

# THE REBEL!

SF REF  
335.005  
R24

PER

No. 4




Volume 1, Number 4

October 24, 1977.



## IN THIS ISSUE

- \* STUDYING INFLATION
- \* THE K-K-KAUTSKYISM OF THE "C-C-CONSERVATIVE COMMUNISTS"
- \* DO YOU JUST BELONG?
- \* REMEMBER CZECHOSLOVAKIA!
- \* LETTERS

  
**red eureka movement**

LETTERS TO THE REBEL

10/8/1977  
Comrades,

.....We must entrench ourselves in the proletariat, constructively attempt to organise the proletariat, raise the political consciousness of the proletariat, and always learn from the proletariat. These things must be realised, and we must reorganise and revolutionise our strategy, tactics and overall politics to what is genuine Marxism-Leninism. There are so many characters around that cannot function as proletarian revolutionaries because of their middle-class prejudices, and due to the fact that they are armchair intellectuals we must not mix around in their ... circles. Let's face reality, on the majority of occasions, when genuine members of R.A.M. do go around visiting people "to promote discussion and debate" in what circles is it done? In working class circles? No! Instead in intellectual realms .....Revolutionaries are not masturbators. It's about time we realised this.

The Australian working class exists in its vast numbers. The Red Bureka Movement must involve itself in that class..... This can and must be done. Instead of finding ourselves babbling about intellectual issues we must NOW start organising, working and living as an integral part of the proletariat. There are countless areas and methods in which we can function. The factories are but one obvious example. The working class suburbs and especially the Housing Commission flats are another. There are the working class social clubs in which we can mingle, socialise and organise with the masses. As communists we must be a part of the proletariat. We must learn to live, think and act like proletarians. The most sure and best possible way is to recruit revolutionaries from that class.

Fraternal greetings  
.....

1/8/1977

Dear Comrades,

Having just had the extreme pleasure of reading your publication "Rebel" (on loan from another comrade), I feel that I must write and pass on to you my thoughts on this revolutionary material.

"Excellent" is all I can say.

"Rebel" has stirred me on. It has refreshed and replenished my whole being, as I hope it will others that have read it.

I'm a very ordinary person, no great scholar or genius, and at times this irritates me. Mainly... because I cannot express myself as fully as I'd like to. But comrades, believe me when I say that I have a deep-rooted hatred inside me, against all that capitalism stands for. Capitalism, fascism, religion etc must be destroyed forever, never to emerge again on the face of the earth. Revolution is, and can be the ONLY answer. Revolution under arms, so that the scum can be destroyed and buried deep ( the bosses, fat cats, uniforms). They are the target for the people to destroy.

cont.

Thankyou for Rebel. Thankyou for relighting a dying flame within me. Thankyou for giving me the courage to march on. . . . . A comrade. (from the country)

FROM THE EDITORS

The Rebel Editorial group thanks all contributors to the paper. This issue of the Rebel contains, among others, a lengthy article which we considered important to publish. Because of this, however, we have held over some articles until Rebel No. 5. We apologise to the writers whose articles have not been printed this issue.

We particularly want to encourage people to write articles for Rebel on topics relevant to the development of the Australian revolutionary movement and the struggle against revisionism, and articles relating to the working class.

The poem "Are You an Active Member?" clearly shows how political comments can be made not only by writing "heavy" theoretical articles, but by amusing anecdotes from unexpected sources. We hope that this provides some impetus for our supporters to contribute a wide range of material to Rebel. In this way we should ensure that Rebel is interesting and provocative, as well as enjoyable to read.

We would like to thank the comrades who have sent contributions for Rebel, criticisms and other correspondence, as well as donations. With continued active participation of our readers, Rebel should improve. Remember, Chairman Mao's words from "Introducing the Chinese Worker", (Vol. 2 Selected Works.)

"Once started, a journal must be run conscientiously and well. This is the responsibility of the readers as well as of the staff. It is very important for the readers to send in suggestions and write brief letters and articles indicating what they like and what they dislike, for this is the only way to make the journal a success."

If you would like to subscribe to "The Rebel" or to "Study Notes", then write to

Red Bureka Movement...  
17 The Ridge,  
Blackburn, 3130  
Victoria

### STUDYING INFLATION

Everyone in Australia and the rest of the capitalist world is very concerned about rising prices. All sorts of theories and "explanations" have been put forward, and all sorts of "solutions advocated.... but prices are still rising and nobody knows what to do.

In this situation it is essential to make a scientific Marxist analysis of the real situation, so as to arm the people with a correct theory that can guide correct action. Merely abusing the multi-national, or saying that "inflation arises from exploitation", or that it arises from capitalism does not really help much. Material published so far has simply repeated a number of (often conflicting) bourgeois theories.

The most popular theory seems to be the "monetarist" myth that: "For political reasons a government comes to the conclusion that it is unwilling to tax beyond a certain point and unlikely to borrow beyond a certain point. It then turns to the central bank and says- 'all right, you print the rest!'"

This particular statement was made by Menzies in 1942, presumably when, having been kicked into opposition, he was trying to oppose the then Government's efforts to finance the war against fascism.

But the history of monetarism goes back well beyond Menzies' pathetic ravings. The essence of monetarism was thoroughly refuted by Marx in his analysis of the controversy between the "banking" and "currency" schools of bourgeois economic theory in volume 3 of "Capital".

In order to understand rising prices, it is essential first of all to understand what price is, what money is, what commodities are. Under capitalism prices do not just rise, they also fall. In every previous crisis of overproduction, prices have fallen, and there is no reason to believe that the present crisis, when it finally breaks, will be an exception.

These questions are outlined in Marx's "A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy" (1859), and more fully in "Capital". Marx studied a great deal of factual and theoretical material before pronouncing on these questions. His explanation of the phenomenon of capitalist crisis are not advanced until volume 3 of "Capital" and part 2 of "Theories of Surplus Value". There is a great deal of new and richer factual and theoretical material that needs to be studied, but that is no excuse for completely ignoring what Marx had to say and copying Menzies instead.

