



**General strike gains nothing —**

# Hawke paves way for Fraser's attacks

Two days after the first ACTU-led national 24-hour strike in defence of Medibank it was already clear that the union bureaucracy had admitted defeat. In the words of ACTU President Hawke, the strike had been "well spent" and would be carried on by a "publicity campaign". Further strike action was considered "remote".

Sensing blood the Government has quickly upped the attack. Refusing to negotiate, Fraser strongly rejected yet another Hawke compromise -- this time the "Scotton proposal" to reduce the levy a miserable 0.5 per cent to 2 per cent. To rub salt in the wound the Government proclaimed legislation to enforce on all unions mandatory postal ballots, ignoring earlier promises to Hawke for further talks and heavily pruned Labor's Prices Justification Tribunal.

The gutting of Labor's Medibank scheme had been central to the success of the Government's fiscal austerity measures. Medibank was one of the Whitlam government's few tangible reforms, and the struggle over it became the Government's first real test of strength with the unions. When Treasurer Lynch announced Medibank's impending doom in his May 20 "mini-budget", he set off an outbreak of strikes across the country and provoked widespread calls for retaliatory national strike action. But it was only after seven fruitless weeks of "negotiations" had produced little but cosmetic crumbs that the ACTU executive, faced with the Government's flat refusal to lower the Medibank levy on one hand and left-wing criticism on the other, was forced to call the July 12 national strike.

Even before the strike occurred Hawke made it clear that the unions did not intend to confront the Government, either over Medibank or its over-

all slashing of social expenditure. The aims of the strike did not even extend to maintaining the old Medibank scheme. The ACTU's "alternative proposals" -- a compulsory tax levy, reduced from Fraser's 2.5 per cent to 1.6 per cent -- were merely a more "equitable" way of making workers pay for health care. And to ensure nothing got out of hand the special federal unions conference, at the instigation of the ACTU executive, ruled overwhelmingly *against* organising rallies or any form of working-class mobilisation on July 12, thus promising in advance that the strike would be no more than a token gesture.

Nevertheless the organised working class strongly supported the strike -- an estimated 60 per cent of the workforce came out and heavy industry and transport across the nation were effectively shut down. The solidity of the strike was a slap in the face to the spurious press campaign against "political strikes", a sharp demonstration of Australian workers' organisational strength and union loyalty.

But while the national strike and the increasing welter of medical insurance options occupied

Continued on page two



Leftists and students demonstrate in Melbourne during 12 July national Medibank strike.

# Diplomatic games at the Olympics

"Politics are destroying the Olympics", was the cry of many as Taiwan walked out because the Canadian host government refused to allow it to compete under the banner of the "Republic of China", and 23 black African states (plus Guyana and Iraq) withdrew to protest the New Zealand rugby team's current tour of South Africa. But the world of sports -- like the vastly more important fields of science and the arts -- cannot avoid being commercialised and twisted to mirror the national chauvinism of the political world dominated by the degenerate bourgeois order in the epoch of capitalist decay.

If the row over Taiwan was a diplomatic tempest in a teapot, the protest against South Africa, through New Zealand, was more significant. Unlike Taiwan, South Africa is an important ally of American imperialism, which is committed to countering the diplomatic isolation of Pretoria's racist butchers. Accordingly, the American delegation threatened to walk out if the Olympic Committee caved in to the demand for sanctions against New Zealand.

For the New Zealand rugby team (which is partly government-subsidised) to tour South Africa immediately after the Soweto massacre, especially in the face of protests demanding the cancellation of the trip, was in effect an act

of solidarity with the Vorster regime, even if motivated merely by a philistine commitment to business as usual. But barring the New Zealand Olympic delegation (which has no relation to the rugby team) is an arbitrary and unconvincing way to condemn the foreign supporters of the executioners of Soweto. The black African rulers (who carry on a substantial foreign trade with South Africa) went after inconsequential New Zealand precisely because they did not dare to try to force out of the Olympics South Africa's real allies: West Germany, which supplies Vorster's military machine with nuclear reactors, or the US, the ultimate protector of the apartheid state.

The protest raises the general question of quarantining South Africa: should opponents of apartheid refuse to visit South Africa on principle. In general, cultural isolation of South Africa does not advance the struggle against racial oppression. Boycott by foreign scientists, academics, artists and athletic teams only strengthens the garrison-state attitudes of extreme Afrikaaner nationalism. When Arthur Ashe beats white tennis players in South Africa, this does not reinforce apartheid. When Jesse Owens won four gold medals in the 1936 Munich Olympics, he humiliated Hitler personally and objectively ridiculed the doctrine of the Aryan "master race".

Under particular circumstances, boycotting athletic events can be an effective political protest. A year after the reactionary coup in Chile, the masses were still heavily boycotting soccer matches at Santiago's National Stadium, where thousands of leftists and labour militants had been brutally tortured (and many murdered) in the weeks following the September 1973 coup. This unorganised, almost instinctive boycott was one of the few ways the Chilean working people could express their hatred for the murderous Pinochet junta. When the Russian soccer team refused to play the Chileans in 1974, this was a significant act which reinforced the protest arising from the Chilean masses themselves.

Similarly, after the Soweto massacre or during the Angola invasion, a campaign of international protest against South Africa -- including cancellation of athletic tours -- could be very effective. But a permanent boycott "in principle" is either empty moralism or a cynical gesture by the neo-colonial African nationalist regimes.

The idea that politics can be kept out of sports in class society is liberal individualistic idealism. International athletic competition, which is organised along nation-state lines and largely government-financed, necessarily expresses chauvinist ideology and is sub-

Continued on page seven

# Hawke . . . .

Continued from page one

the news little publicity was given to Hawke's economic report at the federal unions conference, a report that ACTU senior vice-president Cliff Dolan described as "perhaps more historic" than the general strike decision. The unanimously-adopted report was a carefully veiled argument for wage restraint, presented in the guise of union "responsibility" for the economy's "parlous condition" and the need for "protection" and "consolidation" of wage levels. The conference's reaffirmed support for full wage indexation was purely a gesture, since the Arbitration Commission's "temporary" introduction for the March quarter hearings of plateau indexation (full indexation up to average award earnings [\$125] and a flat rate after that) had already been passively accepted.

## Indexation death throes

Nor on the wages front has the Government wasted time in pressing the offensive. Lynch tested the wind at a businessmen's luncheon in Brisbane, citing New Zealand's 12 months wage freeze and Britain's new anti-labour "social contract", as he outlined the benefits to business of 12 months at "zero indexation". And in the week following Minister for Employment and Industrial Relations Tony Street openly canvassed plans for a wholesale assault on wages in justifying the Government's call for 30 per cent indexation for the June quarter hearings:

"The sharper the reduction now, the shorter the period over which it will need to be extended" (Street to Adelaide executives, quoted in the *Sydney Morning Herald*, July 30).

Egged on by the majority of employers, the Fraser government has always sought to destroy wage indexation. Introduced by the Labor government after the 1974 wages explosion, indexation's primary aim had never been to protect workers'

## Defend Dave McPherson

In October last year Dave McPherson, a student at Flinders University in Adelaide, was set upon and brutally beaten by police in the grounds of Royal Adelaide Golf Club and later charged under two counts of assault. McPherson was one of the organisers of protests at the time against visiting Malaysian tyrant Tun Abdul Razak, protests that embarrassed both the repressive Malaysian regime and Razak's hosts, the South Australian Labor government of Don Dunstan.

McPherson's frame-up and conviction for assault means imprisonment if his current appeal fails. The Spartacist League stands in solidarity with McPherson in the face of this state attack and sent the following telegrams to Peter Duncan, SA Attorney-General, and Premier Dunstan:

"We strongly protest the vicious police persecution and frame-up of David McPherson that has been carried out by your government. The charges and convictions against him are transparent acts of political victimisation and repression for his actions in organising protest against imperialist lackey Tun Razak. We demand that all charges be dropped immediately."

Telegrams or letters of protest calling for the dropping of all charges should be sent to:

Peter Duncan, Hon DA Dunstan, Chief Secretary,  
Attorney General, Premier, Parliament House,  
Parliament House, Parliament House, Adelaide SA 5000  
Adelaide SA 5000 Adelaide, SA 5000

Financial assistance and enquiries for further information should be sent to: The Campaign Against the Frame-up of Dave McPherson, c/- SRC, Sturt CAE, Bedford Park, SA 5042.

## Australasian SPARTACIST

a monthly organ of revolutionary Marxism for the rebirth of the Fourth International published by Spartacist Publications for the Central Committee of the Spartacist League of Australia and New Zealand, section of the international Spartacist tendency

EDITORIAL BOARD: Bill Logan  
Dave Reynolds (editor)  
Aidaire Hannah  
Steve Haran

(Melbourne correspondent: John Sheridan)

GPO Box 3473,  
Sydney,  
NSW, 2001.  
(02) 660-7647

GPO Box 2339,  
Melbourne,  
Victoria, 3001.  
(03) 429-1597

SUBSCRIPTIONS: Two dollars for the next twelve issues (one year).

