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Hawke backs Reagan's war

Statement by the National Secretariat of the Committees in Solidarity with Central America and the Caribbean (CISPESCA) which appeared in The National Review May 1983

Prime Minister Bob Hawke has used his trip to Washington to put the Australian Labor Government firmly in support of U.S. policies in Central America.

His comments in Washington showed a quick and urgent response to the need for U.S. intervention in the region.

Hawke asked the Reagan Administration to balance its legitimate security concerns about developments in the area of Central America with a real concern for the human rights of people involved.

He believes that a balance must be made.

Hawke's stance is especially alarming, coming as it did less than two weeks after the respected academic journal Latin America Weekly Report headlined its June 5 issue "Hard right wins control of U.S. policy in Central America."

Hawke's statements are more than just a whitewash for the U.S. sponsored war now raging in Central America, especially in Nicaragua and El Salvador.

Hawke has made an explicit attack on the fruits of the so-called "progressive" and humane forces in the Central American region.

He states that he was not referring to the human rights of the hundreds of civilians killed each week by U.S.-backed right-wing factions, or the rights of the overwhelming majority of the Nicaraguan people who resist the Reagan Administration's Sumozaist terrorists.

Hawke's statement underlines the warning that the United States is grossly violating its own treaty obligations.

"Don't let's fall into the trap that we often do of thinking there is only one solution to a problem and that it is an easy one.

Hawke, of course, was making a basic mistake: he is discussing the Sandinistas with U.S. troops in Nicaragua.

According to the June 17 Australian, "Mr Hawke said he was disturbed by how the Sandinistas are being treated by the U.S. forces in Nicaragua..." But this is precisely the point. The Sandinistas and in some cases the U.S. forces are being treated more than any other government in the region.

Moreover, it is the most popular and beneficial social programs of the Sandinista Government that are now under attack by the U.S. and its counter-revolutionary forces operating from Honduras and Costa Rica. For example, among the civilians killed by anti-Sandinista forces in Nicaragua, 58 are technicians including many agricultural specialists, 33 teachers, 38 engineers, architects and professionals, and two doctors.

These are people who are working to bring education, technical skills and medical care to the Nicaraguan countryside—hardly an attempt by the Sandinistas to deny "human rights."

It is the U.S.-backed terrorists committing the murders who are denying human rights in Nicaragua today.

Hawke, in the United States, was not speaking simply on behalf of the Labor Party but on behalf of all the Australian people.

But how can he claim that the Australian people support U.S. policy in Central America when even the Australian people themselves do not support it, as numerous recent surveys demonstrate?

The truth is that Hawke speaks neither for the Australian people nor for the whole of the Labor Party. To say what he did in Washington, Hawke had to completely jettison ALP policy on Central America. If Hawke had gone to the US as a genuine representative of the ALP, he would have been campaigning for peace, not trying to cover for the warmakers.

Federal ALP Conference policy adopted in 1982 "reaffirms the people in each of the countries of the Continued page 8
CISCAC statement
Continued from page 5

[Central American] region have the right to determine democratically their political system under which they wish to live and support the political solution proposed by the Governments of Mexico and France in the case of El Salvador.

France and Mexico, like the FDR FMLN itself, have called for negotiations between the rebel forces and the Government to end the civil war. However, France’s stance in contrast to other world leaders in Latin America American Report on the June 10 issue carries an article explaining that “Spanish Prime Minister Felipe Gonzalez will act as a spokesperson for the interests of the Costa Rican peace people in Central America—Columbia, Mexico, Panama, and Panama—on his next trip to the United States.”

Hawke’s statements also ran directly contrary to the policies of the Social Democratic leaders in Latin America, to which the FMLN is a member. Indeed, the FMLN’s April 1982 Conference in Havana, Cuba, reaffirmed its support for the negationist forces in Nicaragua and condemned US support for the contras in Nicaragua and Central America.

Hawke’s support for Reagan’s policies in Central America is part of the general commitment of the Australian Labor Party to the US, as reflected in its support for the US military bases in Central America, and in its support for the US military buildup in Australia, and in its support for the US anti-communist efforts in Central America.

Hawke’s statements on Central America and the United States are significant because they reflect the increasing support for US policies in the country, which is now the major economic and political force in the region. Central America is now a major player in the region’s economic and political affairs, and it is supporting the US policies in Central America.
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Nationalisation—the way forward?

The term "nationalisation" is beginning to gain some currency again. It's being taken down from the dusty shelf labelled "Basic Principles and Objectives" and spied up for examination. Before BHP started seeking thousands of steelworkers and coal miners in the Federal Parliament, and before General Motors-Holden threatened to shed another 1,000 jobs, nationalisation was seen as one of the cherished demands to be fought for as a "matter of conscience and principle" by the Party left.

In 1974 when Labor Minister Ken Dolphin asked if it would nationalise Leyland in Australia to save jobs, it was a fateful "no." But times have changed and the massive jobless by BHP has brought the question of nationalisation to the fore again, even in some unexpected quarters.

In an editorial on March 23, 1983, the AFR suggested that it might be necessary, if not desirable, for the Federal Government to nationalise BHP's steel sector. Having toyed with the idea though, the idea was then dropped in favour of further deregulation.