The following excerpt from Marx's 1859 work may provide some food for thought, and encourage deeper study. It runs directly counter to "monetarism".

"The most common and conspicuous phenomenon accompanying commercial crisis is a sudden fall in the general level of commodity-prices occurring after a prolonged general crisis of prices. A rise in the value of money relative to all other commodities, and, on the other hand, a general rise of prices may be defined as a fall in the relative value of money. Either of these statements describes the phenomenon but does not explain it. Whether the task set is to explain the periodic rise in the general level of prices alternating with a gen -

.....continued over leaf.....

eral fall, or the same task is said to be to explain the alternating fall and rise in the relative value of money compared with that of commodities - the different terminology has just as little effect on the task itself as a translation of the terms from German into English would have. Ricardo's monetary theory proved to be singularly opposite since it gave to a tautology the semblance of a causal relation. That is to say, the cause of the general fall in commodity - prices which occurs periodically? It is the periodically occurring rise in the relative value of money. It would be just as correct to say that the recurrent rise and fall of prices is brought about by their recurrent rise and fall. The proposition advanced by their recurrent rise and fall. The proposition advanced presupposes that the intrinsic value of money, i.e., its value as determined by the production costs of the precious metals, remains unchanged. If the tautology is meant to be more than a tautology, then it is based on a misapprehension of the most elementary notions. We know that if the exchange value of A expressed in terms of B falls, it may be due either to a fall in the value of A or to a rise in the value of B; similarly if, on the contrary, the exchange value of A expressed in terms of B rises. Once the transformation of the tautology into a causal relationship is taken for granted, everything else follows easily. The rise in commodity-prices is due to the fall in the value of money; the fall in the value of money, however, as we know from Ricardo, is due to excessive currency, that is to say, to the fact that the amount of money in circulation rises above the level determined by its own intrinsic value and the intrinsic value of commodities. Similarly in the opposite case, the general fall of commodity-prices is due to the value of money rising above its intrinsic value as a result of an insufficient amount of currency. Prices therefore rise and fall periodically, because periodically there is too much or too little money in circulation....."

( K. MARX "A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy", Moscow, 1970 pp182-3 )

Marx goes on to pour more scorn on this theory, and especially to criticise the 'hot' money theory.

The essence of the refutation is that money is not simply a means of circulation, and bank money or credit money is not simply the same as paper tokens of value that can be arbitrarily forced into circulation to pay state debts.

A simple test that can be applied to various theories of inflation is "Do they explain why prices fall?" None of the bourgeois theories being presented do explain this. On the contrary, they all imply that inflation is a permanent and inherent feature of capitalism and prices will continue rising until socialism is established. The history of previous crises refutes these theories.

"Monetarism" is a theory associated with the most reactionary sections of the bourgeoisie. The talk of "printing money" fits in very well with Krugger's plans for a "tough budget" ( "tough on the government" ) - to reduce government spending, increase unemployment, and savagely attack general living standards.

Many people (including the present writer), has been misled by allegedly "Marxist" explanations of inflation as simply a product of the printing presses. This must be corrected, in the course of further and deeper study of Australian and world reality. Discussion of these matters, even if many more incorrect views are put forward, should help promote this study.

REMEMBER CZECHOSLOVAKIA !

September 14, 1977

by "Super revolutionary"

August 21, 1977 marked the 9th anniversary of the Soviet imperialist invasion of Czechoslovakia in 1968. Throughout Western Europe there have been public meetings and mass demonstrations against Soviet imperialism. In Eastern Europe too, the people remember. All over the world, commemorative articles have appeared in the publications of genuine Marxist-Leninist parties and groups, and in other publications.

In Australia unfortunately there has been complete silence, as though the whole thing never happened. Well it did happen, and its lessons are clear. The Soviet Union is an aggressive, militaristic fascist power. It is a direct, immediate threat and must be vigorously opposed everywhere. It is not good enough to just hurl insults and threats against it in our own "pure" circles, and use this question as a line of demarcation between ourselves and other progressive people. We must actually go out to mobilize the Australian people against Soviet imperialism in appropriate ways, making use of its considerable unpopularity to unite all forces that can be united against it. We must not allow the Soviet Union to escape from its complete isolation by dividing, disorienting or confusing the forces opposed to it.

Czechoslovakia was a Soviet "ally". It sought to free itself a little from the clutches of the new Czars, and made a slight turn in trade and similar affairs, towards the West. "Liberalization" was introduced to make the capitalist system in Czechoslovakia a little less like Soviet fascism, and a little more like bourgeois "democracy" in the West. After intimidation and bluster did not work, the new Czars sent troops and tanks. The Czechoslovak people fought back heroically but they were unarmed. The country's armed forces capitulated thanks to the treachery of Dubcek and other revisionist Government leaders.

The Soviet Union was the dominant imperialist power in Czechoslovakia before the invasion. Moreover it was a rising superpower, while the USA was entangled in Indo-China and facing isolation abroad and mass rebellion at home. Pro-Soviet forces, and outright Soviet agents, were influential at all levels of the Czechoslovak government and society. Nevertheless, when the crunch came, the Russians had to rely on military force. They used their agents, friends, and those who favoured appeasement to "invite" Soviet "assistance", to

actively facilitate the invasion and to call on the people not to fight back. But these agents, friends and appeasers were not able to keep Czechoslovakia in the Soviet orbit by themselves. Russian troops had to occupy the country. This is also a lesson of Czechoslovakia that should not be forgotten. At a time when Soviet penetration into Australia is increasing, we should remember the "Aeroflot manager" at Prague international airport, who suddenly became the Soviet military commander of the airport in charge of operations when the troop transports began to land.

The invasion of Czechoslovakia was not a sign of Soviet imperialism's strength, but of its desperate weakness. Just as Portugal had to retain colonies in Africa because it was not strong enough to rely on neo-colonialism, so the Soviet Union had to rely on direct military occupation because it was not strong enough to rule in any other way. Portuguese colonialism was defeated and so will Soviet colonialism be defeated.

