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red eureka movement
EDITORIAL

We would like to draw our readers’ attention to the August 25th edition of the newspaper Vanguard (vol. 14, No. 32). Two articles in particular attempt to reply to articles published in the last Rebel (No. 2).

"Spurious 'Theories' To Save Capitalism Must Be Combatted" (page 3) attempts to reply to the article by comrade A. Hard entitled "Wages and Unemployment". The Editorial Board apologises for not printing the date this article was written at. It was July 1970. We ask our readers to study both these articles closely.

"Super Revolutionaries Aid Soviet Imperialism" (page 1) is a commentary on the article "Unity on the Basis of the Party's Program" by comrade M. Connell. The author of the Vanguard article quotes comrade Connell's article (inaccurately) as saying that U.S. imperialism is the most aggressively entrenched imperialism in Australia and goes on to say: "The statement is not even factually correct because British imperialism has been the most deeply entrenched imperialism in Australia."

The author of the Vanguard article is, of course, entitled to his/her opinion. But the author is fully aware that comrade Connell was quoting directly from the current General Programme of the Communist Party of Australia (Marxist-Leninist), which was also published in The Rebel No. 2.

If the Vanguard writer considers the Party Programme to be "not even factually correct" and to "serve Soviet social-imperialism", then surely he/she should direct the criticism firebombed most importantly at the authors of the Party Programme rather than those who are defending the Programme.

---00---

"Marxist-Leninists Against Zionism"

A leaflet with the above authorization is being circulated. The leaflet purports to oppose Zionism, to oppose the alleged failure of China to oppose Zionism, to support Mao Tsetung, the Cultural Revolution and Chiang Ching. It is headed "Who Supports Zionism? Demand a Genuine Marxist-Leninist-Mao Tsetung Thought Stand!" and it concludes, "Demand now that the Hsu-Tung (sic) clique oppose Zionism!"

The conclusion alone is a dead giveaway. The authorization should have been "Socialist Labor League (S-L)" or "Spartacists League (S-L)". Whoever heard of Marxist-Leninists making a "demand" that their opponents adopt a correct stand?

China's stand on Zionism is well known and appreciated by all anti-Zionists. To the best of our knowledge, there has been no change in that stand in the past year. Nor is there anything in the leaflet to show that there has been such a change. Clearly the leaflet is really an opportunist attempt to use an attack on Hsu-Tung to attack the policies of Mao Tsetung.

Either that, or it is an attempt to discredit the supporters of Mao Tsetung and the Cultural Revolution. At any rate, the leaflet has nothing to do with the Red Eureka Movement and we know nothing about it.

But we do know that it uses the same typeface and the same "poison pen" anonymous style as a leaflet circulated in 1974 headed "N. Callings: Marxist-Leninist or Opportunist?" which we are told comes from Vic and Vida Little's group.

What the Red Eureka Movement has to say about Hsu Kuo-fong we have said privately. If we have something to say publicly, we will put our name to it.

When we have something to say about an individual, we say it in the appropriate way and sign our names to it individually or collectively. Our opponents know this well and have found our open and above-board style of work difficult to cope with. That is precisely why they spread a rumour that we are involved in this "poison pen" leaflet (and other documents and letters allegedly "circulating" which we have never seen).

Any publication coming from the Red Eureka Movement will have our name and address on it. Anything from an individual associated with us will also have a name on it, or people will be informed who wrote it in an appropriate way.

It would be nice if those who like spreading rumours or making insinuations about where we stand or what we are doing, could be open and above-board too. But of course, that is too much to expect.

---00---

We would like to thank the comrades concerned for their correspondence, contributions and donations. A number of articles and letters have been held over for the next Rebel. We don't want to make each issue too bulky. Rebel No. 4 should be out in about a fortnight.

If you wish to be put on the mailing list for Rebel and our political retrieval journal Study Notes, please write to:

17 The Ridge,
Blackburn
Victoria, 3130 Australia.

Donations to cover costs, contributions and criticisms are welcome.

---00---
LONG LIVE MAO TZEDONG THOUGHT!

(Reprinted the first anniversary of the death of Mao)

Mao Tsetung was the greatest Marxist-Leninist of our era. Although he is dead, his contributions to Marxist-Leninist theory and practice will certainly live forever.

In the last decade of his life, he played an outstanding role in leading mass revolutionary movements aimed at overthrowing the three bourgeois headquarters of Liu Shao-chi, Lin Piao and Peng Hsing-ping.