AUSTRALASIAN SPARTACIST is registered at the GPO, Sydney for posting as a newspaper -- Category C.

living standards but to contain both wages and union militancy through a set of highly restrictive guidelines. Now unemployment has strengthened the bosses' hand, and wage indexation has become an obstacle to the bourgeoisie's drive on wages. Only last month the *Financial Review* noted in relation to the hard-hit building industry that "in a free market situation, it is very unlikely that these [wage indexation] increases could have been recorded" and that "with unemployment at levels unprecedented in Australia's postwar history, pressure for wage increases from the work force has all but evaporated" (*Australasian Financial Review*, 15 July).

With the Government renewing its onslaught on a number of fronts in preparation for further spending cuts in the August 17 budget proper, the manifest unwillingness and inability of the labour bureaucracy to provide any lead to workers in defence of their living standards again graphically exposes the utter bankruptcy of class-collaborationist reformism in the period of capitalism's decay. What is needed is an immediate and decisive campaign of national strike action based on a fighting program of class struggle; to smash Lynch's proposed wage freeze and the wage indexation guidelines through a struggle to institute an unconditional, automatic monthly cost-of-living adjustment; to combat unemployment through a reduction of the workweek and the expropriation of private industry and to fight for free universal quality health care funded by taking over the parasitical private funds, drug companies and insurance companies. Such a course though will never be carried out by the reformist bureaucrats that presently warm the seats of union offices. That task is dependent on communist oppositions in the unions organised to oust the union incumbents and to split the Labor ranks from their treacherous misleaders to the banner of a revolutionary workers party that can lead the struggle to destroy class society at its root -- through the expropriation of the capitalist class, the destruction of its state and the imposition of a genuine workers government.

But across the spectrum of the ostensible "socialists" and "communists", from Carmichael and Halfpenny of the Communist Party of Australia (CPA) to watery ALP "lefts" like Carr and Roulston -- those with the position and power to organise a real class defence -- there is no intention of making the break from their reformist confreres in the union bureaucracy. The watchword for these Mayday "socialists" is "unity against Fraser" -- in fact tailing behind Hawke. At the federal unions conference it was these strongest defenders of "unity" that were instrumental in re-establishing his rapidly tarnishing authority. The castration of the strike's potential power to a protest scarcely raised a murmur and there was no opposition to the thrust of Hawke's economic report. Even when Hawke specifically pointed to the headline "Hawke's Deals Rebuffed" in the CPA's *Tribune* and challenged them to make their case or shut up, CPA bureaucrats like Jim Baird (AMWU), Jack Cambourne (FEDFA) and Merv Nixon (South Coast Labour Council) cowered in their seats and refused to speak. Their subsequent upholding of the "success" of July 12 and calls for further action are just empty verbiage to cover their cowardly capitulation.

## Fake lefts alternative: the "People's Budget"

What has been the reality of the "lefts" further action? Clancy's promise to raise it at the next ACTU executive meeting -- on August 16? Or the AMWU's strategy for the employers to pay the Medibank levy as part of the new metal award? Or perhaps the "People's Budget", a publicity stunt with the message that capitalism really *can* be run for the benefit of all. Launched by leading CPA and AMWU bureaucrat John Halfpenny, its collection of mostly philistine reforms include a call for pensions to be 30 per cent (!) of average weekly earnings, increased taxes for companies making "excessive" profits and no increase (!) in the capitalist "defence" budget. Also thrown in is the odd crackpot proposal like an employment, as opposed to an investment, allowance for employers and for the ecology-conscious there's a "waste tax".

*Tribune* admits that the "People's Budget" does not raise a socialist program; but in the plodding step-at-a-time reformist style of the classic evolutionary socialist Bernstein ("the movement is everything, the goal nothing") the CPA urges that it "should be vigorously supported by the working class movement" and the "socialists should throw themselves into the mass movement that can be developed around the People's Budget" (*Tribune*, 28 July). On the contrary. For socialists to support a campaign that hides capitalism's very nature, that builds illusions in its ability to provide even short-term reforms and attempts to build a "mass movement" on the basis of a better way to carry out capitalist theft is treachery of the first order. Only a perspective of class struggle can both expose the utter bankruptcy of such "socialist" fakery and point the way to a real defence against the exploiters. ■

## At UNHCR Headquarters in Geneva

# Munoz delegation meets with UN Refugee Commissioner

GENEVA, July 16 -- An international delegation organised by the Committee to Save Mario Munoz met today with the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, Prince Sadruddin Aga Khan of Pakistan. The delegation demanded UN action on behalf of Munoz, a Chilean miners' leader forced to flee Pinochet's terror in Chile only to now find himself again in desperate peril from the Argentine military junta.



Argentine rightist death squads' victims.

The Audience with the High Commissioner was obtained as the result of the international attention focused on the campaign to save Munoz, which has received the support of hundreds of prominent individuals, legislators, left and labor leaders in a dozen countries.

Comprising the delegation were Albrecht Konecny, chairman of the Young Generation of the Socialist Party of Austria, also conveying the support of the Austrian Railroad Workers Union and the International Federation of Transport Workers; Guy Aurenche, representing the International Association of Catholic Jurists; Jacques Vittori, representative of the Brussels-based World Confederation of Labor; Christian Grobet, a member of the Swiss parliament and representative of the Swiss Progressive Jurists' Association; Joe Heflin of the Society of Friends (Quakers) in France; and Bill Logan, Australian spokesman for the Committee to Save Mario Munoz. Also present were representatives of the Munoz Committee from Austria, France, Germany and the US and two of Munoz' Chilean comrades. Other trade unions and civil liberties organisations unable to directly participate in the delegation sent telegrams and messages of solidarity urging UN action on Munoz' behalf.

The High Commissioner and other UN officials (including Georges Koulischer, head of the UN's Latin American Section) heard Bill Logan demand that "the United Nations must take responsibility for the life of this Chilean working-class leader who today symbolises the working masses persecuted by the juntas of South America". Albrecht Konecny stressed the need for prompt action: "Time is what Mario Munoz has the least of."

Citing the July 2 arrest of Munoz in Mendoza and last month's mass kidnapping of Chileans from UN refugee sites, following the theft by police or para-police terrorists of lists showing the names and addresses of more than 8,000 refugees, the delegation sought concrete commitments from the High Commissioner concerning Munoz' safe departure from Argentina and the securing of visas. The murderous activities of the rightist death squads and the inability of the UN to protect refugees under its mandate heightens the urgency of bringing international pressure to bear on behalf of Munoz.

The UN officials promised to undertake efforts on Munoz' behalf. But each day that Munoz remains in Argentina, his life is placed in increased peril as the blows of rightist repression rain down on proletarian militants and even liberal bourgeois opponents of the reactionary Videla junta. Only continued international protest and pressure in solidarity with Munoz and all the victims of rightist terror will save the lives of this Chilean workers' leader and his family.



## Healyite cop-baiting covers for reformism

# SWP "democratic socialism" on tour

Bearing the message that "it is good to be a socialist in the United States today" and that the American people were "open to a discussion on socialism" American Socialist Workers Party (SWP) vice-presidential hopeful Willie Mae Reid toured Australia last month. Sponsored by the Australian Socialist Workers Party, her co-thinkers in the reformist wing of the fake-Trotskyist "United Secretariat of the Fourth International", Reid spoke at public meetings and universities on "The Coming American Revolution" and "The US Elections in the Aftermath of Watergate". The content of the talks though gave little hint of revolution; in fact with her nauseating identification with the atrocities of US imperialism (eg, "we" went into Vietnam) there was nothing outside the odd "socialist" phrase to distinguish her from any bourgeois liberal American critic.

But while Reid said very little about the SWP's alleged strategy for socialism, her presidential running-mate, Peter Camejo, has been more specific. In an interview with the *New York Times* (21 April 1975) he was quoted as summarising the SWP's program as follows:

"First, cutting the war budget and getting an emergency public works program to put people back to work.  
"Second, favoring a cost-of-living escalator clause in labor contracts to fight inflation.  
"Third, ending illegal activity of CIA and FBI harassment.  
"Fourth, enforcement of laws which protect minority groups and women. I'm for school busing in Boston.  
"Fifth, opposition to the present foreign policy which we characterize as imperialist."

Hardly a revolutionary program -- in fact a not-very radical reform program. Small wonder that the Staff Director of the Democratic Party Platform Committee could say of the SWP platform: "It all looks perfectly reasonable. You may have saved me ten months of work" (approvingly quoted in the US SWP's *Militant*, 14 November 1975).

