



Theoretical journal
of the Socialist
Party of Australia

Australian Marxist Review

- ★ *US imperialism*
- ★ *Foreign capital in Australia*
- ★ *Australian and world imperialism*
- ★ *“Self management” and socialism*
- ★ *Engels’ Origin of the Family....*
- ★ *Left sectarianism*

QUARTERLY
NEW SERIES No 11
JULY 1984
Price 60c

Australian Marxist Review

Editor: P Symon

Editorial Board Members:

R Gowland

J Henderson

H Middleton

A Miller

Published by New Age Publishers
237 Sussex Street, Sydney
Phone (02) 264 5688

CONTENTS

The real face of US imperialism	CC Executive 4
Further questions and answers on Foreign capital penetration of the Australian economy	Research paper 14
Some thoughts on Australian imperialism and its relationship to world imperialism	Alan Miller. 22
“Self management” and socialist democracy	Bill Briggs 26
On the 100th anniversary of Frederick Engels’ <i>The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State</i>	Martyn Stevens 29
The source of left sectarianism	Stephen Hall. 32

The real face of US imperialism

This statement was prepared by Socialist Party Central Committee Chairman Jack McPhillips and approved by the CC Executive of the Party for publication.

Major issues confronting the people of the world and in that context the people of Australia noted in the previous statements by the Party, viz the threat of war and continued economic crisis, are and remain features of the present situation.

The policies pursued by world imperialism, and in particular US imperialism, in both the areas mentioned continue to be main features detrimentally affecting the interests of the people in relation both to the question of peace and economic well-being.

Many of the activities of US imperialism in pursuit of its war aims which are directed mainly but not solely at the USSR and the socialist countries are well known but not always clearly understood as to their purpose and basis.

The provocation, now publicly known to be such, concerning the Korean airliner and its intrusion into Soviet airspace is one example. The siting of the Cruise and Pershing missiles in certain European countries and directly targeted on areas in the socialist countries is also well known. Currently Reagan is seeking to bluster the US parliamentary bodies into allocating tens of billions of dollars for the development of further MX missiles with multiple warheads for purposes of threatening the socialist countries.

Authoritative spokesmen for the government of the USSR and the CPSU long since warned that the US representatives were deliberately dragging out the talks on nuclear disarmament in Geneva so as to provide the time needed to place the Cruise and Pershing missiles in European countries. History now shows that those warnings were well based.

Even before those weapons were sited, the authorities of the USSR Government made clear that they would not continue the talks if the weapons were sited in Europe and targeted, as they were bound to be, on areas of the socialist countries. On the eve of the siting of those weapons, the authorities of the USSR made clear that their siting would create a totally new strategic situation. They made equally clear that the Soviet Union and its allies in the Warsaw Pact countries would reply in a manner that equally threatened the imperialist countries, including the USA, if the

Cruise and Pershing missiles were sited in Europe and that they would break off the talks.

Having ignored the position of the USSR, Reagan and spokesmen of his administration now demand that the Soviet Union return to the negotiating table even while he continues to bellow hatred and war threats at the socialist countries.

Recently in connection with US imperialist aims and purposes on the American continent, Reagan has been raving in the most rabid language about the need to protect the American continent, north, south and centre, from threatened Soviet aggression and communist takeover.

Reagan knows that his ravings are based upon calculated lies but that fact is not known to the people in general.

Reagan's totally dishonest ravings are part of a deliberately contrived and executed process of psychological warfare waged for the purpose of poisoning peoples' minds against the USSR and thus furthering imperialist war preparations.

The SPA has earlier drawn attention to the need to make the real nature of imperialism better known to the people of Australia and in particular the working people. That view is based upon the contention that if the nature and purposes of US imperialism were fully known to the people of Australia, it would be extremely difficult for the Australian ruling class and central governments to so securely tie Australia in to an alliance with the US.

Some recently expressed views about Australia's position geographically and some issues of defence and foreign policy prompt a reminder of the need for the exposure of US imperialism.

Reagan's outbursts concerning the question of US imperialist interests in the American continent may contain some element of essential needs in relation to the presidential election later this year but they have a deeper meaning and a deeper purpose.

Some of this was revealed in an article in *World Marxist Review* (number 7, July 1981) by Rodney Arismendi, CC First Secretary of the Communist Party of Uruguay.

This article, which contains a good deal of commentary by Comrade Arismendi himself, related to a document prepared by a committee known as the Santa Fe Committee. The document, *A New Inter-American Policy for the Eighties*, was prepared for the Council of Inter-American Security Inc, situated in Washington, and was presented in 1980.

Pointedly, Comrade Arismendi opens his article with a short quotation from a work by Bertolt Brecht (*The Rise and Fall of Arturo Ui*):

The time for joy is not yet come:
If the womb is still fertile
That can beget the reptile.

The article opens: "This warning by the distinguished German author comes to mind immediately when you read *A New Inter-American Policy for the Eighties*.... It appears that what we have before us is a draft of the Reagan Administration's basic guidelines."

Comrade Arismendi goes on: "Presented without embellishing its most brutal aspects, this is a military and political doctrine relative to the Latin American and Caribbean states. Revealing a world domination thrust in the spirit of Hitler's *Mein Kampf*, it is based on the premise that the USA's bid for world hegemony is opposed by 'international communism'.... In accordance with this universal conception, Latin America and the Caribbean are accorded (through the mechanism of 'inter-American relations') the role of 'shield of the new world security and sword of US global power projection.' 'US global power projection,' the document says, 'rests upon a co-operative Caribbean and a supportive South America...the Caribbean and Latin America...helped the United States generate sufficient surplus power for balancing activities on European, Asian and African continents'."

Comrade Arismendi states that this classified document 'mirrors' the approach of US imperialism in the century old Munroe Doctrine. He goes on to say of this doctrine: "A close scrutiny of the central idea underlying this doctrine will leave nothing save a picture of the obsession that the Western Hemisphere is the preserve of the USA, the starting point on two oceans for the attainment of world supremacy."

The article refers to a number of USA sponsored regional systems and forms of agreement guaranteeing American imperialism political and economic domination in Latin America. It then describes the American continent in the following terms: "A huge land mass extending from the North Pole to the South and affording a convenient position on two oceans, the Western Hemisphere was the USA's economic, military and political sanctuary and the rear zone of the aggressive North Atlantic Treaty."

In a further reference to the Munroe Doctrine later in this article, the following is said: "One of its (Santa Fe document) points bluntly invokes the Munroe doctrine: 'No hostile foreign power will be allowed bases or *military or political allies in the region.*' Reagan's recent rabid speeches on the question of anti-communism and American imperialist interests in the three Americas — north, central and south — echo and even more are completely in line with these points from the Munroe doctrine and the Santa Fe Committee document."

Comrade Arismendi then goes on: "The document written in Santa Fe and backed up by statements by Ronald Reagan, US Secretary of State Alexander Haig, (since replaced by George Shultz), the US representative in the United Nations Jeane Kirkpatrick, and others is indicative of the dialectical linkage between Washington's militarist policy and its actions aimed at intensifying the exploitation of the Latin American peoples. The document's introduction, *Foundation for a Fresh, Forward-Looking Foreign Policy*, proclaims the international premises of the USA's Latin America

policy in the form of a monstrous philosophy. Not for nothing did we compare it with Hitler's blueprint for world domination. 'Foreign policy,' the document says, 'is the instrument by which peoples seek to assure their survival in a hostile world. War, not peace, is the norm in international affairs... Containment of the Soviet Union is not enough. Detente is dead... America must seize the initiative or perish.... World War III is almost over.'

