoms.

The simple fact of the matter is that the CPA(ML) offers no support whatsoever to specific womens demands and struggles ! In the Party pamphlet defining their policy the only struggles they refer to positively are those that concern men and women equally :-

"Even so, throughout the years, countless numbers of women took their place in the general revolutionary struggles.

"Here in Australia, many thousands took to the streets in the cause of Vietnam, against Fraser's semi-fascist coup, against the attack upon Medibank, to mention just a few.

"Many splendid young women emerged as leaders striving to master the ideology of Marxism-Leninism- Mao Tsetung Thought." (p.5)

As we see, no specific Womens demands are referred to. In its 15 years of existence the CPA(ML) has never catered for the special problems of women.

As far as specific Womens demands go the CPA(ML) practises abstinence. But just as abstinence generally does not work out in practice as a means of contraception, the CPA(ML) is finding that it doesn't satisfy the political needs of progressive women and men either. How can a Party abstain from supporting specific Womens demands that urgently affect millions of women in Australia and expect to win their support? The ignorance of the CPA(ML) leadership on this question is truly amazing.

Of course, other groups that claim to be Marxist-Leninist do not behave like this at all. Eg., to take one American group, amongst many, 'The League for Proletarian Revolution M-L'. They list a series of specific demands for women :-

1. Equal pay for equal work.
2. Paid maternity leave with job guarantees.
3. Free day care services in community and workplaces.
4. Stop all discriminatory hiring and firing practices against women; stop the practice of assigning women the most menial and worst paid jobs.
5. Right of women to bear arms and exercise the right of self defence.
6. Stop forced sterilisations. Right to free and safe abortion.
7. Stop all attacks against women in education, mass media etc., pornography, degenerate culture etc.
8. Keeping and putting into effect all protective legislation for women."

(from 'Resistance' Feb. 1977, Vol.8, no.2, p.1.)

The CPA(ML)'s failure to develop action around specific demands like this is absolute proof of its abject failure to come to grips with the Women Question.

The reaction of the CPA(ML) to criticism.

Arising from the 'purity', ignorance and the weakness of their position, the CPA(ML) is compelled to ridicule those who disagree with them and to lump them all together into a "hostile", "bourgeois" category.

The CPA(ML) pamphlet says :

" Working class women, like working class men consist of the advanced, intermediate and backward. To designate all working class women as 'backward' is to fall into the bourgeois, revisionist trap as seeing matters from a sex angle and not from the point of view of the class. Great numbers of the Australian workforce now consist of women. A high proportion of Australian women are forced, even without proper support services to take their place on the production lines. Among them we find many advanced women who daily challenge the boss and lead splendid struggles. They will continue even more energetically in the future.

" Their actions give the lie to the hostile Trotskyist trend expressed through some ideologically weak intellectuals which strives to penetrate the independence forces. This trend regards working women as backward, unable to understand the cause of their plight. It prefers to gather in closed left circles and talk about male oppression, by its actions looking down upon

ordinary women as inferior, seeing itself as having nothing to learn from the masses."(p.6)

It is true that there is an increasing proportion of women who now work for wages (wage slaves as well as unpaid slaves) and there are advanced women "who daily challenge the boss and lead splendid struggles." But the fact that women, like men, can be categorised into the politically advanced, middle and backward is no refutation at all to the general observation that on the whole women do tend to be less politically active than men.

Has the CPA(ML) in making its wide ranging observations about the state of the working class bothered to stop and consider matters closer to home, ie. the state of the CPA(ML) ? The public Chairperson and Vice Chairpersons of the CPA(ML) are all men . Is that because it is "scientifically correct"? May we ask what % of women are on the Central Committee of the CPA(ML)? What % of women make up the membership of the CPA(ML)? Of course the CPA(ML) will not answer these questions . The answers would be too embarrassing to their thesis of even political involvement by the men and women of Australia .

In fact the CPA(ML) argument consists of nothing but fake and paternalistic flattery . They are saying - Look! Women are very advanced politically. So advanced in fact that they don't have special problems, we don't need to cater specifically for them.

What is this but a pathetic attempt to stop us all facing a problem in order to take steps to solve it ?