Reid's underlying reformism was drawn out at her Sydney meeting by a Spartacist member who attacked the SWP's demand that the US army be sent to Boston to "protect" blacks from white-racist violence whipped up over court-introduced school busing (a scheme which buses students from one area to another to achieve greater racial

integration in the schools). Reid's standard SWP rationale -- that blacks have their back to the wall and federal troops are the "only force" capable of stopping the racists -- bolsters the treacherous illusion that capitalism's cops and

Socialist Workers Party/Socialist Youth Alliance

Dear Comrades,

The Spartacist League of Australia and New Zealand stands in solidarity with the "Statement on the Socialist Labour League Disruption of the Willie Mae Reid Meeting in Sydney on July 15th" issued by the SWP. The meeting, which was attended by supporters of the international Spartacist tendency, was disrupted and effectively terminated by the shouting, screaming and chanting of SLL supporters engaged in a vicious campaign of slander against long-time leaders of the American SWP. Speakers both from the floor and from the podium were prevented from being heard. We note a factual error in the "Statement", which says that "at one point the SLL members left their seats and rushed to the front of the hall ...". So far as we are aware this did not occur; but this in no way diminishes the responsibility of the SLL for criminally violating the elementary norms of democratic discussion within the workers movement. However, we are compelled to separate ourselves from monstrous hypocrisy of the SWP's "concern" over this violation of workers democracy, since your organisation has for years and continues to systematically exclude supporters of the Spartacist League from its supposedly "public" Direct Action forums for alleged "disruptions" which in fact never occurred. Political exclusionism within the workers movement is a crime akin to that of the gangsterism, thuggery and cop-baiting of the Healyite SLL, and is likewise derived from the twin poisons of Stalinism and Social Democracy, counterposed to the traditions of Trotskyism. Our solidarity against the SLL disruption of the 15th of July must not be taken as an endorsement of your equally unjustifiable suppression of political opponents within the left.

Fraternally,  
Aidaire Hannah  
20 July 1976

army are "neutral" peace-keeping institutions available for hire by both oppressors and oppressed alike. The organisation of independent self-defence groups by labour and black organisations, as called for by the Spartacist League/



Visiting American SWP vice-presidential candidate Willie Mae Reid.

US, is the only effective defence for black school children in Boston. As in Detroit (1943), Birmingham and Little Rock, troops *will* be called in, but only when blacks begin to organise for defence, and then to preserve the racist status quo!

At Reid's Melbourne meeting an SL member challenged her to defend the SWP's policy of defending fascists' "right" to "free speech", citing an incident at the University of Houston, Texas where SWP supporters intervened in the name of "free speech" to quieten enraged students who were jeering and attempting to shout down Scott Nelson, a leading member of the Ku Klux Klan. Reid, civil libertarian and democrat *par excellence*, claimed that the way to fight the fascist vermin was to rationally expose and discredit their ideas. But fascist groups like the Klan, Nazi party etc, cannot be debated precisely because they are not based on their "ideas" but on their racist and anti-working-class *action*.

Continued on page seven

## Defend the OBL!

# Austrian Trotskyists convicted under press censorship law

On July 8 an article in the February issue of the *Bulletin* of the Osterreichische Bolschewiki-Leninisten (OBL -- Austrian Bolshevik-Leninists, sympathising section of the international Spartacist tendency), was declared offensive to the bourgeoisie's "common sense of justice" by an Austrian court. For this "crime" the unsold copies of the *Bulletin* were ordered seized and OBL editor Barbara Dorner was convicted under an all-purpose press censorship law and now faces a sentence of up to two years imprisonment. The conviction is being appealed.

The article which so offended the Socialist Party (SPO) government of Chancellor Bruno Kreisky concerned a terrorist attack on a meeting of the Oil Producing and Exporting Countries (OPEC) by a group called the Arm of the Arab Revolution. Concerned to protect Vienna's image as a *gemutlich* backwater of social peace and genteel center for international trade and diplomacy, Austrian rulers were horrified when the pro-Palestinian commandos kidnapped a number of prominent OPEC oil ministers.

Countering the hysterical uproar in the bourgeois press, the *Bulletin der Bolschewiki-Leninisten* called on the left and labour movement to defend the Arab nationalist commandos against persecution by the capitalist state, while criticising the impotent strategy of the terrorists:

"Trotskyists consider the concept of petty-bourgeois individual terrorism to be completely misguided... [However,] the defense of persecuted proletarian and anti-imperialist

fighters is an essential component of the traditions of the workers movement and absolutely necessary in creating a united battle line against the bourgeoisie."

For defending militants whose "crime" was "making hostages of a handful of monopolists whose hands are dripping with the blood of countless workers and peasants" the OBL was declared guilty of violating Paragraph 282 of the Penal Code. This section outlaws not only "inciting to actions punishable by law" but also "approving of an act punishable by imprisonment of over one year in a fashion such as to offend the common sense of justice or to incite to committing such an act".

The OBL trial is the first time a new (1975) statute aimed at expanding government powers of harassing the press has been implemented, but it will certainly not be the last. Cases are pending against other left groups, including the Maoist MLS. The OBL waged a vigorous political defense against the reactionary press censorship regulations and denounced the ominous implications of the catch-all category of an undefined (and non-existent) "common sense of justice". Recognizing the threat to the entire left represented by this thought-control legislation, supporters of the GRM (Revolutionary Marxist Group) and the IKL (International Communist League) attended the trial as a demonstration of solidarity with the OBL. The Maoists failed to appear.

Throughout the trial, both judge and prosecutor sought to deny that political censorship was involved. Arriving in court on the original

trial date, the OBL comrades were informed that the entire time allotted for the simple "administrative" procedure was 15 minutes! Even after protests by the lawyer and defendants, the July 8 trial was rammed through in under an hour. The judge refused to let Comrade Dorner defend the *Bulletin* article politically, restricting testimony to the "technical" question of the legal responsibility of the editor under Paragraph 30 of the Penal Code. Only in their concluding statements were the OBL comrades permitted to denounce the political repression of the left represented by these censorship laws.

The presentations by Comrades Dorner and Weissenbock and by their lawyer did, however, force the judge to clearly state that she held the OBL guilty of Paragraph 282, even though she refused to allow testimony on this question. "Freedom of expression", the judge declared airily, "means that one can express his opinion freely". She went on: "But there are limits." These limits, she said, are where an insult is made or the common sense of justice is offended. The accused and co-defendant are wrong, said the judge: there is no such thing as a sense of justice divided into that of the bourgeoisie and that of the working class, but rather a single sense of justice, the sense of justice of mankind -- ethics.

It is not surprising that the Austrian authorities systematically sought to obscure the political basis of the trial, for Paragraph 282 (the

Continued on page seven

# LCR seeks grand Pabloite "Unity" with French PSU

# Mandel offers to renounce Trotsky, Fourth International

"By its very nature opportunism is nationalistic, since it rests on the local and temporary needs of the proletariat and not on its historic tasks. Opportunists find international control intolerable and they reduce their international ties as much as possible to harmless formalities ... on the proviso that each group does not hinder the others from conducting an opportunist policy to its own national task.... International unity is not a decorative facade for us, but the very axis of our theoretical views and our policy."

-Leon Trotsky, "The Defence of the Soviet Union and the Opposition", 7 September 1929

In January 1974 the "Tenth World Congress" of the United Secretariat (Usec) of the "Fourth International" unanimously adopted a set of organizational measures supported both by the centrist Europe-based International Majority Tendency (IMT) of Mandel/Maitan/Krivine and the reformist Leninist-Trotskyist Faction (LTF) dominated by the US Socialist Workers Party (SWP) and the Argentine Partido Socialista de los Trabajadores (PST) in a desperate attempt to prevent further splits in its sections and to suppress the debates which were tearing it apart.

The deal worked out was a non-aggression pact which urged the reunification of split national sections while implicitly legitimising non-application of democratic centralism in the Usec by recognising the decomposition products of split national groups as "sympathising sections". But as we noted at the time, "the organizational maneuvering of the last several months is at best a stop-gap measure which will be unable to prevent new oppositions and splits" ("Usec World Congress Preserves 'Scotch-Tape' Unity", *Workers Vanguard* no 42, 12 April 1974).

For several years, we pointed out, a common predilection for unprincipled organizational maneuvering has been nearly the only thing holding the Usec together. But with the political polarization escalating, the de facto split between the two wings has been expressed in public splits between IMT and LTF supporters in country after country. Now, with the outbreak of open factional warfare within the LTF (leading to the appearance in several countries of three competing organizations all claiming adherence to "the Fourth International"), the Usec's facade of "unity" is threadbare.

This has not prevented both IMT and LTF from seeking to make a virtue of necessity by pointing to the public factional fracas as a tribute to the eminently "democratic" character of their common swamp ("everyone welcome but Bolsheviks"). That the Usec's dirty linen has piled so high that it can no longer be laundered in private testifies not to Usec "democracy", however, but to the aggressiveness of the bloc partners' conflicting opportunist appetites.

Thus the suit-and-tie SWP reformists want to slough off Regis Debray-style guerrillaist allies who impede them from becoming respectable influence peddlers to their own bourgeoisie. The centrists, in turn, want unrestricted political freedom of maneuver in order to grab onto the coattails of the "broad vanguards" of their choice. But as their competing schemes become more clearly articulated, all of these fake-Trotskyists are finding even nominal international "discipline" intolerably wearisome.