"The thinking that a third world war has already begun has long since become the cornerstone of the lectures on counter-insurgency for Latin American military and police at US training centres in the former Panama Canal zone. This thinking even serves as moral justification for special courses on torture. In Uruguay, for instance, even rank-and-file warders practise on political prisoners held in dungeons. It is not accidental that Pinochet and the Uruguayan fascist generals claim they are in the forefront of the 'defenders of the West' in the already raging Third World War. This thinking was discussed at a conference of commanders of the OAS armed forces in Bogota after the victory of the Nicaraguan revolution. Together with the thesis of 'internal war,' likewise invented in the USA, it continues to serve as the ideological 'argument' of fascist despotic regimes.

"From these positions the Santa Fe document assesses the political situation on the continent and the striving of its peoples to defend their national identity, achieve genuine independence, and create the conditions for social development and progress. 'Latin America and South Asia,' it says, 'are the scenes of strife of the third phase of World War III.'

"On the strength of the aforesaid, it is declared that there is a need for a comprehensive global foreign policy within the rigid formula of 'either a Pax Doviética or a worldwide counter-projection of American power is in the offering. The hour of decision can no longer be postponed.'

"This total lack of camouflage for the basic guidelines of US imperialism's most aggressive and adventurist circles, who are out to achieve world supremacy, can rarely be found in writing. The spectre of a Soviet threat, the proclamation that the 'empire' is in jeopardy, and the statement that the frontiers of US security run across all latitudes are used to poison people's minds for psychological warfare.

"The Santa Fe document exudes rabid militarism. The section concerning plans of action against Cuba, Central America, and the Caribbean nations is written in the tone of an ideological crusade. Its inspirers take two premises for their point of departure: a) the Caribbean 'is becoming a Marxist-Leninist lake' b) the Caribbean nations constitute the soft underbelly of the USA, 'global factors in America's equation of continental security,' and are threatened by 'the irrepressible activity of a Soviet-backed Cuba','"

Making an estimate of this classified document, Arismendi says "Everything that Reagan has said and done as soon as he crossed the threshold into the White House is evidence that the Santa Fe document is the blueprint for American Latin American policy."

Since *World Marxist Review* published this article exposing the existence of this rabidly militarist, fascist intended document, the US has invaded Grenada in accordance with the Santa Fe principles and Reagan has stepped up his Hitler-like rhetoric against progressive forces in any of the three areas of America and, indeed, anywhere in the world.

The Santa Fe document helps to expose the nature and purposes of US imperialism and the article by Comrade Arismendi in explanation of this document further helps with that exposure.

The article was published three years ago but it is relevant to today's circumstances. Having in mind the continued and close alliance between Australian and American imperialism, it is applicable to Australia and warrants special attention by the politically progressive and peace forces in this country.

It is well to keep in mind what is provided for us by the Santa Fe document when estimating the need to change the foreign policy of Australia. This is further emphasised, having in mind the provisions of the Santa Fe document and current policies of US imperialism, by some articles recently published in the *Sydney Morning Herald* dealing with Australia's geographical position and some issue of defence and foreign policy.

The first of these articles, published on May 15, 1984, was written by Peter Hastings, a very well known foreign affairs commentator and a journalist on the *Herald*. In this article, Hastings emphasises a point made much earlier by a joint parliamentary committee and included in an SPA document dealing with our approach to issues of defence and foreign policy. The point made both by Hastings and by the Joint Parliamentary Committee on Defence established that Australia is in no danger of serious threat and particularly a threat of invasion.

Peter Hastings observes that "Australia remains one of the world's least threatened lands." He goes on to say, that "the only nations capable of offering Australia a direct, conventional threat, let alone a nuclear one, over the next decade are the US and the USSR." He does add ominously that "the USSR is only likely to threaten Australia in direct confrontation in a world order so radically different from today's that Australia assumes a strategic importance it now lacks." Further reference will be made to this point later.

He refers to a regional threat and makes clear that this means a possible threat from Indonesia, but then goes on to say that "any change in Indonesia's present attitude to Australia of reasonable co-operation on most levels to one of open hostility would not occur in isolation and certainly would not occur overnight. In addition a change of that political significance would inevitably distort its wider relationships especially those with ASEAN."

Further on it is said: "In any case, it would take Indonesia some years to mount anything like a significant threat to Australia. To do so would require

a major diversion of scarce exchange and human resources from pressing social and economic problems, leaving the country in the rather desperate situation in which Vietnam finds itself."

So having made clear that this nation is not threatened either by the Soviet Union or any other regional power in this part of the globe, Mr Hastings then points, as did the Joint Parliamentary Committee on Defence, to possible instances in which Australia may with some military force interfere in other countries. On this, Mr Hastings states: "But if there are no discernable threats to Australia, there are plenty of discomfiting security scenarios which may involve an Australian decision sometime or another to become involved in the defence of others in the South Pacific."

The question arises as to which countries are to be threatened by whom in the South Pacific for if there is no such threat then there can be no question of the need for Australia "to become involved in the defence of others in the South Pacific." Subsequently, reference to a further article by another author will show that the Soviet Union is not likely to threaten any of the countries in the South Pacific. Is it likely then that other South Pacific countries constitute a threat to one another? That seems unlikely. However, that does not rule out in our estimate the possibility of the scenario that Mr Hastings refers to becoming real for, as he observes, "the US has an overall presence" in the area of the South Pacific.

It is this latter factor which could result in Australia's involvement as a result of a close association with the US. This possibility is pointed up probably without intention by Mr Hastings. He refers to a number of the South Pacific nations, PNG, Fiji, the Solomons, Tonga, Kiribati, Vanuata, and observes:

"Will they look to Australia and New Zealand for a law and order presence in the event of real or likely collapse of government on the part of any one of them, say the Solomons? And will ANZAC powers respond? How will Australia and New Zealand react to a situation in New Caledonia where Kanak liberation, with Melanesian states' backing, is prepared for armed confrontation with the island's whites to gain independence? Especially if the Melanesian states ask for Australian arms to aid the Kanaks as PNG a few years ago requested Australian aid to help put down the Santos rebels?

"Or to a request from small Pacific states for a 'law and order' force to intervene in Fiji if the island's long-predicted Indian-Fijian confrontation led to violence or political chaos? These are improbable events as things now stand but they remain possibilities in the rapidly changing near environment. And it is in this near environment that most of our future security problems, requiring difficult solutions, probably lie."

This scenario is not new. It means in effect that because of certain associations, Australia could be called upon to play some part in intervening against progressive political forces and even revolutionary forces in those countries, if such forces were challenging the established government.

We have spoken about a certain association, but the one that could possibly involve us in such action is the association with US imperialism.

A further article in this series, published by the *Herald* on May 16, 1984 was by Paul Dibb, currently senior research fellow of the Strategic and Defence Studies Centre, Australian National University. Under the heading, *The Kremlin's View*, Mr Dibb writes about his estimate of the position of the USSR in relation to Asia and the South-West Pacific. In the course of this article, he states: "It is important to discriminate here between South-East Asia and the South-West Pacific. There are probably few areas of the world, with the possible exception of Antarctica, that are of lower priority strategically for Moscow than the South-West Pacific. Other than Australia, this region contains no strategically or politically significant countries or militarily important targets and it offers only modest economic and probably few political opportunities for the USSR."

Clearly then the Soviet Union does not threaten any of the countries of the South-West Pacific.

Mr Dibb goes on to speak of the fact that most of the South-East Asian and South-West Pacific region, with the exception of the Indochinese nations, are tied into the Western alliance system or at least are Western inclined. He then reveals, intentionally or otherwise, a series of alignments or treaties which, having in mind what has been said earlier, tie Australia very carefully into the US alliance for purposes of US imperialism's aims in the South-West Pacific region and South-East Asian region.