In a society where the ruling class tries very hard to promote division on a sexual basis it is inevitable that both men and women will have special problems arising from one-sided social experience (as well as biological differences). This leads to the situation that while women, in general, may be less advanced on some questions (eg. political and industrial involvement) also men, in general, may be less advanced on some questions too (eg. child care, housework, not to mention the Womens Question !). But in the eyes of the CPA(ML) to make observations such as these is to "fall into the bourgeois, revisionist trap as seeing matters from a sex angle and not from the point of view of class" ! The CPA(ML) is forgetting that Marxism must be based on a concrete study of reality. Their idea of Marxism is that it is a dogmatic straight jacket into which they try to fit their pre-conceived and subjective ideas .

From the observation that women are generally less involved politically than men, there follows the question -- WHY ? In order to change the situation it is necessary for men and women to examine this question together . We don't claim to have the answers yet .

But the CPA(ML) does not even allow themselves to observe the differences between men and women in our society. Hence they will not ask the question. Although they have existed for 15 years the CPA(ML) has not even begun to seriously consider the Womens Question.

The danger of the CPA(ML) policy is twofold :-

- (i) That some will fall and have fallen under its influence and so become passive or hostile to just womens struggles .
- (ii) That by lumping all their opponents together and placing nasty labels on them (in this case "bourgeois", "revisionist", "Trotskyite" and "weak intellectual") and by propagating all their views repeatedly in the name of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Mao, they will drive good people away from the genuine Marxist-Leninist camp into the arms of the revisionist and Trotskyist camp . To combat this tendency we have stressed the revision of Lenin by the CPA(ML) on the Womens question in this article.

The CPA(ML) has developed a pernicious habit of pinning labels on themselves and labels on others without explaining the meaning of the labels . They have quite clearly forgotten the meaning of leninism .

Why does the CPA(ML) carry on like this ?

The CPA(ML) has become increasingly dominated by paternalistic men who show no initiative on the Womens Question through fear of releasing forces of rebellion that they cannot control.

The attitude of the CPA(ML) leadership is not one of putting trust in the forces of rebellion at all. Women have to come to them on the basis of joining the "independence struggle". The concept is a "pure" and narrow one. Any forces that are suspected of contamination by 'feminism' are not to be trusted and given a wide berth .

It is a simple fact that many men, in particular, are in ignorance on the Womens Question .

Both the radical feminists and the CPA(ML) adopt policies to encourage the perpetuation of this ignorance . The radical feminists say : "We won't have anything to do with men because they are the enemy." The CPA(ML) says : "We won't have anything to do with Womens liberation because it is bourgeois."

Both policies, from opposite ends of the spectrum, encourage non involvement in the womens struggle. Both policies encourage self contemplation, self cultivation and an inward looking "ideological purity".

It is easy , especially for men, under the pressures that already exist in society ; combined with these pressures emanating from the "Left" to succumb, to cop out and not get involved .

But getting involved is only the starting point. There is a lot of ignorance on the Womens Question . Those who continue under the influence of E.F.Hill will remain in ignorance . On the Womens Question the leadership of the CPA(ML) has yet to begin !

.....

ON THE SLOGAN "NATIONALISE THE CAR INDUSTRY."

In October 1974 a group was formed in Adelaide called "The Campaign to Nationalise the Car Industry". The core and driving force of this group were anti-imperialist and socialist minded car workers. The original ideas and aims of the group were :-

1. To popularise the slogan "Nationalise the car industry" amongst car workers .
2. To assist building a type of united front to challenge the power of U.S. Multinationals in Australia in the area of transport. The idea was that the slogan created a rallying point for the following groups of people :
 - + car workers fighting for a better deal.
 - + people fighting freeways (MATS plan) and wanting a better public transport system .
 - + people supporting alternative transport schemes, eg. the electric car .
 - + people opposed to pollution by cars .
 - + people opposed to the enormous road toll.

The common enemy of all these groups was seen as the U.S. car monopolies and the slogan "Nationalise" was seen as a uniting point .

The group lasted for about 6 months and was quite active in its brief life. It collapsed in 1975. Since then the "nationalise" slogan has not been used in any systematic way in South Australia in the car industry .

Response from car workers .

The main factor that enthused the group initially and kept it going forward was that there was some success in taking the slogan to car workers .

In the second half of 1974 an atmosphere of intense crisis pervaded the whole economy and the car industry in particular. This was deliberately whipped up (the atmosphere was whipped up, not the crisis) for the benefit of the U.S. monopolies to help them win their battle to force the Federal Labour Government to reject the Industries Assistance Commission (IAC) Report into the car industry (released in July 1974). In particular, the U.S. car monopolies opposed the IAC proposal to keep tariffs low and allow unrestricted import into Australia.