Mao Tsetung’s analysis and grasp of two-line struggles within the Communist Party is of particular importance for revolutionaries around the world. Back in July 1966, Mao wrote in a letter to his wife Chiang Ching: “Great disaster occurs when the leaders of the masses lead the masses. Sooner or later the masses will jump out of them. Determined by their own class nature, they are bound to jump out.”

The same month, Mao wrote his famous big-character poster “Bombard the Headquarters” which was the sign for the nation-wide Red Guard counterattack against the counter-revolutionary revisionist line of Liu Shao-chi. The Party Central Committee Circular of Nov 16, 1966 and the famous Sixteen Point Decision of the Central Committee of August 16, 1967 were both drafted under Mao Tsetung’s personal supervision. They clearly stated that the target of the struggle was the top Party officials in authority reflecting the capitalist road. The task of the revolutionary rebels was to throw them and the task of the People’s Liberation Army was to support the Left.

Actually, as far back as 1964, Mao Tsetung had pointed out: “The bureaucrat class on the one hand and the working class together with the poor and low-middle peasants on the other are two classes sharply antagonistic to each other.”

He went on to say: “These cadres who have taken the capitalist road have betrayed or are turning into bourgeoisie elements sucking the blood of the workers, how can they possibly realize the imperative need for socialist revolution? These people are the target of the struggle, the target of the revolution, and we must never rely on them in the Socialist Education Movement. We can rely only on those cadres who are not hostile to the workers and are imbued with revolutionary spirit.”

After the Ninth National Congress of the Chinese Communist Party in 1969, Mao Tsetung pointed out: “Appropriately, we couldn’t do without the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution, for our base was not secured. From my observation, I am afraid that in a fairly large majority -- I don’t mean all or the overwhelming majority -- leadership was not in the hands of real Marxists or the masses of workers.”

It wasn’t long before the second bourgeois headquarters of Lin Piao and the Chaotian Headquarters jumped out for a trial of strength with Mao Tsetung’s proletarian headquarters. By 1971, the Lin Piao clique, which was being systematically exposed and attacked under the leadership of Mao, grew desperate. Lin Piao had “Outline of Project 371” drafted. This was the bourgeois blueprint for a counter-revolutionary coup d’etat and it included plans for the assassination of Mao Tsetung, and the capture of his closest collaborators.

Their plans disintegrated and ended in total defeat.

Just before Lin Piao’s ill-fated attempt to escape to the Soviet Union, Mao Tsetung once more prepared people of the proletariat against the new bourgeois threat. “We have been singing the International for fifty years, yet on ten occasions, certain people inside the Party are tired of splitting. (The 10th was Lin Piao) If I see it, I may happen another ten, twenty or thirty times. You don’t believe it? You say I don’t believe it. Anyhow I do.”

Ten victories over the bourgeois line in the Party had certainly not lulled Mao Tsetung into a false sense of security. He launched the Campaign to Criticize Lin Piao and Condi- ty. He launched the Campaign to Criticize Lin Piao and Com. He launched the Campaign to Criticize Lin Piao and Com.

The Theory of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat. At the end of 1976, he pointed out: “Why did Lenin speak of exercising dictatorship over the bourgeoisie? It is essential to get a clear understanding of this question in order to deal with revisionism. This should be made known to the whole nation.”

Teng Hsiao-ping's revisionist programme served as a rallying call to the bourgeois and revisionists all over China. Anyone with a grudge against or a score to settle with the Cultural Revolution was encouraged by Teng to attack the socialist system, the dictatorship of the proletariat and the revolutionary rebels. This became known as the Right Deviationist Wind to Reverse the Correct Verdicts of the Great Cultural Revolution.

Teng Hsiao-ping followed this up with his notorious "General Programmes" which attempted to restore the old revisionist rules and regulations in industry, and put profit in command. It also deliberately distorted the essence of Lin Piao's ultra-left line by describing it as "ultra-left" and using this a cover to attack the Marxists, Mao related strongly to the "three directives" and the "general programme". He said:

"What 'taking the three directives as the key link'? Stability and unity do not mean writing off class struggle; class struggle is the key link and everything else hinges on it."

The Campaign against the Right Deviationist Wind, initiated at Tsinghua University, soon spread across the nation. Mao pointed out:

"The question involved in Tsinghua is not an isolated question but a reflection of the current two-line struggle."

Out of desperation, Teng Hsiao-ping engineered the counter-revolutionary incident at Tiananmen Square in April 1976. The riot, which viciously attacked the Chairman Mao, had ended in a fiasco for Teng. On Mao's immediate prior to the riot, he said there was nothing of Marxism-Leninism. He represents the bourgeois. He said he would never reverse the verdict. It can't be counted on.