Mr Dibb states: "In the South-West Pacific, the ANZUS Treaty aligns Australia and New Zealand with the United States; Papua-New Guinea, the major indigenous state, has close and friendly relations with Australia — including a strong defence relationship. The other Pacific Island states are heavily dependent on Australia, New Zealand, Japan and the United States for economic well-being.

"In South-East Asia, the Philippines provide the United States with key naval and air bases and the Philippines and Thailand have ties to the US, Australia and New Zealand by the Manila Pact. Malaysia and Singapore are both members of the five power defence arrangement, which includes Australia, New Zealand and Britain. Australia and New Zealand continue to station military forces in Malaysia and Singapore. All of the Asian countries rely on the US and other Western countries for their arms supplies and practically all their trade, aid and investment flows."

What Mr Dibb has to say about our various commitments as a result of alliances and formal documents in this area gives validity to the contention by Australia's Foreign Minister Bill Hayden about the need for Australia to be concerned about the geographical area in which it is placed and the role it can play in this area. It also appears that Mr Hayden has some concern about the possibility of Australia's involvement in a number of otherwise unacceptable situations as a result of these alliances and forms of obligation, documented or otherwise.

In addition, having in mind the Santa Fe document already referred to, Reagan's bellowings about the need to protect the American continent from Soviet aggression and communist development and what is revealed about the extensive and what Mr Dibbs calls "overall presence" of US imperialism, Australia is obviously in danger of being involved at the behest of US imperialism in some actions by that force aimed at protecting its interests and dominant position in relation to the area in which Australia is situated.

The Socialist Party of Australia has persistently raised the need for this country to cancel out any obligations it has under the ANZUS Treaty but it is clear that we need much more than that to avoid this country being involved in military adventures and escapades at the behest of US imperialism in our role of so-called reliable ally in the US-Australia alliance.

In previous documents the SPA has pointed to the danger of Australia becoming involved, in junior partnership to the USA, in acts of aggression sponsored by the USA against countries in the South-East Asian area and in particular the nations of Indochina. These dangers are enhanced by the developing process of Japanese extension of its defence authority to the "1,000 mile" limit and the processes of integrating Australia's defence force activities by joint actions with the forces of the USA and Japan.

The Santa Fe document referred to earlier does not limit its concepts and proposals to the American continent. Mr Arismendi in his *World Marxist Review* article points out that it is intended to serve the purpose of world hegemony by US imperialism. In pursuit of that aim, actions under the Santa Fe concepts would extend to nations in the geographical area in which Australia is placed if their internal political developments did not suit the American imperialists and could be fitted under the broadly defined "communist threat."

With the obligations, understandings and agreements inherent in the series of documents referred to by Mr Dibbs, it is clear that Australia could be involved in the internal affairs of nations in the South-West Pacific area at the behest of the US partner in the Australia-US alliance.

These facts give a new dimension to the basis for the need for a policy of independence and non-alignment for Australia. They emphasise the need for Australia to seek to exercise an influence in the geographical area in which we are placed directed at ensuring a peaceful and progressive economic development of the nations of the area unhindered by any obligations of an alliance with US imperialism.

On Thursday, May 17 this year, the *Sydney Morning Herald* published a third article written by Dr Desmond Ball, head of the Strategic and Defence Studies Centre at the Australian National University, and entitled *Uneasy host, secretive "guests."* The article opens with the forthright statement: "The US maintains in Australia more than two dozen installations concerned with military communications, navigation, satellite tracking and

control and various forms of intelligence collection, making Australia host to more such US operations than any other country except the United Kingdom, Canada and West Germany."

Dr Ball goes on to describe the nature of the three main American installations situated in Australia — North West Cape, Pine Gap and Nurrungar. His definition makes plain that these installations are for American military purposes.

Pointing up the dangers to Australia of the continued existence of these installations, Dr Ball says: "On the question of Australia becoming a nuclear target, there is now a widespread acceptance within the defence community of the argument that Australia's hosting of US defence and intelligence installations is likely to involve Australia in a nuclear war in which not just the installations but (although much less likely) perhaps also Australia's military bases and facilities and even cities might be targets. In particular, it is now generally accepted that North West Cape, Pine Gap and Nurrungar will be priority targets in any strategic nuclear exchange while the RAAF base at Darwin and HMAS Sterling could well be targets in some circumstances."

This fact was also reported in one of the documents issued by the Joint Parliamentary Committee on Defence. The committee went so far as to point out that in the event of a nuclear war, "a mere half dozen" nuclear missiles would be sufficient to put this nation out of action.

There are those in authority who accept this state of affairs and say, as Mr Dibbs puts it, that "Australia has a responsibility to accept the risks involved in supporting US attempts to balance Soviet nuclear capabilities."

Dr Ball points to two other adverse results of the presence of these US installations. Firstly, he deals with their use for domestic intelligence, that is spying on Australia and Australians, and the lack of Australian control over the installations. On the first matter, Dr Ball says "One aspect of the US intelligence relationship which involves infringement of Australian sovereignty is the opportunity for domestic intelligence operations which is provided by some of the intelligence facilities in Australia. There is considerable evidence that the US has engaged in the monitoring of Australian communications."

Referring to a group of installations in Australia engaged in intelligence operations, Dr Ball comments: "These intelligence operations are aimed against the Soviet Union, China and a host of countries in east, south and south-east Asia, including nominal allies of the US and Australia, and may also include intelligence of a domestic nature."

In connection with the control of the installations, Dr Ball says: "The US facilities in Australia have been involved in external military activities several times without the knowledge or consent of the Australian Government. There was, for example, the full commitment of North-West Cape's high frequency transmitters to service of the American mining of Haiphong

and other north Vietnamese harbours in 1972.”

On this same question of control, Dr Ball says: “One of the most disturbing features of the US installations has been the lack of political control exercised by the Australian Government over their establishment, operation and maintenance.

“The Signals Analysis Section is staffed only by CIA and NSA analysts; it includes no US contractor personnel and no Australian citizens. It is imperative that there be Australian personnel working in this section, not only to ensure that all SIGINT of interest to Australia is passed on but also because while there remains a section which is inaccessible to Australians, there can be no confidence that domestic Australian transmissions are not being intercepted and routed through this section.”

It can be said that the three articles published by the *Sydney Morning Herald* do not contain much that is new. However, coming at this time when the main spokesman for US imperialism, President Reagan, is more aggressively and abusively attacking the socialist countries and interfering extensively in various ways in the affairs of the countries of Latin and Central America and the Caribbean, the articles help to serve notice on the Australian people and particularly on the working class of the need to press for the policies advanced by the Socialist Party of Australia in relation to defence and for a foreign policy based upon peace, national independence and non-alignment.

These articles stand in sharp contrast to the explanations concerning the US bases on Australian soil made to the Australian Parliament by Prime Minister Hawke on June 6, 1984. That statement was not in accordance with the facts. Peter Hastings, writing in the *Sydney Morning Herald* shortly after the Prime Ministerial statement, pointed to the vast difference between that statement and the writings of Dr Ball already quoted.

It is unlikely that the Prime Minister would be unaware of the facts to which Dr Ball pointed unless we are to assume that Mr Hawke is, in relation to this matter, an ignoramus.

The extent of the subservience of the Australian Government to US imperialism is further revealed by the fact that Prime Minister Hawke had to obtain approval from US authorities for his statement before he made it to the Parliament.