Because it is a rising imperialism, locked out of the rest of the world by its rivals, the Soviet Union is the most dangerous superpower, and the principal source of a new world war. It occupies a position remarkably similar to that of Hitler Germany before the second world war.

That doesn't mean the Soviet Union has "greater strength" than its rivals. History has proved that Hitler did not have greater strength than his rivals, even though Germany was a rising imperialism, the most aggressive and dangerous imperialism and the principal source of a new world war. Economically the Third Reich was nothing compared to the United States, Britain, France etc. If the Western powers had stood up together with the then socialist Soviet Union and cried "Stop!" then Hitler would have had to stop. But instead they adopted a policy of "appeasement" to divert Hitler eastward against socialism, and got their fingers severely burnt as a result.

Hitler relied on a "blitzkrieg" or lightning war to secure domination over Europe. That worked initially in the West, but when the war dragged out in the East, events proved that he had no "greater strength" at all.

Today the Soviet Union is economically much weaker than Western Europe, let alone the United States. Its superior military position rests on sand. Like Nazi Germany, its inferior position compels it towards militarism and it relies on the illusory hope of a blitzkrieg victory, knowing that its enemies remain immaculate and disunited.

satellites in Eastern Europe are rebelling, and it is situated on a volcano at home. There are difficulties in places like India and Bangladesh. If all the countries threatened by Soviet aggression unite and say "Stop!", then the Soviet empire will collapse just as surely as Hitler's would have. If instead the forces of appeasement hold sway, then a third world war is inevitable. But even then, the Soviet Union is a paper tiger, appearing ferocious but internally weak. It will certainly be defeated, just as Hitler was defeated and just as the US was defeated in Indo-China. We must stress the Soviet Union's dangerousness, and the need to take full account of it tactically, but we must never stress its "strength" or imply that strategically it is anything but a paper tiger.

The Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia may be compared to Hitler's invasion of Czechoslovakia, or perhaps more accurately, to the "Anschluss" in Austria. If this sort of thing is allowed to go on then Yugoslavia or Roumania or Finland may be next, until a point arises, over an issue like West Germany, where the West can appease no more and war becomes inevitable.

In this situation it is imperative to highlight the Soviet war preparations and oppose the forces of appeasement, as China has been doing for several years. Assertions that the Soviet Union has "greater strength" or is "the stronger superpower", or that it can "move into Australia peacefully and take over the US position", or that it "offers more by way of markets than US imperialism" run directly counter to the facts and directly counter to the struggle against appeasement. It is no wonder that those who make these assertions forget about Czechoslovakia.

It is precisely because the Soviet Union has less strength, is prevented from taking over countries like Australia peacefully and has less to offer the compradors, that it is compelled to prepare for war to redivide the world. Far from offering more by way of markets than the US, the Soviet Union is notorious for importing at less than world market prices and exporting at more. It can only do this to the extent that trade is "tied" by some form of direct domination, like COMECON in Eastern Europe or "aid" in India. Even a country so closely tied as Czechoslovakia could not be prevented from turning to the more attractive Western market, except by direct military force. Soviet exports are notoriously shoddy goods with poor delivery dates etc, and its imports have to be financed by Western loans. What "more by way of markets", it is sheer bloody nonsense!

Claiming the Soviet Union is "stronger" and "offers more" is of course direct, unambiguous pro-Soviet propaganda. So are claims that it "underwrites" progressive struggles and the independence movement, that it stands "ready to supply arms for the expulsion of US imperialism from Australia" etc. We can read all that sort of stuff in pro-Soviet publications. The claim that Kerr's coup was simply a US effort to counteract growing Soviet influence through the Whitlam Government is more ambiguous. If anybody believed it, it could have the effect of presenting Soviet imperialism as standing on the same side as the Australian people against the coup. Or it could just help to disorient and confuse the opposition to the coup. Either way, it certainly didn't help the Australian revolution.

Likewise the claim that press exposures of CIA activity and other anti-US trends are the work of the KGB and of Soviet "mouthpieces" in the "pro-Soviet traitor press", and that collaboration between the ABC and the National Times reflects Soviet influence on the ABC (on the subject of "alternative lifestyles!!). This too is ambiguous. If anybody believed it, it could have the effect of presenting Soviet imperialism and the KGB as the most effective opponents of US imperialism and its CIA, while the people's opposition to US imperialism is presented as having nothing to do with its decline. Or it could just confuse and disorient opposition to US imperialism by presenting it as pro-Soviet. Fortunately nobody does believe it, so it only has the effect of discrediting those who publish such statements. But even that is not entirely a good thing, since not everything published in the same place is complete nonsense, and some of it is even correct.

Contrary to both the direct and the ambiguous pro-Soviet propaganda, we must stress that the Soviet Union is a paper tiger, that it "offers less" and that it has absolutely no interests in common with the Australian people (and certainly does not stand on the same side as the people in relation to the coup, the independence movement etc).

There is a growing opposition to appeasement in the West, which is positive and should be highlighted, as the Chinese have been doing. On no account should things be turned on their heads and the trend to appeasement highlighted instead. Likewise there is a growing trend for the Second World to seek independence from the superpowers, and to unite with the Third World against them. The "nationalist" leanings of the Whitlam Government (some of which have been continued by Fraser) are an example of this trend, as was its attempt to raise a large loan from Arab

sources. On no account should this trend be presented as simply a matter of the "traitor class" fulfilling "its role of attaching itself to the stronger imperialism". If the involvement of the Moscow Narodny bank was enough to make it that, then the whole movement of second world countries away from the superpowers can be dismissed as just an attempt to change masters - exactly as the superpowers themselves claim. We can understand why the Americans would claim that any move by Australia and other Western countries away from complete subservience to them is a step towards the Soviet Union, and also why the Soviet Union would favour such moves. We can also understand why the Soviet Union would claim striving for independence in Czechoslovakia, India etc is a move towards the USA, and also why the USA would favour such moves. It is easy to understand why the superpowers believe that they and they alone determine the destiny of the world and that every country must line up behind one or other master. But why would any Marxist-Leninist endorse such blatant imperialist propaganda? That is not so easy to understand!