It was during the counterculture against the Right Deviationist Wind that Mao, referring to Teng Hsiao-ping and others under fire, said:

"With the socialist revolution they themselves come of agriculture there were people in the Party who opposed it, and when it comes to criticising bourgeois social revolution, and yet don't know where the bourgeois is. It is right in the Communist Party itself -- the new bourgeois class."

This statement constitutes a real advance of Marxism-Leninism clearly points out that after the system of ownership and relations of production have been transformed, the principal target of the revolution is the bourgeoisie within the Communist Party itself -- the new bourgeois class.

That this Party bourgeoisie has the possibility of seizing Party and State power and stage a capitalist restoration is a constant threat, and stage a capitalist restoration is a constant threat. If such a restoration occurred, it would not last many years.

Back in 1966 in his letter to Chiang Ching, Mao Tsetung predicted:

"If the Rightists stage an anti-communist coup at Tiananmen, I am sure they will know no peace either and their rule will most probably be short-lived because it will not be tolerated by the revolutionaries, who represent the interests of the people making up more than 90% of the population..."

The conclusion is still the two familiar comments: The future is bright; the road is tortuous."

The best may we in Australia can commemorate Mao Tsetung is to brighten our study of Mao Tsetung Thought and actually apply his method to the problems of the Australian revolution and the two-line struggle in the Australian Party.

---Geoff McGinn---

THE STATE IS NOT BANKRUPT

By Allen Ward 28/7/76.

According to the Fraser Government, excessive Government spending, especially on social welfare programmes, is the main cause of inflation and all other economic ills.

The 'neomercantilists' argue that the level of prices is determined by the level of money supply. By running a budget deficit, the state puts too much money into circulation and so causes inflation.

Let's look at the facts.

In the financial year 1974-75 Government income from direct and indirect taxes and profits from public enterprises was $18.81 billion dollars.

Government expenditure on current account, which includes interest payments, subsidies and private capital grants, as well as ordinary Government spending and welfare payments, was $15.1 billion.

The result was a surplus on current account of $3 billion. The largest surplus ever.

Australians paid $3 billion more in taxes etc than what it cost to run the Government and pay interest on its past borrowings.

Turning to the capital account, we find a gross fixed capital expenditure by Government authorities of $5.36 billion. This includes new investments in water supply and sewage. These are all capital investments not just 'Government expenditure'.

$3 billion of this was financed out of the surplus (ie profit made from Government operations), while the remaining $2.3 billion is still a deficit financed by borrowing.

In other words, the Government retained $2.3 billion of its own profits and borrowed more than $2 billion of the profit made in the private sector, for purposes of expedient capital accumulation.
This accumulation of fixed capital assets by the Government represented more than one third of the gross capital accumulation in the entire Australian economy.

As Engels says: "The modern state, no matter what its form, is essentially a capitalist machine, the state of the capitalists, the ideal personification of the total national forces, the more it proceeds to the taking over of productive forces, the more does it actually become the national-capitalist, the more citizens does it exploit..." (Socialism: Utopian & Scientific)

In Australia, some 37% of civilian employees are employed by the Government (mainly State and local authorities). Only 8% of the private sector workers are employed in the public administration and defence. The bulk are productive workers producing surplus value for capital.

Thus the state is not forced to borrow money and run a deficit because it is bankrupt. On the contrary, it has a huge surplus.

If the Government wished to "balance the budget" it could do so very simply by cutting back on its capital accumulation. Spark off a massive crisis and depression (which will eventually happen anyway).

The Soviet Union has for a long time been spreading the "theory" that inflation and crisis are due to excessive military spending, which for some unexplained reason, inevitably results in the best defense expenditures for 1974-75 was only about $1.4 billion, and the $3 billion surplus was after defense had been paid for.

The state is not bankrupt. Capitalism itself is bankrupt.

---

Communism, Fascism and Nationalism

September 3, 1977

by "A neo-revolutionary"

At the Australian Independence Movement meeting in Melbourne on August 26th, one speaker compared a purely nationalist program for independence to the programs of fascist parties. He pointed out that fascists also include demagogic phrases against "big business" and especially international finance ("the multi-nationalis") and said it was crucial to include references to socialism, or at least opposition to anti-working class forces, in order to distinguish the AIN program from fascism.

This is not correct. Most fascist parties also include references to socialism, and claim to represent the working class. There is even social-fascism which expresses fascism in the name of Communism. Hitler's party was the "German National Socialist Workers' Party" and Brezhnev's is the "Communist Party of the Soviet Union".

Fascism does rely on reactionary nationalism and racism. But the main point is that behind the demagogic phrases, whether about the fatherland, the revolution or the workers, lies the open terrorist dictatorship of the big bourgeoisie.