Having that in mind and in the light of the Santa Fe document, Australia's adherence to ANZUS and the US alliance bodes ill for Australia and emphasises the correctness of the approach to those matters by the Socialist Party of Australia.

Further questions and answers on

Foreign capital penetration of the Australian economy

(Part one of this series appeared in the March 1984 issue of
Australian Marxist Review.)

Q. To what extent do Australian monopolies dominate the economy of the region?

Can it be said that "Australia is herself a middle-sized imperialist power with considerable and growing overseas investments? It has a whole continent as a base. Because of its advanced industry, food production and abundant natural power resources and the difficulties of its rivals, Australian imperialism holds the promise of becoming stronger." (SPA's Socialist Program p5)

A. The 1970s witnessed a boost in the Australian companies' operations abroad. Several estimates show that in the late 1970s, over 600 Australian companies had overseas enterprises whose total investment topped \$2,000 million by the early 1980s. In 1980-81 alone, upwards of \$400 million were invested overseas, the bulk ending up in New Zealand, ASEAN nations, Oceania and the US.

A sizeable portion of that capital investment is handled by the Australian subsidiaries of foreign transnationals but, according to our estimates the larger part of the investment is still handled by the Australian companies proper. One indirect proof of it are figures on the profits of the Australian companies in those countries — the main profit-makers are companies controlled by Australian capital.

The 1970s saw more intensive foreign operations by Australian trading banks. In 1980 the overseas assets of the principal trading banks added up to 21 per cent of their total assets as against 15 per cent in 1975, and they have totalled over \$8,000 million.¹

On balance, though, the role of Australian monopolies in the economy of the countries which have the larger portion of their investment, excluding New Zealand, is fairly small. Quite opposite is the case of the newly emerged Oceania nations. Even though they enjoy the smaller share of Aust-

ralian investment (naturally one has to consider the size of those countries), the positions of Australian capital in the biggest of them — Papua New Guinea, Fiji, the Solomon Islands and Vanuatu — are very strong. Economic factors also determine Australia's political influence in the region.

We see it as no contradiction that Australia, being a target of expansion by transnational corporations, is itself an imperialist nation of a medium order. It is quite another matter, though, how strong the positions of Australian imperialism are. One may say that despite the nation's unique natural resources and possibility for extensive capitalist development, Australian imperialism does not fully exploit that opportunity. Rather, Australia's position is getting worse.

Q. What is the direction of, and the main elements in, the present restructuring taking place in the Australian economy (and elsewhere) under the direction of the transnational corporations?

How are the proportions of GDP from agriculture, mining and secondary industry changing under the influence of this restructuring?

A. Since the late 1960, marked changes have emerged in the Australian economy caused by a whole range of domestic and outside factors. The intensive development of the mining and processing industries made the country one of the leading raw material bases in the capitalist world. The mining industry's share in the gross domestic product went up from two per cent at the end of the 1960s to six per cent in the late 1970s. The country now leads the world in the production of bauxites, zirconium, bismuth, ilmenite and rutile, is the world's second producer of iron ore and the third largest producer of lead. Australia is also the world's second biggest exporter of non-ferrous metal ores and the second to third largest exporter of coal. The recently prospected diamond fields will possibly help the country to outstrip South Africa some time soon in the production and export of industrial diamonds.

The vigorous advances made by the raw material industries in the late 1960s failed, however, to curb the long-term trend towards Australia's declining share in world industrial production and world trade, which continued to fall in the intervening period.² This fact alone is sufficient evidence that Australia's becoming a powerful raw material base failed to bolster its positions in the world economy. The biggest profits accrued not to the Australian economy but to the leading mining monopolies, half of them from overseas. The profits from the exploitation of the most plentiful mineral deposits in Australia were in large measure taken out of the country and not used for fresh investment.

At the same time, over that period, ie from the late 1960s, the manufacturing industry remained either crisis-hit or stagnant. Between the late 1960s and the late 1970s, the share of manufacturing industry in the GDP dropped from 28 per cent to 21 per cent. Investment, which in 1950-65 grew an average six to seven per cent a year, stopped growing from 1965-

66. The share of the manufacturing industry in total private investment fell off from 34 per cent in the mid 1960s to 27 per cent in the early 1970s and the manufacture of labour-consuming sophisticated products steadily declined or remained stagnant.³

The labour force in the manufacturing industry dropped by 150,000 between 1971-72 and 1979-80. Even though the share of manufactured goods in the Australian exports remained essentially unchanged (around 20 per cent), the share of sophisticated products (notably cars and transport equipment) has shrunk.

By the start of 1970, the relatively low efficiency of most enterprises in the manufacturing industry made itself clearly felt. Some estimates conclude that productivity in the Australian manufacturing industry is 20 to 40 per cent lower than in the US and West Germany.⁴ Figures cited by P Robinson show that Canada's auto industry (four big firms) employed 35,000 people in the mid-1970s and turned out products worth \$1,000 million while the auto industry in Australia employed 44,000 but produced only \$360 million worth of vehicles.⁵

The warplane plants in Australia (with account taken of the state-run aerospace laboratories) employ roughly the same labour force as Sweden has in the same area but while between the 1950s and the mid-1970s the former turned out 170 near-sonic jet fighters, 50 light bombers and 110 supersonic fighters, the corresponding figures for Sweden were 600, 450 and 600.⁶

The reasons for the relatively lower efficiency of the Australian manufacturing industry compared with other developed capitalist nations are fairly varied and are determined in the long run by the contradictions of the capitalist reproduction process.

Foreign capital was the cardinal factor in the country's post-war industrial development. The British and US corporations which started enterprises in Australia sought, in the first place, to win the local market. In many instances, the Australian subsidiaries of transnational corporations were devoid of the right to sell their products outside Australia. The size of the emerging enterprises was considerably less than was required for optimal economic efficiency. The absence of agencies to regulate the inflow of foreign investment on a nationwide scale and the competition between the governments of states in attracting foreign corporations to their territory led to an excessive number of plants for such a limited market as the Australian one.

Transnational corporations supplied their Australian subsidiaries with equipment designed for large-scale technologies and was doomed under the circumstances to under-capacity and inefficient operation.

A weak spot in the Australian manufacturing industry was its plants' ill-developed research base. The country's share of industrial research and development spending which amounted in the late 1970s to 0.9 per

cent of the gross domestic product was roughly on a par with Canada (1 per cent), Finland (0.9 per cent), Norway (1 per cent) and Belgium (1.2 per cent), but the predominant aspect of the overall research effort was fundamental research, which meets only in small measure the immediate needs of production and is chiefly financed by the state. Among 15 leading industrialised capitalist nations, Australia tops the list in the share of government bodies in such research (54 per cent) and the share of the state in financing it (70 per cent)⁸ while the role of the private sector in industrial research and development is steadily declining.

In terms of 1974-75 prices, the private sector's spending on industrial research and development shrank from \$236 million in 1973-74 to \$123 million in 1976-77 and rose only slightly to \$132 million by 1978-79. Over the same period, the research personnel diminished by 50 per cent.⁹

On balance, only five per cent of corporations are doing any kind of research. Over half the spending on industrial research and development in the private sector is done by the subsidiaries of transnational corporations, whose policy in the industrial research and development area (to remind you, they dominate all the science-oriented industries) is to concentrate research in the leading enterprises of the country of origin. Laboratories in Australia are mostly preoccupied with adjusting to the local conditions the processes and products made available to them. The Australian monopolies proper prefer to acquire someone else's technologies rather than do their own research.

Nearly all major research breakthroughs (mainly in the military field) were made in state-run laboratories or with their participation, among them Jindivik, Nomad, Ikara, Barra, Interscan, etc, while the private sector is, for the most part, making use of them.