Claims that Whitlam and Anthony are Soviet puppets, or that "increasingly Soviet social-imperialism influences the administration of the state in Australia" (which it certainly must do if the former Prime Minister and present Deputy PM are "puppets"!) make a caricature of opposition to Soviet imperialism in Australia and disorient and confuse that opposition. Apart from this it runs counter to the struggle against appeasement and to the struggle to unite Second and Third World countries against the superpowers. It is outright defeatist propaganda, quite opposite to Mao Tsetung's position that the ruling circles in Western countries can be united with against the Soviet threat.

The word "puppet" has a definite meaning. Likewise "agent". There are puppets and agents of both the superpowers in Australia. There are also comprador elements in the big bourgeoisie friendly to them, and forces that favour appeasement. There is also a class struggle in Australia, quite apart from superpower contention. To assert that Whitlam and Anthony are puppets of Soviet imperialism and to explain all major political events in Australia, such as the Kerr coup as simply a struggle between puppets of one or another superpower, is a very easy way out of trying to analyse the complex realities of Australian politics. (Actually it is not even that easy. How did Anthony, a Soviet puppet, come to be conspiring with Fraser, a US puppet, in the Kerr coup? Is he a "vacillating puppet" like the vacillating mouthpiece in the Fairfax press?).



The question is posed "What was the semi-fascist coup which replaced Whitlam with Fraser all about if it was not about contention and struggle in Australia between US and Soviet imperialism?" One could answer that it was also about the opposition of US imperialism to Whitlam's "nationalism", the inability of Whitlam to cope adequately with the people's struggle and the general loss of confidence by the bourgeoisie in Labor's ability to handle the economic crisis and govern Australia competently. Such an answer may show that we have neither the "power of second sight" nor the ability to use "the dialectical method (around which great mystery" is woven)" (and woven around which is great mystery, may we add dialectically, and dialectically may we add, since it is all a process and there is a process in it all - amen).

Still, even without the necessary dialectical flourishes, we think our explanation of the coup is more all-sided, and more closely related to actual reality, than the "superpower contention explains everything" theory. We always thought that the philosophy that looks for an external cause for everything ("superpower contention") instead of explaining change and development by the contradictions within a thing (class struggle in Australia) was called metaphysics, not dialectics. We also thought that the method of a priori assertion ("what is it if it is not...") and the attempt to deduce facts from general theories (the Kerr coup from the theory that superpower contention decides everything) was called idealism, not materialism. We cannot provide such glib answers to problems as are demanded by others. As Mao Tsetung says:

"Idealism and metaphysics are the easiest things in the world, because people can talk as much nonsense as they like without basing it on objective reality or having it tested against reality. Materialism and dialectics on the other hand, need effort. They must be based on and tested by objective reality. Unless one makes the effort, one is liable to slip into idealism and metaphysics." ("Quotations" p212)

Before the second world war there were German and Japanese agents, pro-Axis forces and appeasers in Australia and other Western countries. People like Mosley in Britain, and the "Australia First Movement" could be put in the "agent" category. The "Cliveden set" and Lady Astor etc and people like Chamberlain were appeasers. In Australia, the Japanese regarded "pig-iron Bob" Menzies as a "clear eyed soul".

The then socialist Soviet Union fought against appeasement just as China is doing today. Communists in the West did the same. But it never occurred to anyone then to allege that

Australia, Britain or other Western countries were in danger of being peacefully taken over by Germany or Japan, that their leading politicians were puppets of the axis powers and so on. The whole point was that "fascism means war" and appeasement encouraged the fascists to launch that war.

It is not surprising that Communists who warned about Hitler in the 1930's, or about US imperialism after the war "were considered little short of crackpots". Nor is it surprising that most people today, in the atmosphere of "detente" etc, do not believe our warnings about Soviet imperialism being the most dangerous superpower and the principal source of a new world war. It is normal that people are slow to understand things that are still developing and still lie outside their direct experience.

But just because people may think we are "little short of crackpots", we don't have to prove them right! To believe that Australia, now, is being taken over by Soviet imperialism "using the back door" one has to be living in another world - right off the planet. Such ideas do not come from social practice, they drop from the sky, from off the planet. If Communists in the 1930s had claimed Germany and Japan were taking over the West "using the back door", they would not have been "considered little short of crackpots". They would have been crackpots full stop.

Of course it is true that the reactionary bourgeoisie of today is capable of complete national betrayal. This was even true of the bourgeoisie at the time of the Paris Commune. More recently, when Hitler occupied France and other imperialist countries, large sections of the local bourgeoisie collaborated. When Czechoslovakia was occupied by the Soviet Union, Dubcek collaborated. If the Soviet Union emerged as the dominant world power after a third world war then, whether or not Australia was occupied, the ruling class here would "adjust" to this, just as when US imperialism emerged as the dominant power after the second world war. But that is very different from the fantastic proposition that Soviet imperialism can "move into Australia peacefully and take over the US position".

For saying such a peaceful takeover in Australia is impossible, and highlighting Soviet war preparations at the AIM meeting in Melbourne on August 28th, supporters of the Red Eureka Movement, and others, have provoked the remark: "As these people develop their argument they reveal more clearly their true position as "left" agents of Soviet social-imperialism."

Apparently "The super-revolutionaries are desperately trying

to c  
have  
Natural  
Soviet I  
"Oppose S  
made by th  
Union was f  
takeover and  
war preparat  
by "super rev  
the meeting, a  
highlight Sovie  
could not be wor  
the claim that  
their got

to cover their pro-Soviet social-imperialist stand" and they have "become more cunning as they are backed into a corner".