When BHP proposed on April 22 to restructure in the Federal Secretary of the Miners' Federation, Harry Swan, suggested that the new Federal Labor Government should nationalise the steel industry. But as yet Canberra hasn't taken up the suggestion.

The apparent easing of jobs losses at BHP has not however made the question any less important. Unemployment stands officially at 19.3 per cent, and shows no signs of abating.

So it is extremely timely to examine nationalisation in all its aspects to clarify just what exactly is involved and why it is such an important part of the solution to unemployment.

The first thing to establish is that nationalisation is legal and possible under the existing Australian Constitution. The power resides with the States not the Federal Government according to the Privy Council ruling in the late 1980s on Chalil's bank nationalisation attempt.

Secondly and invariably, any discussion of nationalisation becomes a debate about the experience of nationalised industry in Britain since the Second World War.

Socialists often hear the objection: "look what happened to British Steel" or more simply "it won't work, it's up against, look at Britain!"

Sometimes nationalisation even becomes the explanation for British capitalism's failures.

The deep examination of the experience in Britain shows why nationalisation didn't work there, and as well as revealing how it could have. The real question is not whether or not to nationalise but how to do it.

In 1945 the Attlee Labour Government was swept into office on the basis of its labour policies. It left the Nationalisation of Industry in 1945, the Nationalisation of Industry in 1946, the Nationalisation of Industry in 1947, the Nationalisation of Industry in 1948, the Nationalisation of Industry in 1949, the Nationalisation of Industry in 1950, the Nationalisation of Industry in 1951, the Nationalisation of Industry in 1952, the Nationalisation of Industry in 1953, the Nationalisation of Industry in 1954, the Nationalisation of Industry in 1955, the Nationalisation of Industry in 1956, the Nationalisation of Industry in 1957, the Nationalisation of Industry in 1958, the Nationalisation of Industry in 1959, the Nationalisation of Industry in 1960, the Nationalisation of Industry in 1961, the Nationalisation of Industry in 1962, the Nationalisation of Industry in 1963, the Nationalisation of Industry in 1964, the Nationalisation of Industry in 1965, the Nationalisation of Industry in 1966, the Nationalisation of Industry in 1967, the Nationalisation of Industry in 1968, the Nationalisation of Industry in 1969, the Nationalisation of Industry in 1970, the Nationalisation of Industry in 1971, the Nationalisation of Industry in 1972, the Nationalisation of Industry in 1973, the Nationalisation of Industry in 1974, the Nationalisation of Industry in 1975, the Nationalisation of Industry in 1976, the Nationalisation of Industry in 1977, the Nationalisation of Industry in 1978, the Nationalisation of Industry in 1979, the Nationalisation of Industry in 1980, the Nationalisation of Industry in 1981, the Nationalisation of Industry in 1982, the Nationalisation of Industry in 1983, the Nationalisation of Industry in 1984, the Nationalisation of Industry in 1985, the Nationalisation of Industry in 1986, the Nationalisation of Industry in 1987, the Nationalisation of Industry in 1988, the Nationalisation of Industry in 1989, the Nationalisation of Industry in 1990, the Nationalisation of Industry in 1991, the Nationalisation of Industry in 1992, the Nationalisation of Industry in 1993, the Nationalisation of Industry in 1994, the Nationalisation of Industry in 1995, the Nationalisation of Industry in 1996, the Nationalisation of Industry in 1997, the Nationalisation of Industry in 1998, the Nationalisation of Industry in 1999, the Nationalisation of Industry in 2000, the Nationalisation of Industry in 2001, the Nationalisation of Industry in 2002, the Nationalisation of Industry in 2003, the Nationalisation of Industry in 2004, the Nationalisation of Industry in 2005, the Nationalisation of Industry in 2006, the Nationalisation of Industry in 2007, the Nationalisation of Industry in 2008, the Nationalisation of Industry in 2009, the Nationalisation of Industry in 2010, the Nationalisation of Industry in 2011, the Nationalisation of Industry in 2012, the Nationalisation of Industry in 2013, the Nationalisation of Industry in 2014, the Nationalisation of Industry in 2015, the Nationalisation of Industry in 2016, the Nationalisation of Industry in 2017, the Nationalisation of Industry in 2018, the Nationalisation of Industry in 2019, the Nationalisation of Industry in 2020, the Nationalisation of Industry in 2021, the Nationalisation of Industry in 2022, the Nationalisation of Industry in 2023, the Nationalisation of Industry in 2024, the Nationalisation of Industry in 2025, the Nationalisation of Industry in 2026, the Nationalisation of Industry in 2027, the Nationalisation of Industry in 2028, the Nationalisation of Industry in 2029, the Nationalisation of Industry in 2030.
The attacks begin

By Barry Healy
Member of Western (WA) branch and the Amalgamated Metal Founders and Shipwrights' Union

He said that since the Government has been in office it has not been able to get accurate information from the Public Service, the old Liberal spending programs. It also has not had time to implement any of Labor's spending programs.

So he said his intention is to ensure that the current programs are properly funded and that they can be properly reviewed. In short, the Burke Government is slugging it out, trying to get the same as the old Liberals program.