The structural inferiority of the Australian manufacturing industry came into sharp focus in the mid-1970s during a world economic crisis which coincided with the emergence of the world market of labour-consuming products from some developing and so-called newly industrialised countries in South and South-East Asia.

However diverse the likely directions of Australian economic development, two basic and essentially different ones could be singled out.

The first spells out an unconstrained integration of the Australian economy with the economies of its principal trading partners, primarily the US and Japan. This option, envisaged by a Pacific integrating plan, would signify a removal of all barriers to the traffic of goods, services and capital between these countries.

The critical argument of the advocates of the policy of "open doors" and free market forces is that this process would raise the efficiency of the manufacturing industry to the level of leading capitalist nations, which would consequently raise the country's living standards.

It is perfectly clear, however that if implemented, this process would boost efficiency only in a few sectors of the manufacturing industry while many sectors would just die out. The most interested party in such "rationalisation" are American transnationals which would like Australia to continue as a reliable raw material base. Australia's subordination would then inevitably increase and transnationals would be able to "rationalise" production with an eye to their global interests.

All this would naturally bolster foreign control of the Australian economy, perpetuate Australia's role as a supplier of raw materials or, at best, semi-manufactured items and unsophisticated products. Australian industry would thus turn into an adjunct of its American and Japanese counterparts.

The other option could secure for Australia a more reliable and respectable position in the world economy. Central to that would be a purposeful government policy designed not only to protect the Australian economy from continued expansion by foreign monopolies but to enable a reintroduction of national control over industry and the country's participation in the international division of labour on an equitable basis. In other words, along with preservation of protectionist policies vis-a-vis the country's manufactured goods market and introduction of a rigid control over foreign capital operations in this country, Australia would have to carry out nationalisation (or at least ensure transition under the control of private national capital) of leading industrial enterprises owned by foreign monopolies, vigorously develop an independent manufacturing industry based on its own industrial research and development, etc. In the final analysis, this is the only way to change the country's current standing in the world economy.

An implementation of either of the two above variants in its "pure form" is practicable in the foreseeable future, while features of either of them will inevitably figure in subsequent development in a varying proportion. The important thing is, then, which of the two will ultimately predominate.

The evolution of the Australian economy will hinge on the balance of power between the country's social groups which shape the Australian government's attitude to the problems in question. The country's ruling class, the monopoly bourgeoisie, is normally averse to the advancement of national independence, being content with its role of a junior partner of American monopolies. Australian monopoly capital is mostly present in industries free of competition with foreign monopolies. By serving the needs of overseas transnationals (and thus getting a large portion of its profits), Australian monopoly capital proper objectively stands to gain from further expansion by foreign monopolies in the Australian economy. There is essentially no conflict of interest between foreign capitalists controlling major industrial sectors of the Australian economy and leading national capitalists piling up profits in banking and other non-industrial sectors.

The Australian non-monopoly national bourgeoisie, particularly its section involved with the manufacturing industry, takes a different stand. As the small and medium employers, they suffer most from competition with powerful foreign monopolies operating in that area and with foreign producers importing their goods to Australia. They would be the prime victims if ever customs duties were lifted. This is why the tariff protection of Australian industry and curbs on foreign capital are crucial for this section of the national bourgeoisie.

In general, the national bourgeoisie in the manufacturing industry is more nationalistic than its counterpart in the mining industry. True, the process of diversification in recent years has advanced so far that not one single major monopoly could be identified exclusively with any one industry, however well preserved its original production specialisation.

Also, there is a strong public drive to place curbs on foreign corporations' operations in the country, to stimulate the development of the manufacturing industry and against the unbridled exploitation of the nation's natural wealth by foreign corporations.

The Australian government, which primarily advances the interests of the country's ruling class, the monopoly bourgeoisie, has also to heed the interests of other social groups.

Our idea is that the country's democratic public should demand that the government formulate a long-term economic development strategy, with emphasis on plans to build up an efficient manufacturing industry. An effective labour force retraining scheme should be introduced, and the applied research standards should be radically upgraded. The funds for that could be obtained by closing loopholes allowing monopolies to keep back their profits, by granting mineral prospecting and exploitation licences to transnationals on terms more favourable to the Australians than is the case now and by generally making the tax system more favourable to Australians rather than transnationals. Finally, cutbacks in military spending could release large funds for productive use.

Q. What changes are taking place in the direction of Australian trade in terms of countries and commodities?

A. Australia's becoming a major raw material base in the capitalist world was most graphically reflected in the structure of its foreign trade. A country which previously exported mainly agricultural produce has turned into the principal or one of the principal world exporters of iron ore, bauxite and alumina, coal, uranium and diamonds. The share of mineral and energy raw materials in Australian exports, which added up to nine per cent in the mid-1960s, shot up to 30 per cent by the early 1980s. Simultaneously, despite its absolute growth, the share of agricultural produce in the exports went down. No marked change occurred in the structure of imports, with machinery, consumer goods and chemicals accounting for some 80 per cent of them.

The share of manufactured products in the nation's exports, which slowly but steadily increased prior to the early 1970s, remained essentially unchanged over the past decade but exports of labour-consuming and sophisticated products declined. Higher manufactured goods exports are only possible through their restructuring, a point we have earlier stressed.

Australia incurs great losses from exports of unprocessed raw materials. A higher degree of sophistication of exported products not only would increase their value but also would cut down transportation costs which would help improve the balance of payments.

Transnational corporations which dominate the raw material industry are quite content with the status quo and the division of labour structure there and would rather preserve it than otherwise. What is consequently needed is vigorous government policy.

Over the last two decades, notable changes occurred in the geographic structure of the country's foreign trade with Japan having become, since the early 1970s, Australia's chief and firmly established trading partner. The current dependence of the Australian economy on Japan is so great that any economic ups and downs in Japan automatically have their repercussions on Australia. Australia's economic cycle in the 70s was in large measure a replica of a corresponding one in Japan.

In the past few years, the growth in Japan's share in Australian foreign trade halted and will remain largely unchanged.

Japan now holds the place vacated by Britain, which by the early 1980s dropped to the fifth position in Australia's exports and third in imports.

The most salient feature of Australia's foreign trade in the 1970s was a mounting share of developing countries, primarily in exports — nearly a third in the early 1980s. The bulk of that went to the developing countries of East and South-East Asia, chiefly the "newly industrialised" ones and the odds are this trend will continue for some time to come.

Over the past decade, there has been an increase in Australian exports to socialist countries. Remarkably, even the strong anti-Soviet policies of the Fraser cabinet failed to dampen the intensity of Soviet-Australian trading relations (even though they certainly took their toll of political, cultural and scientific contacts). Imports from socialist countries, excepting China, are still extremely insignificant.

Q. What are the sources of Australian borrowings overseas and what is the growth in Australia's indebtedness?

A. Foreign indebtedness implies debts of government agencies of any one country to government, private or international organisations in other states. As of June 30, 1981, Australia's foreign debt stood at \$A4,700 million (\$1,500 million in 1971 and \$1,200 million in 1975).¹⁰ To be sure, this contrasts a lot with the main debtor nations: in 1982 Brazil was \$US85,000 million in debt, Mexico \$82,000 million, Argentina \$4,200

million, South Korea \$37,000 million, Venezuela \$36,000 million, Turkey \$23,000 million, Indonesia \$22,000 million, Chile \$18,000 million and Egypt \$16,000 million.

We should mention, though, that while in developing countries the chief borrower is the government (and in the socialist countries naturally only government bodies), in developed capitalist nations, including Australia, this is the private sector. Therefore one has to count in foreign debts of private companies in summing up Australia's overall foreign debt.