In essence this was a battle between U.S. and Japanese car monopolies on who cornered the Australian market. The tension exploded with GMH's announcement to sack 5,000 in December 1974 . The feeling against GMH soared . Support for nationalisation peaked . But then the ALP capitulated to U.S. pressure. They granted the local "Big 3" (at that time GMH, Ford and Chrysler) further concessions. Car workers were told they were let off the hook , their jobs "saved". In fact indirect sackings proceeded, by transfers to different jobs pressuring workers to sack themselves, and direct sackings for trivial breaches of rules and regulations (eg. on clock a minute early).

2/.

The demand to nationalise the car industry received strong support from car workers at this time. A motion to that effect was strongly passed at a mass meeting at GMH-Elizabeth in Dec. 1974. Efforts by sellout, pro-ALP, Vehicle Builders Union Officials to obstruct the motion only increased support for it. Motions calling for educational campaigns on nationalisation were also passed at Chryslers (Tonsley Park) and at shop stewards meetings in 1974.

These motions were passed in periods of crisis when feelings against the Companies, and the Vehicle Builders Union sellout policies, were running high. At another time, at a GMH combined (Elizabeth and Woodville) stopwork meeting at St. Clair Centre in Feb. 1975 just after car workers had been supposedly "let off the hook" by the ALP sales tax cut and import restrictions a similar motion was strongly defeated.

This started us thinking that the vote in favour of nationalisation perhaps did not run very deep but support for the proposal represented a spontaneous lashing out at GMH more than anything else. Following the failure at St. Clair some further investigation and analysis was made amongst the workforce (and other "Campaign..." supporters who were now dropping away) and some important doubts and objections were raised :-

" ITS NOT POSSIBLE " Some people had severe doubts that the ALP would ever support the demand to nationalise the car industry. As the ALP swung to the right in 1974-5 these doubts grew.

" ITS NOT WORTHWHILE " Many workers expressed doubts that nationalisation would be an improvement on the present situation. In particular, many British migrants who had experienced nationalisation under the British Labour Government (the British Labour Government nationalised Coal, Electricity, Gas, Transport, Iron and Steel) expressed the doubts :-

"It didn't work in Britain"

"It wouldn't make a profit"

"It would become a public service bureaucracy (like the Austn. railways)"

"It would be just another boss"

From these facts some fairly obvious truths emerged :

1. What does nationalisation mean ?

It means, whether we like it or not, that we are proposing to replace the U.S. car monopolies with an industry run by whatever Government is in power at the moment. This rather obvious point was not really grasped when the "Campaign..." was first set up. We seemed to assume that people would equate nationalisation with national independence. This was wishful thinking.

A comparison could be made here with "The Campaign Against Foreign Military Bases". If the question were raised: "What do we replace them with?", the only real answer is : "With an armed people". But parliamentary connotations are inbuilt into the nationalisation slogan.

So it is not surprising that support for nationalisation with the Liberals in Government has virtually vanished. For example, did the Chrysler workers put forward nationalisation when 700 were sacked in one hit in July 1977. No. Would Fraser do it? That is a joke. For a moment imagine it possible that he would do it. Would we argue that nationalisation would save the jobs of Chrysler workers? The jobs were lost as a result of the capitalist crisis of overproduction and the introduction of labour saving technology. When we are in a position to actually mobilise large numbers of workers to fight the bosses right to hire and fire (one of the fundamental props of the whole capitalist system) then in such an advanced political situation we would be obliged to call for a revolution for national independence and socialism which would include the socialisation of Chryslers relations of production. This would be nationalisation in a revolutionary sense. Not nationalisation in a reformist sense.

Adherents of the slogan in the present situation might argue: "Then link it to national independence". But since we want to advocate national independence and socialism then why not do so directly rather than confuse the issue with a "nationalisation" slogan with all its parliamentary connotations.

2. The decline of the ALP .

Keeping this first truth in mind all of the above objections arose from the realisation that the social democratic governments (ALP or British Labour Party) are no good, that in the final analysis they do not support the workers .