Progressive nationalism, as expressed in the AIN program, is quite a different matter from reactionary nationalism. Just as reformism is quite a different matter from die-hard conservatism. Both of course represent a bourgeois viewpoint. As Communists we support progressive bourgeois nationalism and unite with it against reactionary nationalism.

AIN is a progressive organization opposed to imperialism and Communists can work with it and join it. The point about AIN's purely nationalist program is that this is fascist, but that it is not socialist. Communists have to draw a clear line of demarcation from it and fight (in appropriate ways) for their own program at all times and in every organization.

A Communist can certainly never be a patriot first and a Communist second. Neither can a Communist believe that "no sectional class interest should be able to dominate the broad movement". That such views can even be expressed shows how far revisionism has developed.

But neither can a Communist even be a Communist first and a patriot second, any more than one can be a Communist first, imperialist second. Our patriotism is rooted in internationalism.
it is part of our Communism, and can never be an expression of nationalism. Just as our fight for reform is part of making revolution, not an expression of reformism.

"On the national question the world outlook of the proletarian party is internationalism, and not nationalism. In the revolution's struggle it supports progressive nationalism and opposes reactionary nationalism. It must always draw a clear line of demarcation between itself and bourgeois nationalism, to which it must never fall captive."

("The Polemics on the General Line of the International Communist Movement", MTP 1965, p.17)

If this applies to the oppressed nations and peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America, then it certainly applies to an advanced capitalist country like Australia. The whole of the polemics against modern revisionism in the 1960s is well worth re-studying in the light of current controversies. History always repeats itself twice, the first time as a tragedy and the second time as a farce.

Lenin put it well in his 1914 article "On the National Pride of the Great Russians":

"What a lot of talk, argument and vociferation there is nowadays about nationality and the fatherland!... - all their respective countries, the glamour of the principle of unity. One cannot fail to see the forces of the brutal oppression of Negroes and Indians who suffer, and where the common bond of the country begins. Nor is that distinction important. Who are we? We are an extensive and very deep ideological trend, the leaders and capitalists of the dominant national class-conscientious proletariat? Certainly not! We are the people who have raised our own magnificent (i.e. nine-tenths of her consciousness)...

"We are full of national pride because the Great-Russian nation too has created a revolutionary class, because it is the struggle for freedom and socialism, and not only with great serfdom to peasants, landlords and capitalists...

"And, full of a sense of national pride, we Great-Russian democrats, revolutionary, and independent, a base on its relations with its neighbours on the human principle, who does everything by his own will, by his own will, by his own will, in accordance with the principle of the nation."

If Lenin, in a backward agrarian country with a semi-feudal autocracy and a largely peasant population, could link national pride to socialism more than half a century ago, and could stand against the "philistine, who from sheer stupidity or spinelessness drifts with the stream" then how dare "Leninism" separate socialism from the independence movement in an advanced capitalist country like Australia?

We are filled with national pride because the Australian nation too has created a revolutionary class, because it too has provided mankind with great models of the struggle for freedom and socialism. We are proud of the Eureka flag and the democratic tradition it represents, and we are proud that it is being raised again.

But our pride is as socialists, as Communists and internationalists. Not as democrats and nationalists. Our class is the working class and our flag is the red flag. We will never surrender it to any other.

Those who try to separate socialism from the independence movement, in the epoch of world proletarian socialist revolution, could not be Communists even in a very backward Third World country that had practically no proletariat. To take this stand in an advanced capitalist country where the proletariat is the largest class and the main force as well as the leading force, one has to be very far from Communism indeed. They may genuinely want to be Communists, and may be very good people, but they will have to shake off the influence of this line if they are to be Communists. And you cannot be a non-Communist in AIM and a Communist somewhere else (or some other time, in the future).

Communists will work with others in national movements, but always for Communism, never for nationalism. This is a question of principle, quite separate from any issue of tactics in the United Front.

AIM is not the United Front in Australia, nor even a united front (who in it represents the forces equivalent to Chiang Kai-shek?). It is a (small) mass organization led by people who aspire to be Communists and most of whose members are the same. There is no "nationalist" pressure to which we can succumb without being Communists. We use talk about what AIM "ought" to be or the "concept" of AIM. We must start from what AIM is.

The old revisionist "Communist" Party made a practice of creating "front" organizations like the Congress for International Cooperation and Disarmament or the Union of Australian Women. In the name of "tacit" and "broad" they
adopted watered down programs in these "mass" organizations, the idea being to attract others. In fact they were extremely narrow and sectarian organizations that alienated and repelled others. The masses don't like fakes and the real mass movement went on right outside these "mass" organizations.