And pulled from his pocket was an old kimono, his only weapon in the battle for the very poor the rates will still hurt the vast majority.

To make the rates more palatable Burke has initiated a "Government" service which is doing very little for the existing machinery and skills of the workers.

In a one time Lucas workers' Corporate Mortgage raised $150 million to invest in the existing machinery and skills of the workers.

While preparing the budget Burke has been criticized for giving too much money to the PLL. So Burke has headed off any resistance around wages.

As a consequence no serious compromises of discontent emerged at the PLL. So Burke has headed off any resistance around wages.

In preparing the ground Burke was assisted by two moderate union officials, Tom Butler and Jim McCourt, who have been appointed as advisers within the Government. Both are experienced numbers' men and can help steer contentious issues through both the Party and PLL.

So the Hawke-Wran consultation consensus method of administrative bitter pills to the working class is being used to advantage by the Burke Government.

By this method and by the rapid implementation of increased opposition to the heart of the federal Opposition, the Burke leadership after four months in Government is still in its honeymoon phase.

For instance, the Fremantle Railway service is going to get going again and moves to protect the Shannon River Basin as a national park carried under way.

The notoriety Section 44 of the Police Act has been redefined, but not quite in line with the Police Party and draft legislation. It is being prepared for women.

But all is not well as far as women's policy is concerned.

Burke has publicly opposed the Police Party's free abortion on demand policy and his conscience vote for politicians so we had better not hold our breath on that. Burke's support for necessary changes inside Labor Women the leadership can't seriously be said to be under pressure on abortion - yet.

Inside the only change in leadership Labor Party Burke has made is the appointment of an official - not a backbench member - who's add it to the agenda presented to the Cabinet. This effectively buries backbench control of Cabinet.

The first month of the Burke leadership has shown them to be very shrewd in conducting business. Burke is against the economic crisis and the Government that protects the interest of the bosses. The indications to date are not too good.
Bitter fruits of consenus politics

In the recent British general election the opposition Labour party, with its leader, Michael Foot, leading the Labour Party, scored a 144-seat majority, in the House of Commons. The fact is that this majority was achieved on the basis of 752,000 votes for the Labour candidate, Sir Harold Wilson, under the principle of proportional representation. The main problem is that the majority is not a decisive one, and it is not clear how the Labour government will be able to implement its policies.

President Ronald Reagan has surely got a policy of limited nuclear war. Everybody in the peace movement seems to know that he is not a reasonable man. Everybody knows that there is no such thing as a limited nuclear war. It's not really a question of whether they can carry it out. But the American public knows that they can't carry it out. So they have to give up on the idea.

The Labour government has already announced that it will not support the war against Iran. The government will not support the war against Iraq. The government will not support the war against Kabul. The government will not support the war against Yugoslavia. The government will not support the war against Afghanistan.

This has led to a problem with the trade unions. They feel that they are being left out. They feel that they are being ignored. They feel that they are being treated as second-class citizens. They feel that they are being treated as second-class citizens. They feel that they are being treated as second-class citizens.

The Labour government has also announced that it will not support the war against Israel. The government will not support the war against Palestine. The government will not support the war against the Palestinian people. The government will not support the war against the Palestinian people. The government will not support the war against the Palestinian people.

This has led to a problem with the trade unions. They feel that they are being left out. They feel that they are being ignored. They feel that they are being treated as second-class citizens. They feel that they are being treated as second-class citizens. They feel that they are being treated as second-class citizens.

But the Labour government has also announced that it will not support the war against the USA. The government will not support the war against the USA. The government will not support the war against the USA. The government will not support the war against the USA.

This has led to a problem with the trade unions. They feel that they are being left out. They feel that they are being ignored. They feel that they are being treated as second-class citizens. They feel that they are being treated as second-class citizens. They feel that they are being treated as second-class citizens.
People think oh well, I voted for my MP and that is it. But it is very important that they are coming out of Parliament in London, they have the support of the party and the campaigns that they are involved in. They have the power to make sure that there is a change in the Government.

But there will be disagreements of course, but once the elections are held the major problem of the Labour Party will not be the lack of a leader. It will be the lack of a leader and the lack of a leader's policies.

There will be disagreements of course, but once the elections are held the major problem of the Labour Party will not be the lack of a leader. It will be the lack of a leader and the lack of a leader's policies.

One way to do this is to encourage activists to produce and sell their various pamphlets, such as Militant and Socialist Action. Such pamphlets should include information, some of the common policies that are being pursued by the Labour Party about getting involved with groups like the Black Block or the Troops Out. This is crucial to the success of Militant and Socialist Action.

Q: What sort of impact has the Irish struggle had on the Labour Party in Britain?

A: Again it is the left-wing that takes up this particular struggle. The right-wing seem to have a policy of maintaining the status quo in Ireland with the troops still there in Northern Ireland. Most left-wing supporters of the H Block hunger strike campaign.

Q: What sort of role do the unions play in the Labour Party in Britain at present?

A: One would hope that the unions would be representing the interests of workers in the Labour Party. But, in many cases they don't. The left-wing of the Labour Party, on the other hand, are very concerned about the worker's rights and are willing to fight for them.