The problem does not lie with convincing the people that the present conditions of the Australian car and transport industry are lousy. That point is generally accepted and there is a mountain of evidence to be produced to back it up. The problem lies in convincing people that nationalisation would be an improvement,

As the ALP swung to the right in 1974-5, and its popularity declined, the sentiments "its not worthwhile" and "its not possible" were reinforced.

The need to investigate and analyse .

It is ridiculous to proclaim a slogan: "nationalise the car industry" and to keep on proclaiming it without making a thorough investigation and summing up experience of the workers at which the slogan is directed .

This is what genuine communists must break free of: proclamation, blind faith, laying down the 'correct' line, having little or no respect for the people. It was a good thing that the "nationalise" slogan was put forward in a vigorous way in the car industry in 1974-5. It had some success. But we have been slow to sum up our experience. The process "from the masses, to the masses" has not been properly carried out. Experience has been gained but the (PTO)

vital factor of correctly integrating it with advanced theory (Marxism -Leninism- Mao Tsetung Thought) has not been grasped as important . This error is called empiricism .

Would the ALP do it ?

An excellent article in "Australian Communist" 67 (Sept. 1974) called "Reformists want reform; Revolutionaries want revolution" points out : Nationalisation is a reform and the ALP as a reformist Party is capable of carrying out this reform .

Nationalisation is a reform because it could be implemented without necessarily triggering off a revolution.

The question of making a correct analysis of the ALP and what they are and are not capable of is important. Only because the actions of the ALP do affect the development of the people's struggle for national independence and socialism. We look at the question from the point of view of the peoples struggle and how ALP policy will affect this, and how we can combat this affect.

The immediate problem at that time (1975) for the ALP from their point of view, was the economic crisis of capitalism. They were riding a tiger and because the ALP is a Party of capitalism the tiger (the capitalist economic crisis) was in control. The ALP is a reformist party (this is one side of it) but the economic crisis limited their ability to carry out reforms.

The ALP Government scheme to raise an overseas loan of \$4,000,000,000 was part of a plan to "buy back the farm." The U.S. multinationals didn't like this and squashed it. A Russian Bank was involved. The ALP is always reluctant to mobilise the people in support of their reforms because they don't want to start something they can't stop (eg. a revolution). Sometimes they will play a role in mobilising people in extra parliamentary activity, eg. Cairns in the Moratorium (refer AC 6/ article above).

The dominant trend in the ALP in 1974-5 was the swing to the right, the swing against reform towards die hard reaction (this is the other side of the ALP), eg. their economic policy of wage indexation (pegging). There was no chance that they would nationalise the car industry at that time.

The future .

In th future it is possible that the ALP will support nationalisation ,. There are various factors involved in this :

- (i) The ALP has always catered for and reflected national bourgeois sentiment and slogans. "Nationalise the car industry" is such a slogan.
- (ii) One side of the ALP is their committment to reform the capitalist system .
- (iii) There is a (slowly) growing influence of Soviet social-imperialism within the ALP. This influence supports nationalisation. In fact it is right up their alley. It hits at the U.S. monopolies

5/.

but does not clearly mobilise the people in a vigorous way (the parliamentary, from the top connotations of the slogan).

In the future, as the economic crisis bites deeper and the people get organised then support for national independence and socialism will grow. In such a situation it is probable that the ALP will eventually come forward with the demand for nationalisation and their attempt to head off the struggle. Otherwise people with a reformist outlook will have no alternative but to accept revolutionary leadership. Just when the ALP will come forward with this cannot be predicted. It may be in a future period of intense crisis.

For example, in Britain during the 1971 Ford strike following Henry Ford's threat to divert investment from Britain 30 Labour MP's called for nationalisation of Ford's plants in Britain and 6 MP's in an amendment urged the Government to take over the Company "with no payment for goodwill since Ford denies its existence" (ie. nationalisation without compensation).

Nationalisation ... should we support it ?

In such a case as the above it would certainly appear correct for communists to support nationalisation. The demand has its progressive side (in Australia or the Ford's example from Britain) because it expropriates U.S. monopolies and challenges the power of U.S. imperialism.

There is a difference between this and the other British industries that have been nationalised in that they have been locally owned and usually but not always unprofitable.

To look at the experience of nationalisation in some other countries might help to clarify the situation.

Example 1 : Egypt, a 3rd world country, under the leadership of Nasser (a strong national bourgeois) nationalised the Suez Canal in 1956. This was a real blow and a popular blow mainly at U.S. Imperialism. Of course Communists would actively support it. At the same time they would exert their independence by preparing people for the necessary armed struggle to repulse the invasion by 3 countries that followed (Israel, Britain and France). Nasser relied on negotiated settlement.