But they gave Communists the opportunity to act in practice as pacifists and reformists even while loudly proclaiming their "Communism" and using it as a shield to protect their pacifism and reformism from criticism. In fact their "Communism" was confined to activities of the "Communist" Party and never taken out to the masses. It was a fake. In this way the Communist Party was liquidated.

In the peace movement, revisionists like Sam Goldbloom and Bernie Taft were notorious for their talk of "super revolutionaries" and "r-r-revolutionaries" (Taft's favourite phrase from Lenin) and their claim to "know the Catastrophe". They always advocated their right wing line in the name of "broadness" and insisted that the Communist Party would take care of the more advanced slogans and that it was therefore inappropriate for the "mass" organization to do so. It is one thing for people in the broad movement who do not approve of Communism, to favour a watered down program. It is another thing for people who aspire towards Communism to do it because of confusion over the role of the Party and its relation to the mass movement. That is already less natural and more dangerous. But when the role of alleged "leaders" of the Communist Party is always to vote against the more advanced program, always to hold the movement back and never to push it forward, only to mention socialism and reformism in order to explain why others should not mention it, then that is something else again. It ends up in revisionism.

Revolutionaries brushed all this aside with contempt, and built an anti-war movement much stronger and with a much broader mass base, because it was solidly grounded on anti-imperialist, not pacifist, politics. That is how a real broad united front against the Vietnam war, the Moratorium campaign, came about. Revolutionaries kept their independence and initiative before as well as after the broader united front was established (a genuine united front including people much further to the right than Jim Cairns, as well as that future Deputy Prime Minister himself, all united against the war but bitterly divided on strategy, tactics and ultimate goals).

Of course all this is "living in the past" according to some. But then isn't the idea that you can't struggle for a revolutionary line until a "broad" front has been created, a lot further back in the past?

The independence movement in Australia is far wider than AIM and similar organizations. The way to build strong, genuinely broad mass organizations for independence is not by watering down our line in the hope that masses will come and join us (because that is what AIM "ought" to be, and the "concept" of AIM), but by taking our line of revolutionary independence and socialism out to the masses and fighting for it.

With a correct line (and a more appropriate name), AIM can play an important role in placing a revolutionary perspective before the various mass movements, like the Uranium protests etc., that form part of the broad independence movement, and can help lead them in a correct direction. Far from becoming an obstacle to mass support, a revolutionary and socialist line will win much greater mass support.

With a wrong line, AIM will inevitably collapse and die, just as the old revisionist "mass" organizations collapsed and died and just as the Worker-Student Alliance did.

With a correct line, AIM can help the Communist Party in fighting for the Australian revolution, by providing a particular form of organization suitable for a particular section of people, just as WSA once did, when its line was basically correct. It can also help build fighting working class organizations in the workplaces.

With a wrong line, it can help liquidate the Communist Party and provide a cover for that liquidation, as well as dragging revolutionaries into a still narrower left bloc, away from the mass work they ought to be doing.

The wrong line in AIM is not one of eulogizing the reactionary nationalism of imperialism and its collaborators. It is not fascist. But it is hard to tell where that ends, "and where the common philistine, who from sheer stupidity or spinelessness drifts with the stream, begins."

Communists will fight in AIM, as everywhere else, for a revolutionary line and against bourgeoisie nationalism. They will unite, in AIM as well as everywhere else (except within the Communist Party) with bourgeoisie nationalists who genuinely fight against imperialism.
THE LEADING ROLE OF THE WORKING CLASS

Marx and Engels stated clearly in the "Communist Manifesto" that the proletariat is the class of modern wage earners and workers who have no means of production of their own, are reduced to selling their labour power in order to live, is the leading revolutionary class.

"Of all the classes that stand face to face with the bourgeoisie today the proletariat alone is a really revolutionary class. The other classes have already disappeared in the face of modern industry, the proletariat is its special and essential product."

The main conflict and area of struggle around this idea in progressive circles arises from intellectuals. For example, some would think or argue that the working class is too slow to mobilise itself on the uranium issue. The students, intellectuals and Christians initiated action here and seem to be more vocal and articulate. The workers are slower to move and seem to fall behind the intellectual element. These observations do arise from our experience.

The trend was noted in the Australian struggle against the war in Indo China. In terms of numbers the working class did take its line to mobilise itself but when it did, its influence was quickly decisive; the troops were withdrawn and conscription ended.