## Democratic Centralism? Never heard of it!

The reformist American SWP went into opposition to the Usec majority prior to the "Ninth World Congress" in early 1969 which adopted a vicarious "guerrilla warfare" line toward Latin America. In the context of ever-deepening adaptation to the norms of social-democratic reformism -- overwhelming electoralist "strategy", parliamentarist reform gimmicks (the "Bill of Rights for Working People"), sidling up to the liberal wing of the labor bureaucracy -- the SWP has grown increasingly determined to dissociate itself from the scruffy and frequently embarrassing unreconstructed New Lefters of the European Usec sections.

This was expressed most succinctly when the SWP unceremoniously chucked out its pro-IMT members (grouped in the ill-starred "Internationalist Tendency", since disappeared) on 4 July 1974, and then curtly told Mandel and company to keep their noses out of its internal affairs. The IMT howled about SWP "federalism", but ended up knuckling under to the flagrantly undemocratic

regime of its "fraternal supporters" in the US. Now the SWP is aggressively shopping around for a new international marriage of convenience, as if oblivious to the fact that it does not yet have a divorce from the IMT.

The SWP has been perfectly explicit in disavowing the Leninist principle of international democratic centralism. In the words of SWP national secretary Jack Barnes:

"The structure of the international is different from the party. For instance, the decisions of the international are not binding on members of national parties. In other words, the highest body of a party is its national convention -- it decides its tactics and elects its leadership -- not the conventions or congresses or meetings of the Fourth International." (*Militant*, 11 June 1976)

The context makes this blatant disavowal of Leninist norms even more despicable: it comes in a deposition that is a key part of the "socialist Watersuit". Note that it is the SWP which brought the court action, not the government.

Moreover, Barnes' gratuitous renunciation of international democratic centralism is accompanied by an explanatory note (*Militant*, 18 June) admitting that the SWP voluntarily supplied the court with "copies of the party's documents, resolutions, speeches, and pamphlets". This clears up the origins of the SWP international internal bulletins to be found in the court record of this case (see "SWP Renounces Revolution in Court", *WV* no 59, 3 January 1975), and would at a minimum lead to a control commission investigation in a revolutionary International worthy of the name.

That the SWP has no intention of letting "the international" tell it what to do has been clear for some time. Previously, however, the SWP had been content to hide behind the paper-tiger Voorhis Act (a reactionary statute prohibiting international affiliation, which is patently unconstitutional and has never been applied). Now Barnes has made a "principle" out of the SWP's declaration of independence.

For Trotsky, there was nothing "different" about democratic centralism on the international level. The founding statutes of the Fourth International (which, should SWP leaders have for-

gotten, called itself the "World Party of Socialist Revolution") clearly state:

"The sections are required to observe the decisions and resolutions of the International Conference and, in its absence, of the International Executive Committee, represented during the intervals between its meetings by the International Secretariat."

On paper, even the revisionist Usec majority espouses disciplined international organization. Its statutes as published after the 1974 "world congress" proclaim:

"The highest body of the Fourth International is constituted by the World Congress....  
"Decisions of higher organs are strictly binding on lower organs....  
"Decisions are taken by majority vote. Minorities are obliged to apply majority decisions."

In practice, the IMT has long since abandoned international democratic centralism in order to maintain the band-aid "unity" of its "international". Now, however, it is rapidly finding reason to disavow the formalities as well. Just as Stalin found it expedient to officially dissolve the Third International as an encumbrance which unnecessarily frightened the bourgeoisie, the IMT has discovered that orthodox labels like "Fourth International" and "democratic centralism" are getting in the way of its appetites toward the timid centrists and social democrats of the "broad (formerly new mass) vanguard".

This impressionistic conglomeration is comprised of petty-bourgeois radicals, "Third World" nationalist movements, militant workers outside the control of the Communist Party, oppressed strata such as racial minorities and women -- along with anything else that strikes the IMT's fancy at any given time. The IMT dreamed up this non-category to denote a combination recruitment pool -- to be attracted by catering to the mood of the moment -- and ready-made "revolutionary" force whose spontaneous militancy can supposedly substitute for a Trotskyist vanguard party at the head of a conscious and organized working class.

## What's in a name?

The showpiece section and main power base of the IMT is the French Ligue Communiste Revolutionnaire (LCR). And as far as the LCR is concerned, the incarnation of the "broad vanguard" is the left-social-democratic Parti Socialiste Unifie (PSU), particularly the wing dominated by ex-Trotskyists such as Yvan Craipeau and Michel Pablo. For some time, the LCR has been playing with possibilities for entries or fusions involving the PSU -- in the political resolution of the LCR's first congress the PSU is termed "centrist" and included in the "revolutionary far left" with the additional note:

In interview with *Politique Hebdo* Ernest Mandel asks "what difference do labels make?" offering to renounce the Fourth International.

PSU leader Craipeau replies "it's not the label that will have to be changed".



"For it must be clearly stated that we aim farther and higher than tactical alliances and suspicious cooperation. We must aim at a common revolutionary organization [of the "far left"], based on a prior debate on revolutionary strategy and the destruction of the bourgeois state, on the characterization of the Union of the Left and tactics toward the reformists, and on a practice which sets aside any sectarian spirit." (*Rouge*, 27 December 1974)

Now it appears that Pablo and company are willing to consider a "regroupment" -- on certain conditions. Some elements of the LCR (Tendencias 1 and 4) will have to be disposed of and the name "Fourth International" abandoned.

In response to these nibbles of interest, IMT leader Ernest Mandel leaped into the pages of *Politique Hebdo* (10-16 June 1976), a radical weekly which the LCR carefully cultivates as a means to pursue fun and games with the PSU, to demonstrate sweet reasonableness and disabuse skeptics of any notion that his associates might get bogged down in dogmatic formalities. Accordingly, we suddenly find Mandel singing Jack Barnes' tune as regards international democratic centralism:

"The variety of national situations implies a variety of tactics and democratic centralism cannot be applied internationally as it is nationally. This is what, along with the concern to make debates public, has allowed us to do away with reminiscences of Stalinism which are associated with this structure."

Linking the principle of international democratic centralism to Stalinism and pronouncing himself in favor of public attacks on official policy by oppositional minorities, Mandel has launched a frontal assault on the Trotskyist program in this amazing interview. Asked whether the "existence of the Fourth International is not an obstacle" to the kind of regroupment envisioned by the USec, Mandel is unambiguous:

"What difference do labels make? If in the political arena we encountered political forces which agreed with our strategic and tactical orientation and which were repulsed only by the historical reference and the name we would get rid of it in 24 hours."

For the benefit of anyone not satisfied with jettisoning the Fourth International, Mandel magnanimously offered to throw out all references to "a bearded man named Leon Trotsky" as well! Trying to give this grotesquely opportunist policy the aura of "success", Mandel adds:

"We have become a modest pole of attraction. And when we join with ETA V1 [in Spain], the Colombia Socialist Bloc or the Icelandic Socialist Youth, they don't discuss the label."

No doubt! What this expert in maneuverism fails to mention, however, is that when the USec group in Chile helped set up the MIR in 1965, they also (and quite explicitly) didn't discuss the "label" of the Fourth International. This led to the expulsion of all "Trotskyists" a couple of years later and places on Mandel and company the responsibility for the fact that militants wishing to go farther than the UP were instead tied to the popular front by the MIR's "critical support" to Allende.

The debate over "labels" and "numbers" has a history in the French Trotskyist movement. During the so-called "French turn" (the Trotskyists' mid-1930s entry into the French social democracy), Trotsky waged a harsh polemic against those (led by R Molinier and P Frank, now part of the USec) who wanted to capitulate in the face of the charge by Marcel Pivert that the Trotskyists "alienated the masses" by their "label" (Bolshevik-Leninists) and their "number" (Fourth International). Trotsky answered Pivert and implicitly addressed the conciliators in an article entitled "'Labels' and 'Numbers'":

"By their name the Bolshevik-Leninists say to each and all ... that they base themselves on the experiences of October, developed in the decisions of the first four Congresses of the Communist International; that they are in solidarity with the theoretical and practical work accomplished by the 'Left Opposition' of the Communist International (1923-32); finally that they stand under the banner of the Fourth International. In politics, the 'name' is the 'flag'. Those who today renounce a revolutionary name to please Blum and company will tomorrow just as easily renounce the red flag for the tricolor flag." (*Writings*, 1935-36).

He adds, "To invoke the 'masses' serves, in this case, only to cover one's own hesitations". Trotsky's polemic against those who wanted to accommodate Pivert's "Revolutionary Left" took concrete form when the Molinier-Frank group first proposed a "mass" paper and then broke discipline to begin publishing *La Commune*. Even before Molinier's fake-agitational paper appeared, Trotsky strongly attacked it.