Q: Can the Labour Party be considered a working-class party?

A: The Labour Party can be considered a working-class party. They have always been a working-class party and they have always been fighting for the rights of the working class.

People think oh well, I voted for my MP and that is it. But it is very important that they are coming out of Parliament in London, they have the support of the party and the campaigns that they are involved in. They have the power to make sure that there is a change in the Government.

But there will be disagreements of course, but once the elections are held the major problem of the Labour Party will not be the lack of a leader. It will be the lack of a leader and the lack of a leader's policies.

There will be disagreements of course, but once the elections are held the major problem of the Labour Party will not be the lack of a leader. It will be the lack of a leader and the lack of a leader's policies.

One way to do this is to encourage activists to produce and sell their various pamphlets, such as Militant and Socialist Action. Such pamphlets should include information, some of the common policies that are being pursued by the Labour Party about getting involved with groups like the Black Block or the Troops Out. This is crucial to the success of Militant and Socialist Action.
The Party polarises

Queensland State Council

"We are in Government now . . . and some people do not seem to realise that we cannot allow ourselves the little self-indulgences of the past."

By Anthea Parker
Member of Keppel (Qld) branch and the ATEMA

Those were the words of Bill Hayden at Queensland State Council on June 4. Hayden was speaking against a motion from the Petrie P.D., which called for the Federal Government to implement policy on East Timor. All allies argued an amendment was passed which stated that "the timing and extent of policy implementation is a matter for the Government and determinative in the light of prevailing conditions."

And it was with major policy areas at this State Council meeting

Socialist left extract

It must be noted that many members of the Australian community, and particularly many members of the Labor Party who worked hard for a Federal Labor victory, are in a state of shock at the performance of the Hawke Government. Within weeks of obtaining Office, the Hawke Government orchestrated a shameful campaign, by smear and innuendo, against a former Party Official, David Combe. They accepted the word of AII, an organization which has been a leading enemy of the Labor movement since its inception, and initiated injunctions against Australia's only progressive newspaper—the MP. These attacks were clearly needed, in a fundamental way, Party Policy on important Foreign Policy issues, such as Sinai, Vietnam and Vietnam. It has regained the services of John Stone, who was a leading Government functionary in promoting anti-communist policy and the pressuring of the Communist Party in the time of the Prime Minister.

Hayden said that it was not only the substance of the Hawke Government — it is the manner in which it is operated, particularly in relation to the Parliamentary Caucus of the Federal Labor Party. He cited theTrade Union movement and the democratic process of Labor. Hayden said that the attacks of the Federal Party that proper procedures of accountability are adhered to.

The real debate was about the role of policy advocated by the rank and file of the Party. Many dele-gates obviously felt unrepresented about the way that the Hawke Government had thrown policy out the window on uranium and on foreign policy issues such as aid to Vietnam or self-determination for the East Timorese (see extract in the box from a special Left publication distributed at Council).

But following the lead of Bill Hayden, the party consistently opposed attempts to voice those criticisms of the Parliamentary leadership.

The uranium debate was where Hayden showed his true colours most fully.

Two motions were received calling for a special Federal Conference to discuss uranium policy, but the Socialist Left chose to ignore this call in favor of an amendment which said that "the Queensland Branch views with alarm recent reports of new contracts for the sale of uranium, and reports that the Government does not recognize any connection between the sale of uranium and the French and nuclear tests in the Pacific."

Hayden launched into an attack on the part of his party to criticise Bob Hawke and who was the great enemy of setting tactics against the Government. I wonder what effect such an accusation has on those in the party who wanted the number of Poles who maintained up to the March elections that Hayden would have made a more progressive leader than Hawke.

As a result of Hayden’s intervention, one of the motions was lost, though only after a division was called for.

One positive feature of Council was the unanimous support expressed for the rejection of legislation in both the Federal and Queensland Parliaments to give effect to the Federal Government on the elimination of all forms of discrimination against women.

While this might seem a relatively uncontroversial issue, a great deal of time has been spent in attacking this legislation in the local sections of labor, of future claims have been made, such as that time has been separated from their parents at birth, and that they be forced out to work against their will.

At least the Party is immune to this right-wing propaganda. But it is a great shame that the Labor Party, the Trade Union movement and the democratic process of Labor that proper procedures of accountability are adhered to.

NSW Women’s Conference

The resolutions passed by the NSW Women’s Conference, held on May 31 and 32, proved once again that rank and file women in the NSW branch are far to the left of the Parliamentary leadership.

The views of the 700 delegates from ALP branches and affiliated unions were a sharp contrast to the conservative male delegates to NSW State Conference two weeks later.

By Louanne Barker
Member of the Port Kembla (NSW) branch of the Federated Ironworkers Union

Women’s Conference anticipated many of Hawke’s betrayals of ALP policy and passed a number of resolutions on foreign policy which were either reinforced or strengthened present policy.

An urgent motion to immediately implement ALP policy on East Timor and grant visas to the Fretilin representatives to tour Australia was adopted. Conference called for renewed support for the Montevideo declaration of recognition for the coalition forces including the unmarked of Pol Pot’s representatives along the Kampuchean border.