Understanding working class leadership is more than a question of direct empirical experience (e.g., on the uranium issue). It is more than a question of blind faith in the Marxist-Leinist classics. It is imperative to oppose the tendencies to dogmatism and authoritarianism. We have to study political theory and have to study that study to our social practice in Australia in a living way. We have to have to study and observe the working class in Australia.

"Perception only solves the problem of phenomena; theory alone can solve the problem of essence." (On the Class or the working class) Negation of theoretical study is wrong. "But Marxists exaggerate the importance of theory precisely and only because it can guide action." (On Theory). All theories originate from practice and in turn serve practice. This is a constant, never ending process.

Within the Party too there is a struggle for working class leadership. Progressive petty bourgeois intellectuals who that they are firmly on the working class road. In actuality there is a struggle between those who regard theory as primary, by subjective feelings, personal zeal and social practice as secondary. And those who regard theory as secondary, by subjective feelings, personal zeal and social practice as primary. There is a problem of those in the leadership who concentrate mainly on writing and there is a problem that they may only keep in touch with the middle and backward class struggle to sum up their experience so that these can be discussed in the forefront for comrades to learn from. There is a constant problem of uniting theory and practice in the primary position.

The goal is: The environment may change; the fine qualities and virtues that people have not changed; the level of theoretical knowledge is raised, the style of integrating theory with practice does not change, working ability is improved, the modest and prudent attitude does not change. (Active in Building a Socialist University of Science and Engineering) by the Workers' and PLA and Tao Tung Thought propaganda teams at Tsinghua University.

Observing the Working Class

The working class is the leading class. Is this true in the light of our direct experience? In general we observe that the working class leads in the following attributes (compared with other classes and strata):

- Generosity. They are familiar with trouble and hardship and will help others out who really need it.
- Forbearance. They are more inclined to say what they think than other classes.
- Confrontation. The working class is more willing to confront the class enemy and people who exploit them than are other classes and strata. It is less inclined to tolerate hypocrisy and bullshit.
- Practicality. The working class puts manual labour in its proper perspective, understands the true value of manual labour and is less inclined to separate it from mental labour than other classes. There is a strong trend in other classes and strata to despise manual labour and those who perform it.
- Discipline. The working class is less disciplined because of the heavy load put on it. It is more reliable in keeping its word than other classes.
- Forbearance. The working class keeps battling against hardship and single things of giving up the battle although they have it harder.

None of these are magical qualities. All arise from conscious decisions of the working class. The working class is oppressed in the sweatshops driven by the line or foreman and most importantly are in the best position to do something about it. They produce all the wealth in capitalist society and they work socially together often concentrated in huge numbers.

Other groups may be as oppressed or more oppressed than the working class, e.g., lumpens, pensioners, those who can't work and are thrown on the scrapheap by the system. But the working class is at the point of production and is in the position to hit the capitalists where it hurts most.

To lead the revolution against the class enemy the working class has to organise. The proletarian party is the advanced detachment of the working class. (Stalin: Foundations of Leninism). The party serves the working class and the people, individuals in the party must show by their deeds that they serve the working class.

A Warning: A One Sided View of the Working Class

The working class has a positive and negative side. Historically the working class is invincible and it will emancipate itself and all other classes to achieve social revolution, but we want to talk about the present and integrate our theory with the present.

Occasionally we meet or hear or read about individual communists or workers whose positive attributes, service
to the people, are so great and their negative side so insignificant that they become individuals worthy of admiration, but the pressures from capitalist society are very great. Especially in capitalist society these individualism are far and few between, but their existence gives great confidence in what people can become and of the ultimate victory of communism.

What should be our attitude to the negative features of the working class? We should discuss this, try to understand the social causes and wage an appropriate militant and protracted fight against the negative in order to build the positive.

It is wrong to emphasize the negative or throw up the negative without attempting to explain it or without attempting to correct false impressions about the working class that it might create. This is what the bourgeois media does.

It is wrong to ignore the negative or pretend it doesn’t exist. To mention only the positive amounts to an unrealistic glorification of the working class. This may appear to be correct but it is brittle in essence because it won’t convince anyone but the converted. And in time they will become disillusioned and this will be harmful to the genuine interest of the people.

Engels on the Working Class

In “The Conditions of the Working Class in England” (1845) Engels talks honestly and frankly about the positive and the negative sides of the private and public character of the working class. For example, the section on “Salaries” or the section on “Jail Imprisonment”. Engels does not talk about the brainwashed, sexual exploitation and disregard for the rights of property, but what emerges from Engels all is an understanding of the working class, of its social origins and their development in the future of the working class. Engels’s understanding of the working class is based on an analysis of the working class as a whole and its relationship to the social interest. Engels’s understanding of the working class in Australia would improve our political effectiveness and improve the penetration of our political line.