This whole controversy is unmistakably alluded to by an informed editor of *Politique Hebdo*, for the Mandel interview is appropriately entitled "What Difference Do Labels Make?" and the photo

Continued on page six

## As Mandel Secretariat swings right

# CL joins fake "mass paper" craze

The Communist League (CL), one of Australia's two affiliates of the dis-"United Secretariat of the Fourth International" of Ernest Mandel and company is the latest in a coterie of fake "Trotskyist" groups to join the "mass paper" craze. Determined not to "propagandize from the sidelines", and in a hurry to "turn to the masses", the CL has proclaimed that its irregular fortnightly, the *Militant*, is now an "activist weekly". The miniscule Communist League vows to make the formidable leap to a weekly on the basis of will power and little else:

"The Communist League in Australia is a young and tiny organisation; our revolutionary socialism is marginal to the forces of the reformists. But we are determined that the voice of revolutionary Marxism shall be heard, now. We have not waited to amass great sums of money before publishing the weekly *Militant*. We are responding to the urgent demands of the class struggle ..." (*Militant*, 21 July 1976).

What the centrist CL is actually responding to is its urgent opportunist appetites. These include keeping up with its reformist brethren in the much more sizeable Socialist Workers Party (SWP), the other Australian adherent to the USec amalgam, whose *Direct Action* went weekly at the beginning of this year, and catching up with the Healyite Socialist Labour League, which is wringing every last drop of blood and sweat from its high-turnover membership in a mad drive to go daily in 1977. CL members would do well to examine the British Healyites of the Workers Revolutionary Party (WRP), who are now working on their second daily, the *News Line*, following the ignominious collapse of the *Workers Press*. Carrying the methodology of fake mass agitational papers to its logical conclusion, *News Line* features spy scares, government sex scandals, human interest "tidbits", and reads more like the *Daily Mirror* than a political, let alone Trotskyist, paper.

### "The great tradition of muckraking journalism"

The first weekly *Militant*, like previous issues of this notoriously sloppy and unprofessional paper, can hardly inspire the confidence of the CL's hard-pressed ranks in the organisation's ability to carry through with this scheme. The paper came out *three weeks* after the previous issue. An article about a sit-in strike of GMH workers is headlined, "Ford Workers Sit-In", lay-out and typesetting errors make some sections unreadable, and part of one article reads, "MILITANT ASKS THESE CANCEL ABOVE MILITANT asks these questions ...".

The sloppiness of the *Militant*, however, is simply one reflection of the fakery of trying to create the impression of a mass paper when such a task is well beyond the real ability of the organisation behind the paper. Readers of a revolutionary paper, whether a mass paper or a small propaganda journal, should expect a revolutionary analysis and program. Instead the *Militant*, in defending its front-page "exposes" of police corruption, promises to depart from working-class politics altogether for a liberal reformist perspective by taking up "the great tradition of muckraking journalism"!

The weekly *Militant* is part of a right turn by the CL which flows from its centrist appetite to link up with the left wing of the trade-union and ALP bureaucracies. Since the sacking of the Whitlam government last year, the CL has become increasingly frenzied, seeking to create the impression that the Fraser government can be thrown

out at a moment's notice by a mobilised working class. The *Militant* (21 July) conjures up "important sections" of the unions that are supposedly "prepared to take whatever action is needed to bring down the Fraser government". Central to the CL thesis is the myth that a sizeable minority of militant workers, predominantly youth, have broken from the illusions of social-democracy, left-reformism and Stalinism. Thus the CL plans to build "*Militant* groups" in working-class suburbs of young workers who want to "bring down the Fraser government and return a Labor government pledged to socialist policies".

The meaning of the CL's central slogan is clear -- a new Whitlam regime with a new set of social-welfare promises! Nowhere in its program for bringing down the Fraser government does the CL mention a workers government. A new ALP administration in Canberra will not bring the workers to power! A workers government can be achieved only through the smashing of the bourgeois parliament, establishment of independent organs of workers power (such as soviets), and the expropriation of the bourgeoisie as a class. For this it is necessary first to throw out the trade-union misleaders and break the stranglehold of the reformist ALP over the working class, replacing both with revolutionary leadership. Where the CL proposes to build a weekly paper and neighbourhood groups on the basis of muckraking and a program of pushing the ALP back to power, revolutionists propose the building of the vanguard party and a program aimed at bringing the working class to power.

### What is a mass paper?

Trotsky pointed out that while it was the duty of a revolutionary organisation to make its paper as widely accessible to the masses as possible, this task cannot be solved except as a function of the growth and development of the revolutionary cadre and organisation. This is precisely the thinking the CL has rejected in favour of opportunist impatience, which "leads to this conclusion: The masses do not come because our ideas are too complicated and our slogans too advanced. It is therefore necessary to simplify our program, lighten our slogans -- in short, to throw out ballast." (Trotsky, "What Is A 'Mass Paper'", 1935).

For the Spartacist League, development of the revolutionary press goes hand-in-hand with the development of the real work of the party -- fractions in the unions, work among women and minorities, the development of a youth organisation and geographical expansion. Furthermore, Marxists see no artificial counterposition between a "propaganda" press and an "activist" press: a genuinely revolutionary press is always concerned primarily with revolutionary propaganda -- the presentation of a fighting program for working-class conquest of power. The paper of a mass party will be more agitational than that of a small propaganda group, but neither one will water down the program in order to merge with radicalising layers of workers or youth, real or imagined. The CL's plans to virtually liquidate into frenzied weekly production and reformist neighbourhood groups will logically lead to the complete burying of the organisation inside the ALP, with the "perspective" of gently pushing the reformists to the "left". ■

### Trotzkistischen Liga Deutschlands

bi-monthly  
\$A6 per year

order from/pay to:  
Postlagerkarte  
A 051 429 Berlin  
West Germany  
Postscheckkonto  
Berlin West:  
503 57 - 107  
(Wolfgang Hohmann)

or  
Spartacist League,  
GPO Box 3473,  
Sydney, 2001.



No. 12 SUMMER 1976

## Women and Revolution

Journal of the Women's Commission of the Spartacist League

**Early Bolshevik Work Among Women of the Soviet East... 14**

Tadzhik mountain women at an early Soviet school for the liquidation of illiteracy

**SUBSCRIBE  
4 issues - \$2.00**

Order from/pay to:  
Spartacist League,  
GPO Box 3473,  
Sydney, 2001.

Kibbutzim Restore Nuclear Family .....	2
The Pankhursts: Suffrage and Socialism ....	8
Thalidomide Cover-up Exposed.....	20
Socialist Workers Party and NOW:	
Together at Last .....	24



## Victim of Allende's popular front and the Pinochet Junta

# Free Sergeant Cardenas!

Beginning on 5 August 1973, a wave of arrests swept through Chilean naval installations in the ports of Valparaiso and Talcahuano. In all, more than 100 people were detained on charges of seditious activity. They were brutally tortured and held incommunicado until, on September 11, the Popular Unity (UP) regime was overthrown by a military conspiracy.

But the "plotters" were not released by the new regime, for the "crime" of the non-commissioned officers and sailors arrested in early August had been to oppose an attempted coup against the elected government of Salvador Allende. For this they were imprisoned for more than 30 days under the UP without the government lifting a finger to defend them, and have sat in jail for more than 33 months since then.

Last month, 57 of the accused were finally sentenced on charges of mutiny and subversion. Most received three-year terms, others got eight years. Two civilians from the MAPU party, Hernan Pacheco and Leopoldo Luna, were given 11 and 10 years respectively, and Juan Cardenas, the sailor identified by the naval prosecutor as leader of



the "conspiracy", was sentenced to 13 years at hard labor.

These men are among the most viciously persecuted victims of the barbarous Pinochet junta. They are also forgotten men. Their names are not included in the lists of prisoners highlighted by the various "Democratic Chile" committees internationally for a simple reason: to raise their case is to indict the criminal passivity of the Socialist and Communist leaders in the face of the real conspirators; it is to call into question the popular front that bound the workers to the "constitutionalist" military officers.

Defend Juan Cardenas and his comrades, victims of the junta, pariahs of the popular front! Their crime? They sought to prevent the mass butchery that has already cost over 30,000.

### The "Conspiracy"

The 62 naval personnel against whom charges were filed were of modest origins. Sergeant Cardenas was the highest ranking non-com and a majority of the naval personnel were enlisted men; 17 were employees of the government shipyards. None were affiliated with left-wing political groups.

After the *tamazo*, the attempted putsch by an armored regiment in Santiago on 29 June 1973, Socialist Party general secretary Carlos Altamirano and MIR leader Miguel Enriquez called on soldiers and sailors to disobey orders for a coup. In response, a group of naval personnel arranged a meeting with Altamirano, Enriquez and MAPU chief Oscar Garreton. At this meeting, they informed the political leaders of preparations for a putsch taking place in the navy, and swore to defend the legal government.

The naval commanders evidently found out about this meeting, and decided to smoke out the "unreliable elements". On the eve of August 5, the crews of the cruisers Blanco Encalada and Almirante Latorre were informed that the high command had resolved to take power; they were given two hours to settle personal affairs and present themselves in formation. The non-coms and enlisted men who had pledged to defend the UP government knew that the departure of the fleet was the signal for the coup (as later occurred,

on September 10), so they immediately rushed to their units in order to prevent the ships from sailing. But when they arrived they were arrested by the cossacks of the naval infantry (marines) and the military intelligence service.