Example 2 : Over the last few years there has been a gradual take-over of Leylands in Britain by the Government. This is propping up a Company with insufficient capital to cover its forward expansion. It is of little or no benefit to the working class.

Conclusions :

I would tentatively advance the following conclusions -

1. In essence "nationalise the car industry" in present Austn. conditions is a progressive reformist or bourgeois nationalist demand. Not to support such a slogan in present Austn conditions would be to commit an infantile "left" error. Communists support reforms, support bourgeois nationalist demands provided this

assists the Australian revolution for independence and socialism. Communist revolutionaries must unite with bourgeois nationalists and reformists and struggle for leadership correctly or else they become only a self proclaimed 'correct' left bloc.

2. "Nationalise the car industry" is only a reformist demand and in itself is not a revolutionary demand. To uncritically advance this slogan without understanding means to act not as a communist but as a reformist.

To suggest or to imply that nationalisation will lead to:

A cheaper, safer, non polluting peoples car.

An end to the road toll

A superb public transport system

An efficient industry

Jobs for all and a better deal for workers etc.

is to confuse nationalisation with national independence and socialism, is to confuse reform with revolution.

The negative side of the nationalisation slogan cannot be ignored. The experience in Britain, the experience with the railways in Australia, the experience of the SEC power workers protracted strike in the Latrobe valley (they had all the benefits of a nationalised company) is a powerful lesson to workers that State monopoly capitalism does not work in their interests.

When advanced without understanding the slogan can confuse the people and it can confuse the communists too. It is important to educate aspiring communists of the differences between bourgeois nationalism and communism. Ridiculous situations have arisen, at Union meetings, where workers with communist ideals have in all sincerity argued for nationalisation and ALP opportunists have put them down by arguing that it wouldn't work under capitalism.

3. Finally, how do we struggle for leadership correctly?

(i) Part of it is being correct in a propaganda sense. We want to encourage rejection of parliamentarism and bureaucracy and raise revolutionary slogans, eg. "Overthrow the Government", "people's democratic dictatorship", "dictatorship of the proletariat", "national independence and socialism" are some that come to mind.

(ii) But only by actually mobilising people to support us can we hope to hold sway over the bourgeois nationalist, reformist, revisionist, opportunist elements who also strive for leadership, authority and power. This requires action, leadership in practice, not just "correct" propaganda.

(iii) Eventually, to form a political party that offers overall leadership we need to formulate a Party program (which would, amongst other things, put the short term demand for nationalisation into perspective). Drafting a Party program is an important pre condition to the formation of a genuine Australian communist party.

+++++

There are numerous phrases that you hear incessantly among left circles. After a while they can jade the ear. Previously, I had accepted the prevailing attitude that political phrases didn't really mean anything, that they were purely incantations denoting "adherence" to something called "Marxism-Leninism". It is quite a pleasant surprise when you begin to realise that they do mean something and that, like all words, they are symbols standing for complex ever-changing relationships in the real world, of which we can have varying depths of understanding. I would like to suggest that people devote more time to discussing what some of the terms and phrases we use actually means. As a start, I have sketched out a few initial ideas on one phrase - "dictatorship of the proletariat" - for people's comments.

In my mind, Mao tse-tung Thought is concerned to a considerable extent with the question of continuing the revolution under the dictatorship of the proletariat, which draws on the experience of proletarian revolution to date, in particular the struggles against revisionism, of both the Soviet and home-grown Chinese variety.

The Dictatorship of the proletariat is not a superior form of parliamentary cretinism overseeing the "construction of socialism", despite whatever Hoxha or Teng might tell us. It is not a static thing nor an end in itself, but a means by which capitalism is transformed into communism.

The vanguard of the proletariat establishes an armed force, seizes administrative control and demolishes the then existing coercive legal apparatus of the bourgeoisie. For a proletarian dictatorship, the above is a minimum requirement, however from then on the degree to which the proletariat dictates is relative.

Firstly there are objective limitations determined by the degree of transformation towards communism that is practically feasible at any given stage. Once all limitations on the dictatorship of the proletariat are eliminated, it ceases to exist - withers away.

Secondly there is the extent to which the transformation of society is pushed to its current objective limits.