Develop Proletarian Revolutionary Optimism

It is often said that there is no room for any mood of pessimism. Why do people become pessimistic and how do we overcome it?

This is a matter of the contradiction between theory and practice in the present development of the Australian workers. It is a matter of the workers are more concerned with this theory than those who are influenced by this theory. If they grasp this theory in the working class with the present day reality in a literal sense they will lead to acute problems. These dogmatists may behave as follows:

a. Dogmatism and commandism in the workplace (an idealistic world outlook). Seeing oneself as an important leader giving orders and instructions before making a proper investigation. Not really listening to the desires of the people, the people talk, but dogmatism is heard, but their mind is far away performing noble deeds for the people. When the people don’t follow this self-appointed leader he/she develops an attitude of contempt for the people.

b. Pessimism and despair. When the idealist observes the working class does not fit into the narrow theoretical conception they have of them (we are all forced to face reality sooner or later) then they fall into pessimism and despair (or they may resort to individual activities, even terrorism, fighting on behalf of the people rather than with them). The common thing is for the dogmatists to vacillate from one mood to the other. They may take on the airs of a great commander one day and lapse into Moody despair the next.

The important thing is to recognize the class of these problems. Either our political theory is not advanced enough (in the case of this it would be ignoring the negative) or it is not close enough to the people and their real needs but is written in an academic, intellectual manner, or we can take the best of political theory and worship it, regarding it as more important or standing apart from social practice.

The text also discusses the importance of reading Engels' works on the working class, leadership, and the need for close contact with the workers. It emphasizes the need for a realistic understanding of the working class and its role in society.

The text concludes with a reflection on the role of pessimism and how it can hinder progress. It encourages the development of a proletarian revolutionary optimism, which is seen as necessary for effective leadership and political work.
Praise the working class. But do these people really know the working class? Some people may even rub shoulders with the workers every day but not bother to make deep investigation about their lives, their work, etc. They may work in a factory but go home to a left bloc household. They make few worker friends. They only believe in the politically advanced. They are secretly ashamed of the "backward" workers or frightened that their "progressive" friends won't be able to talk with them.

Only a correct basic attitude - serving the people and not yourself: the people are the real heroes while we ourselves are often foolish and stupid - can solve these problems. This correct basic attitude is the most important thing. Everything else flows from it.

Part of petty bourgeoisie, shallow optimism is individualism, self-praise and bourgeois leadership (elitism). Rather than working with and struggling with workers, they are not workers or workers are self ordained leaders. They chase leadership. They haven't got real faith in the working class and don't believe that individual leaders will develop off the factory floor.

This can easily lead to trade unionism. The trade union provides for formal positions (shop stewards etc.) that gives the "leader" some of the authority that he/she wants. It can be beneficial to take trade union positions. But in doing so we be full awareness of our own position and lead the struggle full commitment to developing progressive workers on the shop floor.

Proletarian optimism is based on a clear, square on reality and a correct estimate of the relationship between ourselves and the revolution. We must serve the revolution, we too are targets for workers on neither hardship nor death. If we die, will the revolution stop? Do people are no so important that it seems to think otherwise. Self-importance, pretension, arrogance in ourselves are targets of the revolution. The oppressed learn from them and depending on how much we know, teach them.

We are prepared to do whatever is required - including making real sacrifices - to serve the people. Of course we are not supposed to do so. Lenin pointed out the terrible danger of the force of habit, the man of inertia doing what we are used to doing because it is comfortable.

For a person of intellectual training it is comfortable intellectual circles (probably the left bloc) and give up the terrible danger of the force of habit, the man of inertia doing what we are used to doing because it is comfortable.

Writing articles (academic articles?), stay within impasse, speech at meetings. But the real person work (simply working with their hands) or forming good friendships with the politically neutral and backward workers.

And the opposite problems may apply for comrades of working class background.

We can learn from each other, but the working class struggle, not the party. Workers from the factory floor must be actively trained for leadership.

Like anything else proletarian optimism can be learnt...

We can learn from each other, but the working class struggle, not the party. Workers from the factory floor must be actively trained for leadership.

Mass Work and Problems on the Job

We are actually listening (not just listening to what we want to hear - that is wishful thinking) to our fellow workers we come across quite a variety of backward political ideas. As well as listening and acting upon the most advanced ideas that come up on the shop floor we have to take full consideration of the backward ideas. If we don't then we will drift into a left bloc. We will set ourselves too small a task. It is very wrong to confuse our own petty backward workers as right wingers or to ignore them.