The torture suffered by the sailors was ferocious. After being repeatedly kicked and beaten they were thrown into "the pool" -- a tank full of mud, excrement, gravel and all kinds of garbage -- and then forced to lie down so that their bodies were cut open by the gravel.... During the questioning, the sailors were repeatedly ordered to admit that Altamirano, Enriquez and Garreton were their leaders, and when they refused they were strapped to the "cross", a medieval torture device, where they were left expecting to be "quartered" at any time. In the case of Cardenas, simulated executions were also used in an attempt to force a "confession"....

Meanwhile, the naval high command was demanding the removal of parliamentary immunity for Altamirano and Garreton, so that they could be tried for encouraging a mutiny. Simultaneously, the air force was brazenly carrying out searches for arms in factories around the country, and the truck owners' "strike" reduced food supplies and sent the petty bourgeoisie into a panic. "Destabilization" was going full blast; the coup was under way.

### The UP responds

Despite the tortures, the sailors were not broken. They managed to smuggle out a letter, signed by 29 of the arrested, which denounced the lie that they had conspired with left-wing political leaders. On the contrary, they said, "We, sailors who oppose a coup d'etat, have attempted by every means to inform the people and the government of the coup being prepared by the officers of the Navy". After describing the incredible brutalities inflicted upon them, the signatories concluded:

"Is it a crime to defend the government, the Constitution, legality and the people? Or, on the other hand, is it legal not to respect the law, to overthrow the government and wipe out the lives of thousands of people?  
"WE WILL LET THE WORKERS ANSWER THAT."

This letter was read by Carlos Altamirano at a mass rally in the National Stadium (soon to be used as a torture center on September 9). But what did this "socialist", who led the left wing of Allende's party, do during the preceding month? His only action was to issue an equivocating statement calling for "agreement between the people and the armed forces in a noble and patriotic mission" and stating, "we don't want to suggest that our armed forces ... could choose the way of armed *pronunciamentos* which would lead them to lead reactionary dictatorships such as in countries like Brazil ..." (*Punto Final*, 11 September 1973).

And Allende? On August 9, two days after the announcement of the mass arrests by naval authorities, he swore in a new cabinet, including the heads of the three armed forces and the national police, denouncing "ultra-leftists" who would create a "parallel army" and stating: "The mission of this Cabinet is to restore political order and to put an end to fascist or left-wing groups that try to subvert that order" (*New York Times*, 10 August 1973, our emphasis). As part of the tacit "deal" which laid the basis for the short-lived UP-military coalition, Allende kept hands off the armed forces during his last month of office. This permitted the generals to organize their coup without interference from outside, and to continue the reign of terror against "unreliable elements" within the military.

The popular front failed to defend those courageous sailors who risked their lives to defend it. This is not because of any "right turn" by the UP in its last months, but is inherent in the nature of the popular front. From the very beginning, with the inclusion of the Radicals and other small bourgeois parties in the Popular Unity coalition, the reformist Socialist and Communist parties gave guarantees of their commitment to remain within the bounds of the capitalist system. In the end this meant surrendering meekly, without resistance, to a horrendous bloodbath that cost the lives of thousands of the most militant workers and leftists, and of Allende himself.

-- Smash the junta through workers revolution!  
No popular front illusions!

-- Free Juan Cardenas and his comrades! Free all class-war prisoners in Chile!■

(reprinted from *Workers Vanguard* no 116, 2 July 1976)

## Mandel . . .

Continued from page five

of the USec leader is published next to the title page of ... an issue of *La Commune!* A follow-up interview with Craipeau two pages later bears the title, "It's Not the Label That Will Have to be Changed".

As for Pablo, the arch-revisionist whose liquidationist policies led to the destruction of the Fourth International in 1951-53, Mandel and Krivine are now attempting to reunite with him on the basis of once again breaking with the SWP and this time formally giving up the "label" of the Fourth International to boot! Those who deny the Pabloist liquidationism of USec policies will have a hard time explaining this one.

### On to the popular front

Capturing the periphery of the PSU's over-age ex-Trotskyists is but a modest step in the LCR's grandiose "strategy" of building revolutionary parties by sucking in the "broad vanguard". A recent series of policy statements in IMT publications, touched off by the Italian and Portuguese elections, gives a good idea of what Mandel/Maitan/Krivine have in mind. Thus the Italian USec section, the Gruppi Comunisti Rivoluzionari (GCR), envision a Communist Party/Socialist Party government which might include "independents who are not members of either of these two parties or representatives of possible new formations might be part of such a government, provided they were willing to accept its program and discipline" (*Inprecor*, 24 June).

The reference to "new formations" is an unmistakable allusion to the Democrazia Proletaria (DP) electoral bloc which won six seats in the June 20-21 Italian elections. Its components are the Party of Proletarian Unity (PDUP), Avanguardia Operaia and (most recently) Lotta Continua, thereby encompassing the entirety of the USec's sought-for "broad vanguard". It is not surprising that the GCR ran candidates (it was only allowed three) on the DP slate in the election; now Maitan draws the necessary conclusion and calls on Democrazia Proletaria to accept the "program and discipline" of the PCI!

While the DP parties were giving a "critical" cover to the PCI's campaign for a "historic compromise" with Christian Democracy, by calling for a "left government", the GCR maintained a fig leaf of orthodoxy pointing out that this slogan opened the way to a popular front with bourgeois forces. However, the LCR, yearning for the chance to put together a similar prop to the popular front in France, praised the Democrazia Proletaria bloc uncritically. Krivine wrote:

"Going beyond sectarian traditions [the far left] managed to run united in the elections. There thus appeared a pole of attraction for all those who are suspicious of the experience of class collaboration."

There were disagreements within the DP slate, says Krivine, but "it was a question of a debate within a framework of unity which unfortunately has not yet appeared in France" (*Rouge*, 19 June). A *Rouge* editorial (21 June) on election day in Italy cheered: "DP succeeded in emerging as a consistent and politically viable pole, especially to the degree that it expressed the slogan of a government of the lefts with a certain homogeneity."

What's behind the slogan of a "government of the lefts" is revealed in the same 1974 LCR resolution that called for a "common revolutionary organization" of the far left. It states: "To denounce the Union of the Left as a popular front could only lead to a dangerous confusion of [our] tasks." Even before this congress the LCR assiduously avoided any such "confusion", calling for votes to Union of the Left candidates in the second round of the 1973 legislative elections. In 1974, it called for votes for the single candidate of the Union of the Left on the second round of presidential elections. And now Krivine and company call for an Allende-style popular front in Italy. Only Italy? No, the LCR also lusts for a united left slate for the 1978 French legislative elections, to include the PSU, Revolution! and Lutte Ouvriere. Such a French DP would be the "far left" vehicle for tailing after the Union of the Left.

The same line has been extended to Portugal, with some modifications due to the political role of the Armed Forces Movement (MFA) and the relative preponderance of Maoist groups in the misnamed "far left". Throughout early 1975, USec articles and declarations sidestepped or obfuscated the bourgeois character of the MFA. However, when Portuguese IMT supporters -- the Liga Comunista Internacionalista (LCI) -- signed the document of the "Revolutionary United Front" (FUR) in late August, calling for support to the "MFA-People Alliance", IMT leaders rapped them on the knuckles. The flurry which this precipitated in the USec was stilled when the LCI at a special conference in January adopted a sharp "self-criticism" denouncing its capitulation to the FUR as "sectarian and divisionist" -- in other words, as ultra-leftism rather than class collaboration.

Now, however, with the fiasco of the Portuguese USec supporters' joint presidential candidate (withdrawn at the last minute and denounced by her erstwhile sponsors as a provocateur) simply swept under the rug, the question of what policy to take in the June 27 elections led to a sharp division within the LCR which has been displayed in the pages of *Rouge* (30 June). Filoche, the leader of ex-Tendency 1 who is close to the SWP, calls for a vote for the Communist candidate, Pato. Krivine calls for a vote for Major Carvalho, arguing that since "Otelo" is supported by the "broad vanguard", revolutionary Marxists should back him. But wait, there is a third position! Perhaps a section of the LCR has thrown off unprincipled maneuvering and told the workers clearly that they should refuse to vote for the bourgeois officer or the Stalinist candidate whose program is a popular front with the armed forces? Alas, it is only Bensaid, who calls for votes to both Carvalho and Pato!

#### Where is the USec going?

The Leninist-Trotskyist Faction whose core is the bloc between the SWP and Argentine PST is apparently no more stable than the USec as a whole. The PST has increasingly distanced itself from the SWP's disgustingly rightist stands on Portugal and Angola and at the February 1976 USec plenum voted for the IMT's Angola position and against both the resolutions on Portugal (*Imprecor*, 4 March 1976).

The PST's new-found repugnance for the SWP's international line certainly has as its basis considerations of horse-trading. Well in advance of its rapprochement with the IMT, the PST was already locked into a power struggle against the SWP within the pro-LTF sections. The PST-engineered split in the Mexican Liga Socialista in September 1975 must have been months in the making, and, according to the SWP, months of factional intriguing in the Portuguese Partido Revolucionario dos Trabalhadores culminated in the expulsion of SWP supporters by PST supporters ([SWP] *International Information Bulletin*, April 1976).