In addition, direct foreign investment also has some features of indebtedness since dividends on it repaid to foreign investors are drawn from the national income and this is especially relevant to Australia which has foreign investment topping \$46,000 million.

Australia chiefly gets loans from industrialised capitalist nations like the US, Britain, West Germany and Switzerland.

Q. In considering our strategic aim at the present stage in Australia's political and economic development should the Marxist-Leninist party give greater weight to the "anti-imperialist" element of its policies or to "anti-monopoly" or are they equal?

A. Since there are no basic contradictions between transnational corporations and Australian monopoly capital, one would be well justified to give equal priority to both the anti-imperialist and the anti-monopoly struggle. But given the current international situation, keynoted by efforts by US imperialism to whip up military psychosis, boost its military capability and escalate world tensions, the above struggle should have, as we see it, primarily an anti-American thrust. The drive against US imperialism, which has many aspects, includes action in the economic area against expansion by American transnational corporations, benefitting from contradictions between them and their counterparts in Britain, Japan and other countries.

-
1. G Crough, T Wheelwright. *Australia: A Client State*, p 136.
 2. Australia's share in world industrial production (among capitalist nations) amounted to 1.8 per cent in 1950, 1.6 per cent in 1960, 1.5 per cent in 1970 and 1.3 per cent in 1979.
 3. Between 1971-72 and 1977-78, car output dropped from 467,000 to 361,000; that of internal combustion engines from 355,000 to 246,000; electric motors from 2,466,000 to 2,872,000; radios from 770,343 to 216,174 (*Australia Year Book*).
 4. *Australian Bulletin of Labour*, Vol 6 No 1, 1979, pp 52-61.
 5. P Robinson. *The Crisis in Australian Capitalism*. Fitzroy, 1978, p 34.
 6. P Stalker. *Comment on a Colonial Technology*. Brisbane, 1979, p 21
 7. Industrial Research and Development in Australia. Canberra, 1979. *The Australian Economic Review* 3rd quart. 1979, p 33.
 8. *Ibid*.
 9. *Future Tense. Technology in Australia*, p 99.
 10. G Crough, T Wheelwright *Australia: A Client State*, p 171

Some thoughts on Australian imperialism and its relationship to world imperialism

by Alan Miller

In this article, I want to raise some points concerning Australian imperialism and its relationship to world imperialism for the consideration of readers. I am not setting out to present an all-round analysis of the subject.

First of all, I think we should be careful, in presenting out party's view on this question, that we do not refer to the Australian monopoly capitalist ruling class on the one hand, and foreign imperialism on the other, as though somehow Australia had monopolies but was not imperialist and that the only imperialism with which Australia is involved is foreign.

To present the question this way separates monopoly from imperialism and, in this regard, we should recall the words of Lenin in *Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism*:

"If it were necessary to give the briefest possible definition of imperialism we would have to say that imperialism is the monopoly stage of capitalism."

Lenin went on to say: "But very brief definitions, although convenient, for they sum up the main points, are nevertheless inadequate, since we have to deduce from them some especially important features of the phenomenon that has to be defined." (Ibid)

He goes on to elaborate on imperialism: "Imperialism is capitalism at that stage of development at which the dominance of monopolies and finance capital is established; in which the export of capital has acquired pronounced importance; in which the division of the world among the international trusts has begun, in which the division of all territories of the globe among the biggest capitalist powers has been completed." (Ibid)

When one thinks of imperialism in these terms, Australia must be regarded as an imperialist country.

So instead of speaking in terms of Australian monopolies and foreign imperialism, we should talk of the relationship of Australian imperialism with other imperialist countries and the world imperialist system as a whole.

Secondly, I think we need to avoid any suggestion that foreign imperialism, including US imperialism, absolutely dominates this country and that the Australian imperialists are completely suppressed.

Certainly Australian imperialism is small compared with, say, US imperialism. However, that does not prevent it from acting in its own interests and developing its own particular policy line.

Our monopolists, for example, invite into this country large amounts of foreign capital in order to maximise their own profits through the process of extended reproduction. There is logic in this, as local capital, on its own, cannot meet the economic possibilities presented by modern capitalist development.

Economic relations in the world imperialist system are noted for a relative unity based on the common aim of exploitation, but they are also noted for a never ending struggle between various imperialisms. Economic relations, therefore, invariably end up with the stronger imperialist countries dominating the weaker, with the latter compelled to accept this reality although still getting their pound of flesh.

Australia is affected by this economic process which is part of a larger process, concerning political and military affairs and which leads to an undermining of our national independence.

Australia's willingness to play a secondary role, particularly to US imperialism, is seen more clearly in the sphere of foreign policy and military strategy. But even here, this secondary role is a decision of Australian imperialism, part of its own policy line.

The Australian imperialists are anti-Soviet and anti-communist. They want to preserve and extend world imperialism as part of wanting to preserve and extend Australia's part in it. However, Australia is not powerful enough to lead the imperialist world against socialism and social progress generally and so it settles for US leadership. It recognises and accepts the fact that the US is the international gendarme of monopoly capitalism.

So it is not a question of absolute domination and oppression of Australia by US imperialism, but a willingness by Australian imperialism to yield to a stronger imperialism in the interests of the worldwide struggle against the revolutionary process and the Soviet Union and the socialist world in particular.

Now comes the question: "Against whom should the Socialist Party of Australia (SPA) strike the main blow?" The chief danger in answering this question is to oversimplify the matter.

One has to look at both the world situation and the position in Australia and see the dialectical relationship between the two.

The international communist movement, of which the SPA is a part, sees the main contradiction in the world as that between the socialist and imperialist systems. The communists of the world see all the imperialist countries, including the US, as part of the world imperialist system. However, the communists also recognise the US as the leading force within world imperialism and so they say the main blow should be struck at US imperialism.

The social forces to strike the main blow at US imperialism, as part of defeating imperialism as a whole, are the socialist world, the working class movement in the capitalist countries and the national liberation movement, with the socialist world being the leading force.

The international communist movement fully appreciates that contradictions exist between imperialist countries, but these are secondary to the main contradiction between socialism and imperialism. Therefore, the movement does not abdicate its historical role and trail behind other imperialisms in the struggle against US imperialism. However, it does utilise differences between the imperialists to serve this struggle.

One should not forget that the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (CPSU), relying basically on Soviet strength and the forces of the international communist movement, saw the need to strike the main blow at the fascist imperialist powers as part of the struggle against world imperialism. In this regard, the CPSU utilised secondary contradictions between the fascist powers and the other imperialist countries. Such were the dialectics of the anti-fascist alliance and the victory which meant so much for the progress of the world and represented an enormous advance for socialism.

The SPA approaches the Australian situation in the light of the processes going on throughout the world. However, the party must take full account of the internal contradictions and from these single out the main contradiction, if it is to advance the revolutionary process in Australia.

The main internal contradiction is that between the working class and the Australian imperialist ruling class. There are secondary internal contradictions between working farmers and monopolists and non-monopoly capitalists and monopoly capitalists and the SPA utilises such secondary contradictions in the struggle against Australian imperialism.

In the New Democratic Economic System (NDES) stage of the socialist revolutionary process, the main blow is struck at the monopolies which are at the very heart of the Australian imperialist system and a broad anti-

imperialist alliance is built. In the socialist stage, capitalism itself is tackled. The NDES deals a body blow at imperialism, but the socialist stage deals with the very roots of imperialism.