The term "dictatorship of the proletariat" means nothing unless it is seen in terms of transformation - "continuing the revolution under the dictatorship of the proletariat".

Implicit in the above is the view that a correct policy at one stage is counter-revolutionary at the next. Mutual aid teams in China were correct in the early '50s, they weren't after 1958. Later on the communes can become a stumbling bloc to progress. And one final example, Mao said that the worker propaganda teams must stay permanently in the schools and universities - true, but not withstanding the fact that the continued existence of schools and universities may one day become a hindrance to historical development.

PROLETARIAN PARLIAMENTARY CRETINISM IS GENUINE PARLIAMENTARY CRETINISM.

The most striking feature of Enva Hoxha's speech, "Proletarian Democracy is Genuine Democracy" is the clear message that the revolution is complete in Albania, that class struggle no longer really exists and the bourgeoisie no longer poses a danger in Albania.

Consequently, rule by the proletariat in Hoxha's terms is reduced to simply being a superior form of parliamentarism and rule of law, to that practiced under capitalism. To Marxists, proletarian rule is seen as the means by which the revolutionary transition to classless communist society is brought about. It is something with a continuing revolutionary task, not simply a "just" form of government.

Complementing Hoxha's static parliamentary notion of proletarian dictatorship is his equally static concept of "socialist society" that has been completely severed from any concept of socialism as a period of revolutionary transition to communism - revolution by stages throughout the whole historical period of proletarian dictatorship.

Hoxha's notion of socialism, in all essentials, is identical to Teng Hsiao-ping's. And the wording is much the same, although perhaps having a more militant tinge. To take an example - "Our Marxist-Leninist Party is inspired and nourished by the Marxist-Leninist ideology and its only aim is to raise the wellbeing of the people, to complete the construction of socialism under the dictatorship of the proletariat" (p 11).

The following gems from Hoxha's speech are no doubt meant to reassure the Albanian proletariat that they can quite safely stay out of politics and confine their activities to turning up on election day and "conforming to socialist norms". (Hi Norm!).

PARTY
"Our ~~country~~ has always seen to it that our country is free from foreigners in every respect, that it is fully independent from the outside world and never endangered by classes which our revolution has deprived of their economic, political and moral power" (pp10-11).

After stating that Albania is "truly socialist" and the greatest wage differential is "only" 2 to 1, Hoxha goes on to say, "We allow no dislocation in the implementation of the principle of remuneration according to the amount of work done, hence there is no, nor will there ever be any, stratum of working people placing themselves above the others and taking decisions according to its desires and interests" (p12).

And finally:- "... the way has been barred by law to revisionist tendencies" (p12).

When you read this sort of stuff in Peking Review or New Times (Moscow), it is easily identified as revisionist. It should be no harder to recognise simply because it emanates from the "8 Nentori" Publishing House.

13/4/79

LETTER FROM ALBANIA .

Editorial note: We have been requested to publish the following letter. It refers to an article in Discussion Bulletin 3 called "Are Mao's critics MLs at all?" (see Editorial at front if you wish to obtain a copy). We would like to receive readers comments on this thoughtful letter. Please fill out the following quiz. Neatest correct entry wins a free copy of Enver Hoxha's yet to be published autobiography.

Does the letter :-

- a. stimulate your interest in sausage production ?
- b. make you look forward to comrade Envers next 3 volumes ?
- c. impress you for its biting and irrefutable logic ?
- d. bore you stupid ?

.....

Tirana, ALBANIA
25th April, 1979 .

Dear

Two copies of your discussion bulletin have now reached me and been studied. The article which I wrote last November at your request has done one very good thing - it has so infuriated Albert Langer that he has cast off all disguise and come out openly in his true colours as a rabid enemy of the Party of Labour of Albania and the only country in the world where the dictatorship of the proletariat is in power. So much so in fact that he even tries to allege that socialism does not exist in Albania. Why is this ? Because the heir to the Langer Sausage empire does not like the proletarian revolution. He is a bourgeois revolutionary and hence pours out his vilest speen on the proletariat and the proletarian party. Thus you can no longer regard him as a "good guy with whom we have some differences over strategy and tactics" , but must see him as an enemy who must be fought. He comes in the same category as "Danny the Red" and other petty bourgeois student types who have played a role for a time in some sections of the revolutionary movement, but who always end up as vicious opponents of the proletariat in the revolution. W. Randolph Hearst in the USA played a similar role early in this century when, having inherited his family's gold mine, he became a newspaper baron and wanted to run Upton Sinclair (of "The Jungle", "Oil" and other famous novels) as communist candidates for the presidency of the USA.