It was only a week later that Hawke buckled both the customary foreign policy and a resolution on Central American policy was also timely since Hawke took only a few weeks to deal with the present policy in the scramble to assure Reagan and Wall Street of his whole hearted allegiance. This motion called on the Federal ALP to declare its opposition to U.S. military and financial aid to the Military Junta in El Salvador and to condemn the action of the U.S. Government in financing and training the counter-revolutionary forces invading Nicaragua.

The ALP Government was also urged to withdraw troops from the Iranian, to recognize the FLO, to call on the U.S. to cease the flow of arms and money to Israel and support a democratic Israel. The conference was structured to combine different methods of discussion and debate, as some workshops were workshops as well as the more usual plenary sessions were held. This work- ed to a certain extend but it put the Conference under tremendous time pressure. On any one motion or policy area the time for debate was very limited.

British women at Greenham Common—a human chain against US bases.

Workshops were held on four policy areas, Women and Unemployment, Women’s Centres, Uranium and Disarmament and Women in Prison. In each of these debate centred around a previously prepared printed statement. In addition there were four workshops on skills to provide greater information and increase women’s participation in the present motion. From this motion, it was clear that the conference was substantially in agreement with the previous conference.

Part of the prepared motion for the workshop, stated that “Labor Women reiterates its policy of opposition to all foreign bases on Australian soil” and that there has been “a first step in the Government that a step forward in the direction of disarmament and nuclear disarmament.”

Continued page 18

(Australia National University, Act 1963)
NSW State Conference

There were few surprises at the NSW Labor State Conference held on the 11-13th June. With the tight wings in control, the outcome of the conference was predictable but the debate was stifled.

By Bruce Tarelli
Member of Annandale (NSW) branch

In the wake of Bob Hawke's world tour, the main topic of debate was Party policy. In an amendment to the Federal Administrative Report, John Birch called for the making of all Federal rules followed, particularly with regard to East Timor, Indonesia, Vietnam and uranium. He pointed out that the Federal rules of the Party were quite clear, and referred to the precedent set by John Curtin calling for a special National Conference during World War II to change the Party's policy on conscription.

The response of Centre Unity was to say as little as possible. The issue was to be that of Hawke and the Government should not be criticized, as it was a risk to the policy they so desired. The amendment was defeated along faction lines.

On the morning of Conference, a motion was put forward to the Federal Conference, an amendment to the Federal Administrative report that the policy of the NSW Branch should be implemented "according to the rules of the NSW Branch". The motion was then accepted and brought down down.

The remainder of the conference was taken up with more local issues, with a number of resolutions being passed. The conference then adjourned.

Barrie Unsworth
This was narrowly lost by 31votes to 304, with several Centre Unity members voting against the Union delegation and four of the five Centre Unity delegates voting against the Union. The argument for the amendment was that the Hayden line of the previous day--that the time for the implementation of policy should be left to the Party/Parliament.

In another interpretation of the "Radical" movement, a motion to lift the freeze on public sector employment was unanimously defeated by 441 votes to 274, despite a strong call by the State Conference to defer the proposal to the NSW Branch conference. The motion was tabled by John McBean, in his opening address as President of the NSW Branch Conference, that the plan for the elimination of public sector workers was "unemployment and declining living standards", with no real alternative solution put forward by the Left.
**Victorian State Conference**

It was one of the best State Conferences for a long time with the Left wing even activists on many issues, ranging from local issues such as uranium, AIDS and the Australian Defence Force to global issues like the United Nations. There were some heated debates on various issues, but overall, the conference was a success.

And Hawke's resolution on independence for Papua New Guinea was simply ignored by the delegates. It was a sign of the times that even Hawke's own colleagues were not prepared to support the resolution. The motion was carried, but only with a two-thirds majority. The conference also discussed the future of the ALP, with many delegates calling for a more progressive agenda. The motion to ban members of the ALP from membership of the ABC was carried by a substantial majority. The conference also discussed the role of the ALP in the upcoming Federal election, and the need for a more radical agenda.

Of the many decisions made at the conference, two issues have received very little attention by the media. One was the decision to support the Heavy Industry Research Institute (HIRES) in its negotiations with the Australian Steelmakers. HIRES is a private research institute that conducts research on heavy industry in Australia. The conference also voted to support the HIRES' proposal for a $200 million research fund.

The Right wing was in disarray with hardly one Parliamentarian supporting the Left wing and Hawke's resolutions. Hawke's resolution on independence for Papua New Guinea was even more disarray with hardly one Parliamentarian supporting the Left wing and Hawke's resolutions. Hawke's resolution on independence for Papua New Guinea was even more disarray than the Right wing and Hawke's resolutions.

The Right wing was in disarray with hardly one Parliamentarian supporting the Left wing and Hawke's resolutions. Hawke's resolution on independence for Papua New Guinea was even more disarray than the Right wing and Hawke's resolutions.
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The Right wing was in disarray with hardly one Parliamentarian supporting the Left wing and Hawke's resolutions. Hawke's resolution on independence for Papua New Guinea was even more disarray than the Right wing and Hawke's resolutions.
South Australian State Conference

Industrial health and safety, legitimisation of marijuana, and the
right of police to carry guns in the
city were some of the highlights
discussed at the South Australian State Conference on June 11-13.