The whole process of dealing with the internal contradictions, as already indicated, cannot be isolated from the main contradiction in the world and the need to strike the main blow at US imperialism on a world scale. After all, Australian imperialism is part of the world imperialist system and accepts US leadership.

Therefore, striking the main blow at Australian imperialism in the context of the internal contradictions is dialectically connected with striking the main blow at US imperialism in the world context. We tackle the Australian ruling class as part of our contribution to the struggle against world imperialism and its leading force, the US. In this way we advance Australian and world socialism. And, simultaneously, we serve the cause of peace and national independence.

These are the sound reasons for seeing the working class as the best fighter for peace and national independence and the wisdom of not relying upon capitalist forces in this struggle. However, we would be foolish not to make full use of contradictions between the imperialist countries and that applies to contradictions between Australia and other imperialist countries, including the US, and within the Australian imperialist class.

I would add the warning here that if we simply said strike the main blow at US imperialism and ignored other factors such as the internal contradictions in Australia and Australian imperialism's connections with the US, we would be in danger of sliding into a purely nationalist position and that would be a blow to socialism, peace and national independence.

“Self management” and socialist democracy

by Bill Briggs

From time to time voices are raised laying all sorts of claims to being left, socialist or even, on occasions, communist. Often these voices “prove” themselves by launching all manner of attacks against existing socialism and against the Soviet Union in particular. One favourite and recurring theme that these “champions” of socialism come back to is the call for what is loosely called “self-management” socialism. This is seen as an ideal free of the difficulties of bureaucracy and the heavy hand of the state.

What is behind these utopian slogans is a strong and quite virulent anti-Sovietism. They say that the Soviet Union still has a state apparatus — 67 years after the revolution — and the state has not withered away as predicted by the founders of scientific socialism.

What these critics forget is that none of the founders of the communist movement drew up blueprints or put dates on the achievement of what in effect will be the establishment of a communist society. The state exists, as Lenin pointed out, as a coercive force aimed at protecting the ruling class. In the Soviet Union, the state is a state of the whole people but there are still plenty outside the borders of the Soviet Union and more than a few inside who will use any means at their disposal to destroy socialism. The events in Poland are a testimony to that truth.

But what of this “self management” theory and what is really going on in the Soviet Union? For some to say that we need to push for self-management socialism both in Australia and in the socialist world is to imply that under existing socialism, the workers have little impact upon events.

This is not the way things are. Socialist democracy is improving, refining and developing itself constantly. There is no other way forward for a society which bases itself on the theories of Marxism-Leninism. No-one in the Soviet Union would be foolish enough to suggest that perfection has been achieved. There are still a great many problems and shortcomings but the processes under way allow these problems to be systematically overcome. To look at the actual level of workers' participation in management in the USSR is to dismiss as ludicrous the claims of these “pro-socialist” anti-Sovietees in our country.

Today most Soviet workers participate in one way or another in managing the processes of production. Things were moved considerably closer to full workers' "control" with the 1983 Law on Labour. Under this law, the workers participate in decision making at all levels, including the development of work plans, collective agreements and setting work standards. The workers may demand that any worker, including the management, be disciplined or even sacked if decisions of the work collective are not carried out.

The management is now compelled to report twice a year to a general meeting of the workers. Between these meetings, the functions of the collective is carried out by what are known as standing production conferences elected by the workers.

Between 1979-81 before the new law was introduced, these conferences adopted more than 15 million proposals, of which 80 per cent were implemented.

Another important form of public involvement in management are the socialist emulation drives when individual workers or whole factories enter into competition with each other. Later the results of these drives are compared and then made public.

But the real growth of industrial democracy can perhaps best be seen in the activities of the work teams. A team is a self-governing unit which ensures its members every opportunity to participate in the process of management. A general meeting of the team or its elected council evaluates the performance of every worker and works out the basic wage to be paid to each member and the bonuses, etc, depending on the actual input of that member. The team participates in drafting work plans and develops strategies to improve the working and living conditions of its members.

This does not mean that all in the garden is rosy. Many workers still do not play an active role in management. There are still socially inactive people and, on the other hand, people active in a great many social functions who tend to spread themselves a bit thin. There are a number of good and honest workers who attend the meetings but rarely advance initiatives and are still indifferent to various shortcomings. Importantly, their numbers continue to drop as more and more workers are drawn into active participation in the running of society.

Since the birth of the socialist state, the move toward full workers' democracy has been continuous. Prior to the 1983 law, workers assisted management by offering their advice. While this is already streets ahead of anything which could be offered in Australian workplaces, it was not enough.

In the future, roles in the management process will change with the managers being the advisers to the workers and not the other way round. There will be a far greater interaction between manager and worker than there is at present. The actual decisions will be taken by the workers on the basis of the management's specialist advice and knowledge.

This will still not please those demanding nebulous self-management, who are either ignorant of the valuable lessons of 67 years of socialist construction or who wish to distort it to fit their own unworkable patterns based on anarchistic individualism. They will be disappointed to learn that even when socialisation of the means of production reaches its peak, there will and must remain a centralised management of production and social processes. It is indispensable to the smooth running of the national economy. After all, the economy is not just so many factories operating in a vacuum with no real contact with other factories or branches of the economy but one integrated and planned whole.

On the 100th anniversary of Frederick Engels'
*The Origin of the Family,
Private Property and the State*

by Martyn Stevens

Frederick Engels' most popular book explains the origin and prime cause of human exploitation and oppression and demonstrates on that basis the way to human liberation. Completed at the end of May 1884 and published later that year, *The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State* examines the origin and history of class society, the oppression of women and the development of the state as they arose with civilisation out of the womb of primitive society.

The book clearly demonstrates that those ugly features of mankind today which are passed off by defenders of exploitation as "human nature" in fact arose in violent opposition to the human nature of primitive society as it was before the emergence of private property and class differentiation.

The family and private property

Engels traces the history of the family through its main stages: group marriage, pairing marriage and monogamy and shows how these corresponded to savagery, barbarism and civilisation respectively.

"That woman was the slave of man at the commencement of society is one of the most absurd notions that have come down to us from the period of Enlightenment of the eighteenth century. Woman occupied not only a free but also a highly respected position among all savages and all barbarians of the lower and middle stages and partly even of the upper stage." (p 49. Here and below, all quotations are taken from the Progress edition).

However, a new social force arose which brought about a revolution in the family: private property.

According to the division of labour then prevailing between the sexes, the original domestication and tending of herds was the work of the man. These herds, at first the common property of the tribe, yielded a considerable increase in food production and other animal products, enabling a surplus to be produced. The status of a man tending a herd was raised and, at the same time, he came to consider the herds as more and more

his private property. However, at that time, his children could not inherit from him, because descent was still reckoned through the female line.

"The increase in production in all branches — cattle breeding, agriculture, domestic handicrafts — enabled human labour to produce more than was necessary for its maintenance. At the same time, it increased the amount of work that daily fell to the lot of every members of the gens or household community or single family. The addition of more labour power became more desirable. This was furnished by war; captives were made slaves." (p 157).

With the advent of private property and slavery, the first form of class society, monogamy was introduced in order to guarantee the paternity of a father's children and thereby enable him to pass his new wealth on to his children and not to the descendants of his maternal aunt or sister. Thus, patriarchy followed on the heels of private property and class exploitation. In the words of Engels "The first class antagonism which appears in history coincides with the development of the antagonism between man and woman in monogamous marriage, and the first class oppression with that of the female sex by the male." (p 66).