Naturally in describing how the "Super Revolutionaries" "Aid Soviet Imperialism", "Can't Hide Their Pro-Soviet Stand" and "Oppose Struggle" no mention could be made of the main point made by the "super revolutionaries". Namely that the Soviet Union was preparing for a third world war, not a peaceful takeover and that attention had to be focussed on these war preparations. Although the precise wording proposed by "super revolutionaries" was ritualistically rejected by the meeting, an almost unanimous decision was taken to highlight Soviet war preparations in the AIM platform. That could not be mentioned because it would not fit in with the claim that "The independence movement (sic!) has rejected their schemes. But they will continue to pursue their aims in an even more cunning way."

It is one thing to misrepresent our position on matters that people wouldn't know about, to spread rumours, publish insinuations, rave on about alleged promotion of "socialized relations of production under capitalism" and what have you. Most people wouldn't know what on earth you are going on about, and those that do would naturally be inclined to believe your version, and assume we are saying and doing the things you accuse us of saying and doing, because they have no reason to believe otherwise. But it is rather different to misrepresent what happened at a public meeting attended by more than one hundred people. Those who were present know what was said and what was decided at that meeting. They therefore know (whether they immediately want to admit it or not) that our position of highlighting Soviet war preparations is being deliberately misrepresented. Blind faith is a very powerful force. People who want to believe can convince themselves of almost anything. But isn't it very dangerous to stretch that faith to breaking point? Won't such obvious distortion force people to ask questions, and to wonder what else is being distorted?

At the AIM meeting no concrete facts or arguments were cited in support of the "peaceful takeover" thesis. Instead "examples" were cited to "illustrate" it. Vietnam, Angola and Cuba were mentioned as examples. Since there was no time to reply then, let us reply now.

It is not appropriate at this stage to discuss publicly the precise situation in Vietnam, even if others think it proper to do so, or do it without thinking. Suffice to say that Vietnam is certainly not an example of a "traitor class" that "fulfils its

role of attaching itself to the stronger imperialism." As for Angola, it would be news to the thousands of Angolans massacred by Cuban expeditionary forces, on behalf of the Russians, that this was an example of the latter moving in peacefully. If not for the well known principle that veterans are always right, we would have thought that Angola illustrated the opposite of a "peaceful takeover".

Cuba on the other hand, is an important and relevant example, although it is not a case of a "traitor class" switching masters either. But Cuba does show how an "independence revolution" aimed mainly at "winning independence from superpower control" can be co-opted and taken over by another imperialism. It shows the importance of really linking the democratic and socialist revolutions and really fighting for working class leadership of the revolution. If the example had been intended as a warning to be heeded by the independence movement then it would have been quite correct. But unfortunately that is not what was meant, and it was used to illustrate the "traitor class" concept instead.

Although the three examples given are quite unconvincing, one could choose better ones. Unlike our opponents, we have no need of Aunt Sally's to knock down, even when these are provided free. So let us look at some more relevant examples.

There are a number of Third World countries in which pro-US and pro-Soviet forces are battling for supremacy, with now one and now the other on top. India is a notorious case. Even in the Second World there are cases like Finland where a basically "Western" country is forced to "accommodate" itself to Soviet interests to some extent, because of its strategic position. In Portugal not so long ago there was a concerted push for power by basically pro-Soviet forces aligned around the Portuguese "Communist" Party and a section of the Armed Forces Movement, with many "leftists" falling into the trap of siding this ploy by pushing a mainly anti-US line. Our new anti-Soviet heroes in Australia were not particularly interested in the analysis of this situation made by Portuguese Marxist-Leninists at the time, and were rather critical of those they now brand as "left" agents of Soviet imperialism for bringing the matter up. The potential for something similar exists in Spain and in countries like France and Italy where there are mass revisionist parties that for all their "independence" can act as a channel for Soviet pressure. In a major crisis there is always the possibility of "fraternal aid" from the Soviet Union.

But none of these examples either, shows a "traitor class" that simply swings over to attach itself to the stronger power. What these far more relevant examples do show,

in  
is  
that  
it ca  
some d  
country  
The abstract  
abstract po  
world's impe  
exists, (it i  
reality we fac  
Soviet shows a  
attention preparati  
alternative?  
In this situation Com  
warning against appeas  
against Soviet  
insults  
if

imperialism. What these far more relevant examples do show

is that there is fierce contention between the superpowers, that the Soviet Union is scrambling for a foothold wherever it can, and that this situation must inevitably lead to war some day. They are very, very far indeed from showing that countries like Australia could be peacefully taken over.

The abstract possibility exists of course, just as the abstract possibility of an ultra-imperialism in which the world's imperialists exploit the whole world peacefully exists, (it is really the same proposition), but the actual reality we face today is quite different. Examination of that reality shows a headlong rush to war and direct, immediate Soviet preparations for launching such a war. So why focus attention away from that reality onto some abstract "peaceful" alternative?

In this situation Communists must be in the forefront of warning against appeasement and mobilizing the people against Soviet imperialism. That is not a matter of hurling insults and threats or making general "calls" for struggle. If that were the criteria then our new anti-Soviet heroes would really be doing a wonderful job, on this and on all other aspects of the Australian revolution. Practical measures are required. Occasions like the anniversary of the Czechoslovak invasion should not be allowed to slip by without some action. The anniversary of the October Revolution will provide another opportunity (although on this occasion, action could not include all forces that can be united against Soviet imperialism, but only those that support the October Revolution). If we are not to be confined to commemorating anniversaries and issuing statements then some specific organization that takes up the question of Soviet imperialism is required to collect material together and publish it and initiate action in various areas, just as there are specific organizations devoted to opposition to Uranium mining, solidarity with East Timor, Australia-China Friendship and so on. Perhaps a subcommittee of the Australian Independence Movement (AIM) would be appropriate. There has already been a good deal of useful material published, but only in very limited circles. Such practical organization would be a lot more use than hare-brained schemes to divert May Day into an attack on a Soviet-line bookshop (what could be better calculated to help them along) or to make American Independence Day (July 4) a demonstration of 50 people against the KGB outside ASIO headquarters!