By Marg McHugh
Member, Belair Blakwood (SA) branch.

A motion was passed calling on
State Government to establish a
state-wide workers health centre in Adelaide.

The motion was seconded by Dr John
Cormack, SA Minister for Health.

This will certainly be a big step up
given the current state of the
industry. The motion was passed by
the ASIO and the SA Labour Government.

Public transport was also a significant issue
discussed at the conference.

The Government intends to table
the White Report into the activities of
the South Australian Special Branch in
1976. This Report revealed police
investigation of Labor Parliamentarians,
trade unionists and other social justice
activists and even some religious
leaders.

Other important motions that were
passed included resolutions to
increase the number of women
in government, increase the number
of women in the workforce, and
increase the number of women
in politics.

In summary, the conference was
a success and a good indication
of the growing support for
women's issues in South Australia.

Ken Fry

The first 100 days

Q. How would you evaluate the first
100 days of the Hawke Government?
A. Well, you could say it's been
disappointing—particularly in
relation to foreign policy. We've seen
to the point where we're dealing
with the US and not with China
anymore. The relationship between
the foreign policy of the Fraser
Government and that of the
Hawke Government has been
reversed. And I expounded at length
on a number of other issues. Since
then, however, some of the
statements of the Prime Minister
have made a significant difference
in the conduct of foreign policy.

I'm referring particularly in
relation to East Timor, to China in
Vietnam, and most recently in Central America.

The Hawke Government has
been influenced by the astute
leadership of Julian Assange, even on El Salvador. At the
same time, the government has
also been influenced by the
leadership of Julian Assange,
including his recent
appearance in Australia.

I think the goal of the
Federal Government will be to try
to resolve these conflicts,
and to suggest to the Prime
Minister certain actions the
Australian Parliament can be
involved in.

I don't think they can get
away with it, but then again I'm
not the one who's going to
endorse the clear message
that his actions have not been
endorsed at least three State
Conferences.

A typical example of
the response was at the ACT
Conference when the Prime
Minister was asked to
endorse the Australian
Parliamentary Conference
on East Timor, and he
agreed to do so.

Now, I think people
really think in view of
the threat of nuclear war, the
possibilities of the development of
other socialist countries and socialist
governments gain some ground
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...many of their operatives are people of European descent with hang-ups about socialism. They are generalists and not specialists. They've much to offer them and I think we must fight them very, very hard.

I've never heard that we don't need a security agency. Of course we do. The role of the CAB is to protect the nation from such influences. It's very much to our detriment and I think we must take a very firm line here.

The CAB is a very small industry, it's very hard handed politically and in view and I think the ESPK would show that its role is to protect us from such influences. In fact, the CAB is a very well handled industry and I won't comment further.

Heavily armed in the defence of the nation, the CAB is a very well handled industry and I won't comment further.

Mr. Hawke says there is a clear indication that the Prime Minister and his government are making a clear statement about their position on the Vietnam War in Parliament. However, I think Mr. Hawke's line is that this statement is being made in a very tactical manner.

I think Mr. Hawke's line is that this statement is being made in a very tactical manner.

The other area where we've clearly gone against policy in relation to the conduct of the war, as I understand it, is that we've opposed the American involvement there. But you couldn't interpret what the Prime Minister said as being consistent with this policy. Certainly he had

Q. What about the proposed Parliamentary fact-finding tour? Will this be useful in resolving this issue?

A. Not really. I'm skeptical about the whole exercise. It isn't that I have doubts about the people going or the time allowed for the tour. They've only been there for about a day and a half.

Q. Do you think the fact-finding tour is an effective way to resolve the issue?

A. I believe it is. It is an excellent way to resolve the issue. It is a very important way to resolve the issue.

As to the Parliamentary fact-finding tour, I believe it is the only way to resolve the issue. It is an excellent way to resolve the issue.

Q. Do you think the Prime Minister's statements about the position of the Government in the war are not only surprising but also irresponsible?

A. I believe they are. They are very surprising and very irresponsible. I believe the Prime Minister's statements about the position of the Government in the war are not only surprising but also irresponsible.

Mr. Hawke's position is clear. He is against the war. However, I think Mr. Hawke's line is that this statement is being made in a very tactical manner.

Mr. Hawke's position is clear. He is against the war. However, I think Mr. Hawke's line is that this statement is being made in a very tactical manner.

I think Mr. Hawke's line is that this statement is being made in a very tactical manner.
Withdraw the Sinai troops!

When newspaper headlines highlighted the massacre in the Sabra and Shatila camps in Lebanon last year, horror and a revolt occurred for which had occurred, war expressed throughout the world.

In a special report by the Sunday Times (London) evidence was given of Israeli complicity in the Sabra massacre.

By Irene Robinson
Member of the Zionist (Vic) branch

"By nightfall the Gaza hospital corridors were jammed with 200 Palestinians and Lebanese, mainly women and children. The hospital was turned into a prison and Israeli troops were fully in control around the hospital and inside. An unimpeded massacre was taking place."