"In the old communistic household, which embraced numerous couples and their children, the administration of the household, entrusted to the women, was just as much a public, a socially necessary industry as the providing of food by the men." (p 73). But the differences in the wealth of the various members of the tribe which came about with the advance of production and the increasing division of labour, caused the old communistic household communities to break up wherever they had still been preserved. This coincided with and was the stimulus to the gradual transition from pairing marriage, which was not patriarchal or oppressive, to monogamy. It put an end to the common cultivation of the soil for the account of the community, assigning the cultivated land for use to the several families individually, marking a gradual transition to complete private ownership. "The administration of the household lost its public character. It was no longer the concern of society. It became a *private service*. The wife became the first domestic servant, pushed out of participation in social production." (p 73). All this made the individual family the economic unit of society. Civilisation was born, based upon private property, slavery as the first form of class exploitation, and the domestic enslavement of the woman as the continuing, major form of the oppression of women.

Engels goes on to conclude from the above that "the first premise for the emancipation of women is the reintroduction of the entire female sex into public industry; and that this again demands that the quality possessed by the individual family of being the economic unit of society be abolished." (p 74).

"With the passage of the means of production into common property, the individual family ceases to be the economic unit of society. Private housekeeping is transformed into a social industry. The care and education of the children becomes a public matter." (p 76).

Bourgeois feminists think that it is men as such and the family as such which are the problem and, like all capitalist ideologists, they obscure the economic aspects and the class aspects which form the real basis of the problem. Engels' book clearly demonstrates that men and women lived in harmony before private property and class society arose, that class society turned this harmony into antagonism and that the achievement of a classless society once again will restore the harmony that once existed, but at a much higher stage than in the primitive past. Thus, it is not men as such that are the problem, but the exploitative and oppressive nature of class society.

Engels ridicules the notion that the progress of legislation to an increasing degree removes all cause for complaint on the part of the woman. First of all, inequality before the law is not the cause but the effect of the economic oppression of women. Secondly, legal advances which declare equality before the law do not concern themselves with the actual inequality that exists in real life. Equality on paper is not at all capable of removing cause for complaint if it ignores the power given to one side by its economic position, the pressure it exercises on the other, the economic supremacy of one and the economic dependency of the other.

The aim, then, is not merely to establish formal equality, the hypocritical cloak in which bourgeois forms of oppression express themselves, but to turn each main aspect of housework from being a private service into a public service available to all and to release women to take up jobs in social production, with every form of assistance and encouragement that is required. This will enable the individual family to lose its characteristic as the economic unit of society and, freed of all economic considerations become founded on equality and mutual affection only.

To be continued

The source of left sectarianism

by Stephen Hall

The August 1983 edition of the *AMR* carried an article by Ray Clarke purporting to present a Marxist "definition" of left sectarianism.

The article is a reply to an earlier article by this writer in the October 1982 issue of *AMR* entitled *The Real Meaning of Left Sectarianism*.

Ray Clarke writes:

"The essence of his (S Hall's) article is to prove that as the 'social base' of sectarianism is the 'petty proprietor, the small master,' and as there is no such social base in the Socialist Party of Australia, therefore the SPA (particularly its present leadership) is not guilty of the sin of sectarianism."

One of the most widely used devices of deception is to attribute to an antagonist a proposition he does not adhere to and then proceed to attack the falsely attributed proposition. This is what Ray Clarke does.

This writer did show that left sectarianism has a petty bourgeois social base *but* did not claim that the absence of a petty-bourgeois social base inside the SPA was the reason why the party is not guilty of left sectarianism.

The absence of a petty bourgeois social base within the SPA is not the reason it does not suffer from left sectarianism. The SPA is not sectarian because it does not display any of the three distinguishing features of sectarianism referred to by Lenin in *Left Wing Communism* and mentioned on p 38 of the October 1982 *AMR*. Ray Clarke failed to respond to the main propositions of the October article.

Any Marxist seeking to formulate a definition of a political phenomenon (including left sectarianism) must not only look for the phenomenon's effects but also for its causes. Such is the dialectical approach.

Cause and effect is one of the main categories of Marxist dialectics. According to V G Afanasyev:

"In the material world causality has a general, universal character. No phenomena exist or can exist without cause, for everything has its cause." (*Marxist Philosophy*, Progress, 1980 p 138).

In the world of social and political relations, phenomena are the result primarily of the interaction of social classes.

It is primarily in his failure to come to grips with the causes of left sectarianism that Ray Clarke's article fails to measure up to even the basic standards of a Marxist definition.

Indeed, not content with simply ignoring the causes of left sectarianism, Ray Clarke goes so far as to claim that it is not the result of any class influences at all. By denying the existence of a social base for left sectarianism and by confining his "Marxist definition" to a description of its effects, the reader is left with the impression that sectarianism materialises out of thin air.

Such a patently metaphysical approach can hardly be expected to serve the interests of truth or clarity.

But, then, the article is not really designed to clarify. Instead Ray Clarke's purpose is to accuse the SPA of left sectarianism. His purpose is revealed towards the end of his article where he misrepresents an incident on the Sydney waterfront in 1982.

Because a charge of sectarianism against the SPA would be false, it could only be made by resorting to false arguments.

Contrary to Ray Clarke's view, left sectarianism does have a social base. Lenin pointed to it in *Left Wing Communism* in using the term "petty bourgeois revolutionism."

Left sectarianism is one of the forms of petty-bourgeois revolutionism which is in turn the product of petty bourgeois ideological penetration into the working class.

"Impoverished by the pressure of big monopoly capital and swelling the ranks of the proletariat, former members of the urban petty-bourgeois middle strata bring into the working class movement elements of anarchism, disorganisation and leftism inherent in petty-bourgeois radicalism." (*The World Communist Movement Progress* 1973 p 259).

Boris Ponomarev, in writing about Lenin's *Left Wing Communism*, said:

"Bolshevism, Lenin points out, grew, took root and was tempered in the course of stubborn struggle against both open opportunism and 'left wing' doctrinaire attitudes. Lenin comprehensively describes the stages of this struggle and reveals the social roots of opportunism." (*Lenin and the World Revolutionary Process Progress*, 1980 p 19).

It is the penetration of petty-bourgeois ideology into the labour movement which provides the soil for Trotskyist and Maoist organisations and which is responsible for their exaggerated forms of sectarianism. Marx, Engels and Lenin frequently wrote against the sectarianism of the petty-bourgeois revolutionaries of their day (eg Lassalleans, Narodniks, Socialist Revolutionaries, etc).

Marxist-Leninist parties are not immune from the penetration of petty-bourgeois sectarianism either. As communists, we must be constantly aware of the danger of petty-bourgeois (and even bourgeois) ideas and attitudes, of right and left varieties, penetrating the working class and its

Marxist-Leninist party. Indeed, the SPA is now concluding a struggle against just such opportunist influences in its own ranks.

"They (the small commodity producers) surround the proletariat on every side with a petty-bourgeois atmosphere, which permeates and corrupts the proletariat." (*Collected Works Lenin Vol 31 p 44*).

In Chapter 8 of *Foundations of Leninism*, Stalin argues that the recently proletarianised petty-bourgeoisie affects both the working class and the party ideologically by introducing petty-bourgeois ideology and that "the party becomes consolidated by purging itself of opportunist elements."

So, although left sectarianism has a petty-bourgeois social base, it does not necessarily follow that the appearance of sectarian errors in a Marxist-Leninist party is dependent on the existence of a petty-bourgeois social base inside the party. If a communist party falls into sectarian errors, it is because petty-bourgeois ideology or attitudes have penetrated into the working class and into the party itself.

However, the recent growth and increasing influence and activity of our party is evidence of the fact that petty-bourgeois left sectarian influences do not exist and that petty-bourgeois right opportunist influences have been overcome.