As Lu Hsun once said "Hurling insults and threats is certainly not fighting" Mao Tse-tung added:

"What is scientific never fears criticism, for science is truth and fears no refutation. But those who write subjectivist and sectarian articles and speeches in the form of Party stereotypes fear refutation, are very cowardly, and therefore rely on pretentiousness to overawe others, believing that they can thereby silence people and "win the day". Such pretentiousness cannot reflect truth but is an obstacle to truth. Truth does not strike a pose to overawe people but talks and acts honestly and sincerely...Against the enemy this tactic of intimidation is utterly useless, and with our own comrades it can only do harm. It is a tactic which the exploiting classes and the lumpen-proletariat habitually practise, but for which the proletariat has no use. For the proletariat the sharpest and most effective weapon is a militant and scientific attitude. The Communist Party lives by the truth of Marxism-Leninism, by seeking truth from facts, by science, and not by intimidating people. Needless to say the idea of winning fame and position for oneself by pretentiousness is even more contemptible..."

("Oppose Stereotyped Party Writing", Selected Works, Vol 3, p57-8)

Those who prefer hurling insults and threats to actual fighting will no doubt continue to do so. This was their style in fighting US imperialism so it comes naturally in fighting Soviet imperialism. It will prove no more effective against the Red Eureka Movement than it is against imperialism.

Revolutionaries will not be put off from fighting Soviet imperialism by those who now seek to turn that fight into a caricature, any more than we were put off when the same people opposed us directly on this point.

We were not put off from burning a Soviet flag at a July 4 demonstration, along with the Stars and Stripes, when some of today's anti-Soviet heroes opposed this.

We were not put off from drawing attention to the lessons of Portugal and the dangers of a purely anti-US stand when some of today's anti-Soviet heroes would not listen.

We were not put off denouncing the Conference for a Non-aligned Australia as a pro-Soviet operation, when some of today's anti-Soviet heroes were publicly sponsoring it.

We were not put off supporting greater Australian defence preparations, and collective security against Soviet aggression, when some of today's anti-Soviet heroes were denouncing Fraser for "increasing" the defence budget and claiming this was a cause of inflation. (The same is still being said, although more quietly).

So why should we be put off continuing to fight against Soviet imperialism by the latest insults and threats? Faced with such a complete caricature of the struggle against Soviet imperialism, it is only natural that some people

Being about. been called so forth, and we are more abuse inevitable, would be the is a weak declaration agents would be because danger, things every... Over

conclude the whole question is being "overemphasized" and should be played down a bit. But it is not being "overemphasized", it is being crudely de-railed. The correct response is not to play the issue down, but to step up the struggle and show how to really fight, instead of hurling insults and threats.

Being called Soviet agents is really nothing to get excited about. After all, an incomplete list shows we have already been called revisionists, Trotskyites, disruptors, scum and so forth, yet the sky does not appear to have fallen down and we are gaining more and more "soldiers". There will be more abuse, and we will grow still more rapidly. It was inevitable, right from the beginning, that "Soviet agent" would be the epithet eventually settled upon. It would hardly be appropriate for us to be called CIA agents since the US is a weak declining superpower etc etc. Not to call us Soviet agents would be a serious failure to "always keep in mind the greater danger"! We have to be called somebody's agents because everything is explained by external causes and things never develop through their own internal contradictions. Our arguments cannot be refuted because we conceal our "real" position so cunningly. So what else is there to do?

As Lenin explains:

\*in politics abusive language often serves as a screen for utter lack of principles and sterility, impotence, angry impotence, on the part of those who use such language.  
"That is all there is to it."

(The Political Significance of Vituperation", Collected Works, Vol 20, p380, Moscow, 1964)

If we are really revisionists, Trotskyites, disruptors, scum, Soviet agents and so forth, then there are some obvious organizational measures that ought to be taken. The absence of such measures is an especially dramatic confirmation of the "utter lack of principles, sterility, impotence, angry impotence, on the part of those who use such language".

Speaking frankly, it would be more appropriate to look for Soviet agents among those who have persistently dragged their feet in opposing Soviet imperialism and who now make a caricature of and disorient and confuse such opposition. Look among those who claim the Soviet Union is "stronger" and "offers more" and that it can "take over peacefully". Look among those who want to "forget" Czechoslovakia.

If we were as excitable as our opponents, we would commence such a hunt now. But it is better to first refute views we

believe to be wrong (in the course of which we will no doubt have to modify our own views as well), and only then, and if it is still necessary, examine the motives of those who still cling to a wrong line. The method of discrediting an opponent personally first, and then using this as an argument against his views, is only resorted to by those who have no other arguments. Mao Tse-tung's handling of Liu Shao-chi, Lin Piao and Teng Hsiao-ping stands in marked contrast to the methods of struggle used by the promoters of opportunist lines in China both before his death and since.

In any case we know that there is an objective basis for a right wing and revisionist line in the pressures exerted by capitalism on all revolutionaries. Just because our opponents attitudes have the objective effect of diverting and disrupting the struggle against Soviet imperialism, it does not prove that they are Soviet agents. Even if there are enemy agents of one sort or another involved in promoting a wrong line, the main point is still to defeat that wrong line. We can unite with any comrade who will correct their mistakes and really fight against imperialism and for a new Australia, irrespective of differences on any particular question, or past unprincipled behaviour.

If on the contrary we had reached a final conclusion that our opponents were revisionists, Trotskyites, scum, disruptors or Soviet agents etc, then we would not mumble about it impotently and make insinuations, pass rumours around secretly and so forth. We would rather name the names and present the evidence openly.

Naturally we have reached some tentative conclusions about the revolutionary integrity of people who act in this way, but we have reached no final conclusions and it is still not too late to turn back.

We will not be put off by abuse and will continue to refrain from it ourselves. We will continue to state our views publicly and positively. We have no alternative but to follow Mao's policy: "Practice Marxism and not revisionism; unite and don't split; be open and above board and don't intrigue and conspire". Just as those with a wrong line have no alternative but to do the opposite.