The SWP seems to be on a converging course with the French Organisation Communiste Internationaliste (OCI) of P Lambert and its international allies. The SWP/OCI discussions have been a bone of contention in the USec since 1974. More recently, much to the IMT's annoyance, the SWP-aligned Quebec group has undertaken serious fusion discussions with its OCI-affiliated counterpart. The Quebec Lambertists' attendance at the LTF group's December 1975 conference, like the presence of an OCI representative at the August 1975 SWP convention, is an unambiguous declaration that diplomatic obeisance to the "unity of the Fourth International" will not stand in the way of the SWP's pursuit of more congenial bloc partners.

The political logic behind the USec's main tendencies -- the SWP toward mainstream social-democratic reformism, the IMT toward the "re-composition" of centrist forces into trial-run electoral blocs in the direction of classic popular frontism -- will tend to impel them toward an outright split. But the fundamental organizational principle of both the centrist and reformist wings of the USec is maneuverism, so the political physiognomy of the eventual split will no doubt distort the programmatic axes of the seven-year factional struggle beyond recognition.

Unlike the former "third tendency" -- which has, in fragmented fashion, either capitulated to the majority (Germany) or linked up with the rotten remains of an earlier USec split, the Spartacusbund (Austria and Italy) -- oppositionists within the USec, if they are to find their way to authentic Trotskyism, must break with the revisionism of both the IMT and the LTF. Only the international Spartacist tendency, which has refused to capitulate to popular frontism or bourgeois populism and whose adherence to international democratic centralism is based on principled programmatic congruence, provides the groundwork upon which the Fourth International can be reforged. ■

(reprinted from *Workers Vanguard* no 117, 9 July 1976)

## ... Olympics

Continued from page one

ordinated to diplomatic manoeuvring. The deformed workers states, with their nationalist ideology and commitment to the substitution of diplomatic "victories" for class-struggle victories in the name of "peaceful coexistence", accept the framework which defines the Olympic games as mainly a tool for patriotic self-congratulation, expending considerable resources of their planned economies in the training of superior athletes.

The "cold war" mentality of the 1950s virtually reduced the Olympics to a symbolic test of superiority between "Soviet socialist man" and the "rugged individualism" of the "free world". When the USSR outpointed the US for the first time in 1956, it produced a minor national trauma and much hand-wringing over the supposed loss of moral fibre among American youth. But when national hostility reaches a certain pitch, it explodes among the athletes themselves. In 1956, shortly after Soviet tanks crushed the workers' uprising in Budapest, the Russian and Hungarian water polo teams met at the Melbourne Olympics. Within minutes the pool was red with blood.

## SWP . . . .

Continued from page three

The Spartacist League stands on the revolutionary tradition of the SWP in the 1930s and 40s which, as in the case of the Trotskyist-led Minneapolis Teamsters' (truck drivers) union defence guard that chased the fascist Silver Shirts out of town in August 1938, fought to mobilise the mass organisations of workers and blacks for defence squads to teach the racist/fascist scum a lesson in the only language they understand.

The SWP's absolute defence of democratic "freedom of speech" does not extend to its communist critics within the labour movement. The Australian SWP has a continuing policy of excluding Spartacists from "public" *Direct Action* forums for alleged but non-existent "disruption" while the American SWP viciously assaulted and ejected three trade-union militants from their Militant Forum last year when they attempted to protest the exclusion of the SLUS. Ironically at the Willie Mae Reid meetings the SWP encountered a real case of disruption from the Healyite Socialist Labour League (SLL). Pushing their vile and baseless slanders that US SWP leaders Joseph Hansen and George Novack are accomplices of the GPU (Soviet secret police), the SLL political bandits shouted, screamed and chanted during question-time at Reid's talks in Sydney while the SWP leadership spinelessly stood by and watched.

The SLL's scurrilous attacks and outrages against workers' democracy served to prevent the exposure of the SWP's wretched reformism in the meetings and allowed the SWP, with seeming justification, to place a total political ban on SLL attendance at its public meetings, thus reinforcing its position for political exclusion of left critics. The Spartacist League protested both the SLL's disruption and the blanket political exclusionism of the SWP. When approached by the SWP to sign a declaration condemning the disruption the SL submitted a statement which the SWP ignored (see SL statement reprinted on page three). Real disrupters of a public meeting can be ejected, but the SWP's generalised bans serve only the opportunist SLL and SWP, both of whom fear political exposure and need to justify their hypocritical exclusionism.

From Reid's tour it was transparently obvious that the SWP's US presidential campaign is explicitly class-collaborationist, in no way a supportable working-class alternative to capitalism. The US SWP's aping of liberalism over troops to Boston, "free speech" for fascists and reforming US foreign policy, the FBI and CIA etc, can only build a reformist obstacle to the coming American revolution. ■

The cry that "politics should be kept out of the Olympics" also reflects American and European smug contempt for the "lesser nations" of Asia and Africa. During the first and second world wars, the Olympics were simply cancelled. If in 1944 anyone had suggested that the Olympics be held on schedule in neutral Sweden so that Russian, German and French youth could compete in a spirit of brotherhood, he would certainly have been declared a lunatic. Yet liberal sports-writers argue that Israeli and Egyptian, or Pakistani and Indian, athletes should somehow be unaffected by the fratricidal antagonisms whipped up by their bourgeoisies.

#### Sports in a socialist world

But the sentiment that "politics should be kept out of sports" reflects more than just liberal mushy-headedness. Like music or astronomy, athletics is a genuinely trans-national activity whose standards of achievement are international. Sports like judo and new techniques like the back flip (the "Fosbury flop") in high jumping and the East German-developed skin suit in swimming were rapidly internationalised. The notion that national antagonisms should not prevent athletes from competing against one another is in part a rational impulse which is utopian in the consummately irrational world system dominated by capitalism.

A socialist society would see an unprecedented flowering of athletics on every level. Greater individual athletes will be produced, without the mutilation which produces illiterate American boxers and Russian gymnasts who have done nothing else since they were four. Amateur sports will draw upon the broader participation of people from all social and age groups, who will find in athletics a source of pleasure, relaxation and health. Socialist man, benefiting from the enormous increase in leisure resulting from the qualitative expansion of the means of production inaugurated by the destruction of private ownership, will find in all the diverse forms of creative endeavour an outlet for a competitive spirit unlike that which now finds its expression in a sports world suffused with racism, sadism and commercialism. In Trotsky's words, socialist man "will make it his business to achieve beauty by giving the movement of his own limbs the utmost precision, purposefulness and economy in his work, his walk and his play". ■

## OBL . . . .

Continued from page three

editorship law) is derived from an earlier law of the first Austrian republic which was extensively used under the clerical-fascist regime of Schussnig during the 1930s. In 1936 an Austrian Trotskyist, Friedrich Neischer, was convicted under this law for articles appearing in the clandestine newspaper *Der Bolschewik*.

The state's main interest in the 1936 trial was to convict Neischer of high treason, for which the punishment was life imprisonment. The original judges disagreed, but did take objection to every conceivable type of revolutionary propaganda. Their verdict cites with wide-eyed incredulity such "offensive" and "shocking" statements in *Der Bolschewik* as:

"the brown [Nazi]-infested judiciary and police are lusting to pounce upon the proletarian revolutionaries; all capitalist countries are robbers and mortal enemies of the workers, and therefore the universal slogan: the enemy is at home; the Communists and Social Democrats had better recognize that all their deferential petitions to the government, their bowing and scraping and begging for democratic rights, only demonstrate to the class enemy the impotence of the workers; the bourgeoisie won't be assuaged, it is necessary to go for the jugular; democratic rights can only be won back through revolutionary struggle."

Reviling such "crass" expressions as "going for the jugular", "life-and-death class struggle" and slogans such as, "Down with Austria! We shall organize the defeat of our country! Dictatorship of the proletariat!" the court held that the press law was violated because "revolution is affirmed as a positive goal". Later, the appeals court also found Neischer guilty of high treason.

With this unsavory legal precedent the present authorities prefer to mask their censorship in a purely "technical" garb, refusing to allow the defendants to justify and explain their views which are under prosecution. That Kreisky Socialists must rely on precedents derived from the clerical-fascist regime is a telling indictment of the reactionary anti-working-class character of social democracy's smug "welfare state" capitalism. We call on all socialists and defenders of democratic liberties to denounce the conviction of Comrade Dorner and demand that the charges against her and the OBL be immediately dropped! ■

(reprinted from *Workers Vanguard* no 119, 23 July 1976)

# Australasian SPARTACIST



## Subscribe 12 issues — \$2

NAME \_\_\_\_\_  
 ADDRESS \_\_\_\_\_  
 CITY \_\_\_\_\_ STATE \_\_\_\_\_  
 POSTCODE \_\_\_\_\_

mail to/make cheques payable to:

Spartacist Publications,  
 GPO Box 3473,  
 Sydney, NSW, 2001.