Newspapers everywhere gave similar reports. What many did not emphasize was that the Israeli army was in a direct conflict with the Palestinians, part of the Palestinian people, and part of the Palestinian society. The massacre of Yasser Arafat in 1983 was followed by the massacre of four hundred and thirty Palestinians in the Sabra and Shatila camps in Lebanon, a massacre that intensified the consolidation of the Israeli state in all Palestinian areas.

The immediate victims of our efforts from the Sinai would be an important step in helping to stabilize this crisis by opening the door to new opportunities. In this context, we extend our congratulations to the Lebanese for their courage and determination in the face of this difficult situation. We also express our solidarity with the Palestinian people and their struggle for self-determination.

The situation in Lebanon has deteriorated significantly in recent months. The political and economic situation in Lebanon remains critical. The country continues to be mired in a state of political and economic crisis, with little prospect of a breakthrough on the horizon.

We call on the international community to take immediate action to address the situation in Lebanon. We urge all parties to the conflict to engage in constructive dialogue and to work towards a peaceful resolution. We also call on the United Nations and other international organizations to provide assistance to help the people of Lebanon.

In conclusion, we reiterate our commitment to the Palestinian cause and our support for the struggle for self-determination. We call on all Palestinians to remain united and to continue to fight for a just and lasting peace in the region.

Yours sincerely,
Irene Robinson

--

EAST TIMOR SPEAKS!

After being banned by Fraser from entering Australia since 1976, Fretilin Central Committee members Abilio Araujo and Joque Rodrigues will speak throughout Australia next month.

This is a unique opportunity to hear about the current situation in East Timor, the Fretilin-led resistance and how Australians can help bring peace and self-determination to East Timor.

SYDNEY: Sunday July 31, 3pm, Town Hall, Sydney

ADelaide: Tuesday August 6, 7pm, Town Hall, Adelaide

PERTH: Wednesday August 7, 7pm, Town Hall, Perth

MELBOURNE: Sunday July 31, 3pm, Town Hall, Melbourne

WOLLONGONG: Thursday July 27, 3pm, Wollongong Workers Club

To book a speaking event, please contact Fretilin Australia at info@fretilin.org.au or call 0411 555 666.

Send to: East Timor Team, PO Box 775, Sydney NSW 2000.

P.O. extracts from Fretilin's 1989 statement:

"The establishment of the Republic of East Timor was a historic event that marked the beginning of a new era for the people of East Timor. The people of East Timor have demonstrated their determination to achieve self-determination and independence."

--

Letters

Mr. Gerry Hand, M.P., Member for Melbourne, Parliament House, Melbourne, VIC 3000

Dear Mr. Hand,

I am writing to urge you to support the withdrawal of Australian troops from the Sinai Peninsula. The ongoing military presence in the Sinai has caused significant harm to the region, and it is time for Australia to take a strong stance against this deployment.

The withdrawal of Australian troops from the Sinai would be a clear signal to the international community that Australia is committed to the Palestinian cause and to the establishment of a just and lasting peace in the region.

I urge you to consider the following points as you decide whether to support or oppose the withdrawal of Australian troops from the Sinai:

1. The ongoing military presence in the Sinai has caused significant harm to the region, and it is time for Australia to take a strong stance against this deployment.

2. The withdrawal of Australian troops from the Sinai would be a clear signal to the international community that Australia is committed to the Palestinian cause and to the establishment of a just and lasting peace in the region.

I believe that it is in the best interests of Australia to support the withdrawal of Australian troops from the Sinai. I urge you to consider these points as you decide whether to support or oppose the withdrawal of Australian troops from the Sinai.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]

Send to: East Timor Team, PO Box 775, Sydney NSW 2000.
antiwar

Dictatorships and the arms race

Published below is the speech given by Peter Miller MHR for La Trobe to the celebration of the 30th anniversary of the end of World War II.

Celebrating the 30th anniversary of the end of World War II, Peter Miller MHR, member for La Trobe, said: "We are all proud of our country, which has been a leader in the fight against fascism." Miller emphasized the importance of remembering the sacrifices made by Australian soldiers during the war. "We must never forget the bravery of our troops," he said.

In his speech, Miller also highlighted the need to prevent future dictatorial regimes. "We must always be vigilant against the rise of such regimes," he said.

Miller concluded his speech by calling for continued support for the United Nations and its efforts to maintain peace and security around the world. "We must work together to ensure a better future for all," he said.

The speech was well-received by the audience, who gave Miller a standing ovation.

---

US awareness trains Salvadoran army as part of Reagan's stepped up involvement in Central America.

US officials are seen training Salvadoran army as part of Reagan's stepped up involvement in Central America.

Evidence of the involvement of the US Central Intelligence Agency in Nicaragua was given in The Time Magazine of 16 May. A quote from the magazine reads: "The training of the Contras in Guatemala has been going on for some time, and it is now becoming more public. The CIA is said to be providing training in guerrilla tactics, commando training, and weapons.

The training is seen as part of the US's efforts to support anti-Sandinista forces in Nicaragua.

The US has also been involved in training the Contras in El Salvador and Honduras. The Salvadoran government has been accused of carrying out human rights abuses in the country.

The US's involvement in Central America has been a source of controversy in recent years. Many people have criticized the US for providing support to anti-government forces in the region.