The tenth anniversary of the invasion of Czechoslovakia will certainly be commemorated by all genuine revolutionaries next year. In the meantime there will be many opportunities for stepping up the struggle against Soviet imperialism and not just for hurling insults and threats. It will be made an integral part of revolution in Australia.

no  
low  
this  
resti  
for a  
such as  
inberia  
from the  
"Or the  
U.S. cour  
power imper  
is bitful  
from the co  
list the U.S.  
two - line str  
STALIN'S REMARKS  
At the Hilarious  
Communist Inertia  
of the 1st of  
" Firstly, the matter  
among i. the new  
unoccupied  
new



THE K-K- KAUTSKYISM OF THE " C-C CONSERVATIVE COMMUNISTS"

" It is impossible for the Soviet social - imperialists to move into Australia peacefully and take over the U.S. position"

This statement made at the August 28 Melbourne A.I.M. general meeting and other statements in similar vein have come in for a surprisingly hysterical attack. People making statements such as the above are labelled as "left agents of Soviet social imperialism" and part of some fantastic conspiracy stretching from the C.I.A. and KGB to the Red Eureka Movement.

"Of course Soviet social-imperialism can peacefully replace U.S. imperialism", we are told. "There are many ways for a powerful country to make a less powerful one dependent on it." Is this true? Can Australia undergo a "peaceful transition" from the U.S. imperialist camp to the Soviet social-imperialist camp? This is a very important question in the current two - line struggle.

STALIN'S REMARKS

At the Enlarged Plenum of the Executive Committee of the Communist International in 1926 Comrade Stalin went to the heart of the matter. He said: "What are the basic elements of the law of uneven development under imperialism?"

" Firstly, the fact that the world is already divided up among imperialist groups, that there are no more "vacant" unoccupied territories in the world, and that in order to occupy new markets and sources of raw materials, in order to expand, it is necessary to seize territory from others by force.

" Secondly, the fact that the unprecedented development of technology and the increasing levelling of the development of the capitalist countries have made possible and facilitated the spasmodic outstripping of some countries by others, the ousting of more powerful countries by less powerful countries but rapidly developing countries.

" Thirdly, the fact that the old distribution of spheres of influence among the various imperialist groups is forever coming into conflict with the new correlation of forces in the world market, and that, in order to establish 'equilibrium' between the old distribution of spheres of influence and the new correlation of forces, periodic readivisions of the world by means of imperialist wars are necessary.

" Hence the growing intensity and acuteness of the unevenness of the development in the period of imperialism.

" Hence the impossibility of resolving the conflicts in the imperialist camp by peaceful means.

" Hence the untenability of Kautsky's theory of ultra-imperialism, which preaches the possibility of a peaceful settlement of these conflicts."

( On The Opposition pp615- 616 )

Comrade Stalin is expounding the basic and fundamental principles of the Leninist theory of imperialism, but anyone expounding these same principles in Australia has been variously described as promoting a "gang of four" line, revealing a trotskyite position or being a Soviet agent.

Calling it a "gang of four" line is certainly the most accurate description because that was Mao Tse Tung's line -- the Leninist line.

Labelling it as "trotskyite" is ironic because in expounding this thesis, it was precisely Trotsky and Zinoviev who Stalin was repudiating. It was Trotsky and Zinoviev who were resurrecting Kautsky's revisionist theory of ultra-imperialism and claiming that spheres of influence could peacefully change hands.

.....cont.

As to the "Soviet agent" charge, which is a reflection of the peculiar notion that everybody must be somebody's flunkey, it hardly deserves a serious answer. Perhaps a question is more appropriate: Since when do Soviet revisionist flunkies insist on a Leninist-Stalinist analysis of imperialism?

#### THE BRITISH - U.S. MODEL

We are told that the possibility of the Soviet social-imperialists taking over Australia is shown by the "fact" that the "traitor class" peacefully handed Australia on a plate to the U.S. in the 1940's.

Let's look at the facts. In 1939 the situation in the imperialist camp was precisely as Stalin had predicted. The contradictions between the declining British and French imperialists and the rising German, Japanese and Italian imperialists had reached bursting point. The old distribution of spheres of influence and the new correlation of forces in the world market were out of "equilibrium" and the only way the fascist imperialisms could bring them back into "equilibrium" was through force, armed aggression and world war.

Japanese imperialism could never have peacefully taken over Australia. It could not peacefully take over China, Indochina, Burma, Malaya, the Philippines and New Guinea.

Italian imperialism could not peacefully take over Ethiopia. It did not peacefully takeover Albania, German imperialism did not peacefully takeover Austria, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Yugoslavia, Belgium, France, Greece, Norway or North Africa.

Between 1939 and the end of 1941, French imperialism lost its spheres of influence through military conquest. British imperialism lost a large slice of its spheres of influence and was losing its grip on others. This was a direct result of military conflict, not peaceful transition.

Towards the end of 1941, the U.S. imperialists entered the war. What was their aim? According to Stalin: "The United States of America hoped to put its most dangerous competitors, Germany and Japan, out of action, seize foreign markets and the world's raw materials resources, and establish its world supremacy."

(Economic Problems of Socialism in the U.S.S.R., Moscow Edition, 1952, p35)

The U.S. imperialist aims were partially successful. They put western Europe, Britain, Japan and Yugoslavia "on rations" for a period. They seized back the Philippines and brought most of South-east-Asia and the southern half of Korea into their sphere of influence. And they walked into Australia when Britain was barely capable of defending its own home ground, let alone far away Australia, and when Australian troops were busy defending Britains interests in North Africa.

It could only have happened in a period of world war - of an intense world-wide military struggle for the redivision of the world. It could never have happened and would never have happened under "peaceful" means in a period between wars.

#### A QUESTION OF SHORT MEMORIES

It has been said that those who put forward the Leninist thesis of imperialism have short memories. Of course the Soviet Union can peacefully takeover other imperialists spheres of influence we are told, and this is proved by the examples of Vietnam, Angola and Cuba.