Such people find it delightfully easy to dig out isolated passages from documents in order to bolster their case, entirely overlooking the time and circumstances in which these documents were published and the fact that almost every inter-party document represents some sort of compromise imposed by the situation. Here our "pure" revolutionaries (as opposed to real revolutionaries engaged in concrete struggle) will proclaim in triumph that a genuine revolutionary party must not make compromises. But Lenin states bluntly that this is an infantile sectarian stand. The essence of the matter is what sort of compromise - does it assist the revolution or does it harm it ? Would it have been in the interests of the revolution for the PLA to have come out openly in public attack on the Soviet Union after the 20th Congress when the entire international communist movement was striving (by official decision at the two Moscow meetings) to keep the differences with the revisionists as an internal problem in the hope that comradely criticism would put the CPSU back on the M-L track ? The same situation prevailed later in the differences with China. In both these cases the PLA took the stand that it must defend the M-L principles by attacking revisionism in the concrete form of Yugoslav revisionism that had been publicly denounced by the world communist movement while keeping its criticisms of the revisionist deviations in the USSR and China strictly within the confines of the two parties concerned or the legal forums of the world movement. Even when it came out openly against the

theory of the three worlds at the 7th Congress in 1976 it did not name the CPC as the author of this theory and did not openly state its differences with the CPSU or the CPC until these two parties themselves had made the differences public.

As to the question of replying to the slanderous attacks on the PLA and comrade Enver, by now you will have had at least one copy of "Imperialism and the Revolution", which is a major weapon in this battle, while we are now in the process of publishing "Reflections on China", excerpts from Enver Hoxha's political diary which sets out, day by day and week by week, the way Enver gradually formed his opinions about how things were developing in China and what the PLA must try to do to stop the revisionist degeneration in that party and country, because of its enormous importance to the world revolutionary movement. This work will run to about 2000 pages in three volumes the first of which is now in the hands of the printer and will be available in the middle of next month. The other two volumes will be put out before the end of this year, too. These two works are the best reply to all the shit that smart alecks like our fat friend try to smear on the PLA and socialism .

Since I have been working almost day and night on the translation of the latter work and will be continuing to do so for some months to come, it is quite impossible for me to devote the time to carefully checking up on the extensive bibliography quoted in the Discussion Bulletin in order to do a word by word refutation, and the work I am engaged in will make it quite unnecessary to do so in any case. However, I do want to refute the smear that I did not want that article published over my name because of "some little difficulty with the line of the CPNZ."

As you can see in the decision of the CPNZ plenum, published in the yellow-covered pamphlet last September, the CPNZ was not prepared at that stage to take a decision on the reason for the obviously reactionary trend in Chinese policy in recent years. It said it needed more time and facts in order to make an analysis, which was fair enough. But this did not mean that those of us who had facts and had formed opinions should sit dumb until some heavenly miracle brought clarity to the others. On the contrary it imposed a duty on us to express our opinions in an effort to reach clarity and agreement on the issues involved, but this could not be done in such a way as to commit the CPNZ to those opinions. This is why I told you that I did not want my name published with the article, which, incidentally, I sent to the CPNZ in the same mail as I sent it to you, explaining in a letter the course I had adopted. Thus despite the screams of anguish from certain quarters, I did not breach the discipline of the party in any way.

The major earthquake that struck the northern regions of the country on 15th April did colossal damage - 10,355 houses destroyed or damaged and over 400 other buildings. The superiority of the socialist system became apparent once again with the rapid and effective measures to eliminate the consequences. Everyone was provided with temporary shelter by 6 p.m. the same day and repair work commenced immediately. A great national action is under way and all the damaged buildings will be reconstructed or repaired by 1st October, while the production plans for 1979 will also be fulfilled all on the basis of self reliance. In neighbouring Yugoslavia, however, the story is rather different. According to radio reports, in some places tents were arriving only yesterday to house some of the homeless, and Tito has been holding out both hands for foreign aid. It's not the first time of course. The earthquake is a severe blow to the Albanian people but they have surmounted worse problems and are confident that they will do so again .

Cheerio and best regards,