## Yahya Khan, Nixon, Pinochet, and now —

# Fraser "warmly embraced" by Peking

If you believe the Maoist press, which routinely characterises conservative bourgeois politicians like Malcolm Fraser as "fascist", then you can only conclude that the bureaucratic misrulers in Peking have concluded yet another alliance with yet another of the world's worst bloody-handed butchers. For it was none other than Fraser -- the "fascist dictator", "millionaire hypocrite grazier", "agent of US imperialism" and "mere pigmy" (!) -- who strode into the Great Hall of the People last month for one of the most enthusiastic Peking welcomes in recent memory, and to paeans of praise as well from the local Maoist *Vanguard* for his tough stand against "Soviet social-imperialism".

The fact that the "mere pygmy" Fraser is a reactionary capitalist politician and in no sense a "fascist" does not lighten the immense load of hypocrisy which the Mao clique bears. In comparison with the bloody price paid by workers and peasants for Mao's real fascist and butcher friends, the addition of Fraser to the list has been painless indeed.

Fraser handed Peking what it wanted on a diplomatic silver platter. Before his departure, the Prime Minister told Parliament that detente was a failure, the Soviet Union was responsible for the arms race and Australia should have good relations with China "now and in the future". This sent up a howl of protest from liberal commentators and opposition leader Gough Whitlam, who complained that Fraser was abandoning the "even-handed" policy of his Labor Party administration.

Upon his arrival in Peking, Fraser was greeted by a special editorial in the *People's Daily* repeating his remarks, no doubt with embellishments, and was boycotted by Soviet-bloc ambassadors. Worse for Fraser was the leak -- probably by a senior member of his entourage upset with current policy -- of secret transcripts of his talks with Chinese Premier Hua Kuo-feng, including speculative reports that Fraser had called for an anti-Soviet military alliance of China, Australia, Japan and the US. Tall tale or not, it is a fact that Fraser's military/foreign policy starts with paranoid fear of Soviet naval presence in the Indian Ocean (where, unlike the US, the USSR has no bases) and ends with high-pressure demands on the US to keep up its military forces in Asia and the Pacific. All of this is music to Maoist ears.

Since the late 1960s, when Mao's previous diplomatic approach aimed at wooing left-nationalist demagogues like Nkrumah of Ghana and Sukarno of Indonesia had failed (in particular through the slaughter of half a million workers, peasants and Communists in Indonesia egged on by Sukarno himself in 1965), Mao and company engineered a new turn: pursuit of alliance with the US against their bureaucratic rivals in Moscow. To do this, these Peking Stalinists befriended tin-pot, CIA-backed butchers and disavowed workers' and peasants' movements all over the globe.

### "China has behaved well"

In just one of the more obscene examples, as the marauding Pakistani army butchered *one million* Bengalis in its genocidal war against the Bengali national liberation struggle in 1971, Chou En-lai commended "Your Excellency" Yahya Khan and despicably denounced the fallen nationalist fighters as "a handful of individuals intent on sabotaging Pakistan's unity" (*Le Monde*, 14 April 1971)! Betrayals of many others, including Ceylonese JVP youth rebels (1971), Omani national liberation fighters (1973) and Iraqi Kurds (1975) followed suit.

By September 1973 it was surely an automatic reflex in the Chinese foreign office to give open support to Pinochet's bloody coup against the popular-front Allende regime in Chile. As desperate leftists and working-class militants fled from Pinochet's troops in the streets of Santiago they found *no refuge* in the Chinese embassy, which, unlike other embassies, *closed its doors* and because of this was the only one not guarded by soldiers! China was among the first to recognise the new regime while the screams still echoed in the National Stadium, and recently Peking offered Pinochet a loan of US\$58 million

to help this butcher regime -- which still tortures thousands of jailed workers and communists -- break out of its international economic isolation. Pinochet's comment on Mao's treachery needs no elaboration: "China has behaved well" (*New York Times*, 29 November 1975)!

Recognising that the industrially stronger Soviet Union was its greater enemy, US imperialism opened the door to alliance with China in exchange for Mao's pressure on the Vietnamese Stalinists to accept the robber's peace of Kissinger. The aim was essentially achieved when Nixon and Chou En-lai sipped champagne in Peking in 1972 as the US attacked Vietnam with the heaviest bombing raids in history. Since the



Fraser and Hua Kuo-feng toast new-found friendship.

Nixon visit, the Chinese leaders -- having decided in 1968 that the Soviet Union went capitalist by some mysterious process twelve years earlier -- began to denounce the USSR as *worse* than the US, the *main danger* everywhere and even *fascist*.

Maoists have never come up with an explanation for how the Soviet state reverted to capitalism in 1956. Though degenerated under the Stalinist bureaucracy since the early 1920s, the Soviet Union retains the state-owned, planned economy which was the basic achievement of the Revolution of 1917. The greatest counter-revolution the world has yet seen would be required to revert the USSR to capitalism, and surely it would not have gone unnoticed, even by the buzzards in the Forbidden City (who were supporting Khrushchev's suppression of the Hungarian Revolution at the time)!

The Maoist "superpower" doctrine is essentially empirical, not Marxist: the USSR is denounced as "capitalist" because it is wealthy and powerful, not because the Maoists have discovered capitalist, ie, *private* accumulation of surplus value at the commanding heights of the Soviet economy. Yet even with this empirical analysis, the US is clearly the more powerful, more exploitative and more dangerous to the people of the world. It is here that the Maoists' characterisation of the Soviet Union as "fascist" is revealed as the greatest of Mao's betrayals.

In World War II, Stalin allied with the older and better-established imperialisms, British, French and American, against "upstart" Japan and Germany. As the subsequent "American Century" of the US in the role of world policeman proved -- from Greece to Korea to Vietnam -- the war was an inter-imperialist conflict requiring a Leninist policy of revolutionary defeatism on both sides, except for the necessary military defence of the Soviet Union itself. Stalin's rationale for this traitorous bloc with one set of imperialisms against another was the supposedly greater aggressiveness of Hitler and the Mikado.

With the analysis of the Soviet Union as "fascist", Maoists will build for and support a counter-revolutionary imperialist war against the Soviet Union which will, indeed, restore capitalism and be the greatest setback ever experienced by the world's working class. The restorationist sweep let loose would hardly stop at the borders of Mao's not-so Eternal Kingdom either. This betrayal was presaged by Chinese intervention in Angola on the side of the US and South Africa in an international proxy war against Cuban troops and the USSR.

As put by *Vanguard* (15 July 1976), organ of the Maoist Communist Party of Australia (Marxist-Leninist) (CPA (M-L)), "Soviet social-imperialism" is aimed mainly against the US, and

"In this it is Soviet social-imperialism that is the aggressor...."

"There can thus be no question but that Fraser is correct in opposing Soviet social-imperialism just as Churchill and DeGaulle were correct in opposing appeasement of Hitler and non-intervention in Spain, Austria, and Czechoslovakia. Motives are another matter."

The disastrous consequences for such a line for the world working class cannot manage to escape even some Maoists, and another issue of *Vanguard* (3 June 1976) hints that some of the paper's supporters are "hedging" on the question of "Soviet social-imperialism".

### No "appeasement" or no US bases?

In Australia, the Maoist line of independence for Australia and opposition to both superpowers is difficult enough to accept, since it calls for class-collaborationist, nationalist unity in a country which as every schoolchild knows is already independent. Yet the concentration on US imperialism allowed Maoist ranks to aim their fire at legitimate targets of US world-policeman militarism, such as the Cockburn Sound naval base. But slowly the vice of contradiction tightens. With the USSR the "main danger" everywhere, and if Fraser is "correct" in his opposition to Soviet naval presence, and if there should be "collective security" and no "appeasement", how can Maoists oppose US bases? Fraser's "correct" call takes him quite logically to Washington where he embarrasses Ford by giving credence to ultra-rightist Reagan's call for greater US "defence" spending. The Mao regime is the world's most consistent supporter of West German rearmament and the building up of NATO forces in Europe; and in Germany, Maoists have gone so far as to take the defence minister to court for "unpreparedness" in military opposition to "Soviet social-imperialism". The full implications of Mao's reactionary alliance with US imperialism cannot escape Australia much longer.

The bureaucracies ruling in the deformed workers states -- from Moscow to Peking and from Hanoi to Havana -- betray a real defence of their own anti-capitalist states through subordination of the revolutionary workers movement around the world to their narrow, nationalist, diplomatic interests. Extension of the socialist revolution throughout the rest of the world -- the only real defence against imperialism -- will only be achieved through ousting the bureaucracies in political revolution, and establishing proletarian-democratic rule under the leadership of an international Leninist vanguard party.

Maoists wishing to commit themselves to the world proletarian revolution must go beyond "hedging" or rejecting this or that individual betrayal of Chinese foreign policy. Today only the Trotskyism of the international Spartacist tendency carries forward the banner of proletarian class independence and socialist revolution unstained by Stalinist treachery and betrayal. For the rebirth of the Fourth International! ■

## FORUM

Communist  
work in the  
trade unions

Speaker: CHRIS KNOX  
(Labor Editor, *Workers Vanguard*)

7.30 pm  
18 August  
Wednesday

Room 5  
Trades Hall  
Sydney