This is really quite extraordinary. Firstly, it should be pointed out that it is quite out of order for responsible senior "open" communists to publically claim that the Socialist Republic of Vietnam is a satellite of social imperialism. But what it is quite clear is that U.S. imperialism lost Vietnam through a particularly protracted war called the Vietnam war, and certainly not through peaceful means, no has got the short memory?

.....cont.

I do not think that the thousands of Angolan orphans and widows who went through a bitter war involving South African troops, U.S. financed mercenaries, Soviet "advisers" and Cuban mercenaries would agree that Angola made a peaceful transition to the Soviet orbit.

Which leaves us with Cuba. Now I was always under the impression that the Cuban revolution, which wrenched that country out of the U.S. orbit, was also the case of armed struggle. Castro keeps reminding us of that by always parading around in his khaki fatigues.

As to the Soviet's moving into Cuba after it had been violently wrested from the grip of U.S. imperialism, that is another question. That certainly did happen. It is worth noting that Castro never proclaimed himself a "communist" until the Soviets moved in. The most important lesson from Cuba is that the much vaunted "independence" revolution, of which Cuba is a classic example, is bound to end up that way (if it ever gets off the ground).

We must once again ask our critic -- just who has got the short memory?

#### WHAT ABOUT SOVIET INVESTMENT AND TRADE?

In attempting to prove that Australia can peacefully slide into the Soviet orbit, our "conservative communists" cite examples of Soviet investment in Australia and the A.L.P. loans affair. This also requires comment.

There is in the world today a single imperialist system, a single imperialist world market and included within it is every country and region except the socialist countries and some liberated zones in countries where armed revolution is going on. Australia is a country within the imperialist world market. Of course Soviet finance capital invests in Australia, as does U.S., British, Japanese, German, French, Italian and Swiss finance capital and many others.

U.S. finance capital is invested in the Soviet Union. The amount of U.S. investment in all Eastern European countries except socialist Albania is rapidly increasing. The Hungarian revisionists recently altered their law on foreign investment to allow western companies and banks have a say in the management of Hungarian enterprises. Poland has been granted U.S. credits and loans and has a multi-billion dollar trade deficit with the west. Hundreds of individual enterprises in Eastern Europe have established partnerships with the U.S., West German and French corporations (along the lines of Esso - B.H.P.). These are all well known and documented facts.

But despite this massive U.S. and West European investment, loans and trade with Eastern Europe, no one yet has been naive enough to suggest that the Polish or Hungarian "traitor class" is about to hand over those countries to the U.S. If some East European traitor class was insane enough to attempt such a peaceful transition, does anyone seriously deny that the Soviet imperialists would not perform a repeat of the 1968 invasion of Czechoslovakia?

Why then, do people attempt at expounding such absurd theories about Australia? Perhaps it is because U.S. imperialism is in decline? Certainly it is in decline but it is still a superpower, it is still aggressive (and shall always be) and it is still preparing for a world war. To imply that because the U.S. has entered a state of decline, it cannot resist a process of "peaceful transition" to Soviet domination is, in the final analysis, to deny the inevitability of imperialist war and to resurrect the stinking corpse of Kautskyism. They have claimed that the "super revolutionaries" position would mean that the people of Woolloomooloo should give up struggling against Soviet finance capital. This really reveals the nitty gritty of our "conservative communists" thinking.

.....Cont.

It has been correctly stated both in the REBEL and in the current general programme of the C.P.A. (M - I) that the U.S. section of the imperialist bourgeoisie is the most aggressively entrenched. As long as Australia remains in the U.S. sphere of influence, the main blow of the Australian revolution must be directed at it. But within that general line, particular struggles against other imperialist interests and notably Soviet interests emerge and should be wholeheartedly supported. Of course we will struggle against Soviet penetration, and that struggle must be intensified but we must never lose sight of the main target in any given period. And this is exactly what betrays the essence of the "conservative" communists' line. By their assertion, what they are really saying is that you can only struggle against one superpower. And they have decided in their infinite wisdom that the Australian revolution should be directed at one superpower - the superpower which does not have Australia within its orbit. Who are we to seize state power from if we are fighting someone who doesn't control it?

#### CONCLUSION

The threat of world war is growing, and this presents Australian Communists with urgent tasks. The recent Joint Declaration of the Seven Latin American Marxist - Leninist Parties put it very well:

"Among the peoples the correct idea is maturing that in face of the war threats of the two superpowers, the revolutionary class struggle must be raised to an even higher level to oppose the outbreak of the war, to weaken the base of the aggressive forces, or to turn the unjust inter - imperialist war into a just liberation war."

MARTIN CONNELLY

... in the U.S.  
...t aggressively  
...t sphere of  
... U.S. sphere  
... must be  
... particular  
... notably Soviet  
... struggle  
... and the main  
... of the main  
... of the "conservative"  
... section, but one sup-  
... able reason that the  
... to widespread  
... it one step power-  
... within its orbit  
... the eye fighting someone

... this presents aue trellien  
... joint decision of  
...t very  
... during the  
... the revolution-  
... even higher  
... the  
... to weaken  
... the industry  
... or to turn  
... the industry

The following poem, which is taken from the Black Rock Yacht Club Journal, is reproduced for the benefit of all comrades and supporters of the Red Eureka Movement. The editorial committee of the REBEL hopes that all readers get some inspiration from the poem and so become active contributors to the REBEL. To run the REBEL as it really ought to be run we need the aid of our readers and sympathizers.

DO YOU JUST BELONG ?  
Are you an active member , the kind that would be missed ?  
Or are you just content to have your name upon the list?  
Do you attend the meetings and mingle with the flock ?  
Or do you stay at home to criticise and knock?  
Do you take an active part to help the work along ?  
Or are you satisfied to be the kind that just belong ?  
Do you voluntarily help at the guiding stick?  
Or leave the work to just a few and talk about the clique ?  
Come to the meetings often and help with hand and heart.  
Don't be just a member, take an active part.  
Think this over, member, you know right from wrong.  
Are you an active member, or do you just belong ?  
.....