---
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Committee Against Repression in the Pacific and Asia

Statement of Aims

1. To aid in defending victims of political persecution and to support the struggle of Asia and the Pacific, regardless of their nationalities, beliefs, affiliations or associations, and to provide whatever assistance is possible for those families.

2. To cooperate with all efforts to stop the repression of free speech and free association, in order to respect the role of law in all political situations, and to enable the hijacked by regimes which are often manipulated by the United States' and the USSR's policies.

3. To inform and arouse public opinion in Australia on the repressive policies pursued by military, authoritarian and constitutional regimes in Asia and the Pacific and in the United States; and to call attention to the lack of respect of the political rights of those countries.

4. To cooperate with the Committee Against Repression in the Pacific and Asia in other countries which have similar purposes.

Join CARPA! Become a sponsor

1. Endorse the Committee Against Repression in the Pacific and Asia. My name may be used publicly to promote the aims of CARPA.
3. A tax-deductible subscription to the CARPA Bulletin (Australia $35, overseas $60).

You can help by contributing to the work of the Committee Against Repression in the Pacific and Asia. My name may be used publicly to promote the aims of CARPA.

Aims of CISCAC

1. To promote an understanding among the Australian people of the struggles in Central America and the Caribbean against exploitation and repression, and to work for solidarity with those struggles.

2. To encourage and finance the work of the Committee Against Repression in the Pacific and Asia, and to contribute to the work of the Committee Against Repression in the Pacific and Asia.

You can help by contributing to the work of the Committee Against Repression in the Pacific and Asia. My name may be used publicly to promote the aims of CARPA.

Aims of CISCAC

1. To promote an understanding among the Australian people of the struggles in Central America and the Caribbean against exploitation and repression, and to work for solidarity with those struggles.

2. To encourage and finance the work of the Committee Against Repression in the Pacific and Asia, and to contribute to the work of the Committee Against Repression in the Pacific and Asia.

The peoples of Central America and the Caribbean need your support...
Parliamentarians speak out against harassment of Turkish migrants

"Democracy in Turkey and the 'Come Back Home' letters was the subject of a seminar held in Melbourne on May 28. The seminar was organized by a joint committee of representatives from the Union of Australian Turkish Workers and the Australian Turkish Cultural Association.

By Coral Channells

Speaker included Hurretin Babecan, a longterm activist in the Victorian branch and Commissioner for the Victorian Ethnic Affairs Department; Stewart West, Minister for Immigration and Ethnic Affairs; Brian Howe, Minister of Defence Support; Peter Smyke, Victorian Minister of Ethnic Affairs; Gerry Hand, Federal Member for Melbourne, and Caroline Hugg, MLC for Melbourne West.

The meeting, attended by more than 100 people, was called to publicise and build support for the campaign against the Turkish Military Regime's attempts to intimidate and penalise Turkish labour movement activists.

Because of political work in the Turkish community, including encouraging involvement by the Turkish community in Labor Party work, Hurretin Babecan and 12 other Turkish activists have received letters from the Turkish Consulates in Sydney and Melbourne threatening loss of Turkish citizenship and property unless they immediately return home.

In her speech, Babecan gave a detailed account of the Turkish regime's repressive rule since the 1960 military coup. She described the mounting campaign of victimisation and harassment against Turkish-born migrants in countries around the world.

Babecan said that Turkish migrants in other countries — including trade unionists, journalists, artists, and intellectuals — have received similar 'come back home' letters.

She called on the Labor Government to extradite the Turkish Ambassador to Australia. Turkish activists believe that Consular officials, under the direction of the Ambassador, have spied on the Turkish community and that names have been sent back to the Junta.

Stewart West assured Turkish permanent residents that the Turkish Government could not force them to return home. They would undoubtedly face jail, torture, or death, if they did, he said.

West has also issued a statement in Turkish to the ethnic media outlets reassuring the community and setting their rights under Australian law.

Caroline Hugg spoke about her connection with the Turkish community and the problems Turkish migrants face in Australia.

The Turkish community worries desperately about its children's education, about language problems, the lack of availability of Turkish-speaking teachers here — about the loss of its culture. In an effort to address these problems, they began to form associations and political parties — indeed some took out Australian citizenship — gradually they began to become politically organised and active.

But at this point the Turkish Government, through its representatives here, began to locate the activists in this legal and democratic struggle and try to turn people to return to Turkey.

Hugg said the summons to return "threatens the community and attacks these people's democratic existence. They are in every way attacks against international relations and democratic rights."

I believe that there is a case to be made out that the Consulates exceed their authority in this matter and I would indeed like to see an investigation of the Consulates' role."}

In his speech, Gerry Hand described the curtailment of democratic and trade union rights carried out by the Military Junta in Turkey.

He pointed out that many Social Democratic parties in Europe have reacted strongly to the regime's dissolution of the Turkish Social Democratic Republican People's Party, and the jailing of its leader, Halil Erenvit.

He added that "I suggest that the Australian Government should examine the question of whether Australia-Turkey relations should cease.

"As a Member of Parliament," Hand concluded, "I will support all activities taking place, and will protest at the inhumane activities of the Turkish Junta."