1. Some workers have attitudes of apathy, cynicism, disillusionment, helplessness, pessimism about changing the wrongs in society. Some can see the wrongs not in some depth but don't believe that others can change them. Others can see divisions between the workers and the job and are pessimistic about how they can change them.

Frequently there is grave suspicion of anyone who seems actively involved in politics or the union (particularly if they don't seem to talk about much else). There is resistance to being marginalised or led up the garden path by a "shill in a shirt".

The social democratic (ALP) and revisionist (CPA, SPA) parties have not achieved anything of lasting value here. The people of the ALP and trade union leaders have taught workers by direct experience that those "working class" leaders are dishonest, manipulative, selfish and all of the rest. Basic working class principles and the, e.g., the trade union leadership, and experience underlined by this trade union leadership, and experience underlined by this trade union leadership, (e.g., the ALP leadership) (for example) can lead to a deep lasting suspicion of all potential leaders.

Why? Because clear and definite lessons are not necessarily drawn from experience and the idea still lingers (from the fellow workers, the media and force of habit) that the ALP is a workers party.

2. Some workers express narrow and selfish attitudes. They may be prepared to struggle when they see something tangential in it for themselves. But when effort is required to help other workers they lose interest. Why? Considered overall it is in its effects on the working people that capitalism literally forces people to put themselves first. This is a matter of analysing the bourgeoisie dictatorship and how it operates in more depth.

Some workers have a small businessmans outlook. They have
been or want to become a capitalist themselves. These people will want the company to make a big profit because that will guarantee their job security.

It is fairly natural for workers who accept the permanence of the capitalist system (the vast majority do not challenge this "natural" bourgeois assumption) to want to maintain their "privileged" positions, e.g., foreman, leading hands, relief operators etc. It is valuable to them to maintain the contradictions between these privileged workers and exploit them.

3. Many workers accept varying degrees of attitudes that are actively pushed and fostered by the ruling class. Racism, militarism, and attitudes to work into the working class. Racism attitudes will work against us if we act against them, but attitudes to work into the working class means that if we are seeking it, then we should be the people who make it, and for workers on the other shift, another plant or another section (lack of communication in the factory fosters this), division between tradesmen and production workers.

Experience shows that these attitudes are usually not deeply held amongst the majority. When the different groups struggle against our attitudes and activism, and we are actively excluded and then they can appear to vanish overnight (only to reappear at a later date).

4. Some workers suffer from a colonial mentality, i.e., we need foreign help to develop Australia. They lack confidence that the Australian people can do it themselves. This colonial mentality can be countered by explaining (doing it now, little things and big things), common sense and looking at our history to see what we have done.

5. Many workers suffer from anti socialist and anti communist ideas. This idea comes mainly from the constant barrage from the media. Also most workers describe the USSR as a communist country and often for good reason, unlike what they see as "communism" in the USSR. No opportunity for individual initiative etc). Eventually, many workers come to the conclusion that the idea of collective action does not have to be "total" and that the whole people make it. In order to encourage, we must encourage and not be quiet on the workers' sentiments on socialism and communism. There is no problem about this but certainty they have to be honest to the people about our ideas and be quite certain we should not fear the red tag. The red tag mentality is very strong, the left side is a reflection of it and great unity is needed to break from this. Fear should not be in command, boldness should be in command. The best medicine to combat anti communist ideas is when workers see that someone who is called a "commie" is not a monster but genuinely serves the people.

6. Workers may appear to be uninterested in politics. We must have real faith and confidence in the workers and the mechanics of belief that they will follow the "correct line" leadership, now or in the future. This can reflect itself in our attitude and conception of politics and the workers' attitudes and conception of politics is class struggle and so involves everybody. But the workers conception of politics and sometimes ours may be one learnt from the bourgeoisie - that politics makes history or that politics is political politics involving only a privileged stratum and not the people as a whole. It is fair to say that some workers are not interested in politics. Obviously it is hard to respond by showing "politics" (the bourgeois system) down their throats. Equally bad is to think that they are not worth talking to. It is also bad to be not very good at talking to this type of worker. It may be understandable (particularly if we are not thinking enough in the left but living in the right) to be very bad to be aware of this error and not to take steps to correct it. How to practice?

There are some of the "backward" political ideas found in the working class. Only by alertly and openly identifying these ideas can we make a proper start to systematically countering them. To just ignore these ideas is not acceptable. They must be treated as a break on the role of the Vanguard elements (those who are politically conscious and active) in the task of political and ideological development of the working class. It means that we will set ourselves a wrong task or too small a task. It does not disparage the working class to truthfully admit that these ideas do exist. These working class is a vulnerable class. Just as in any individual worker is vulnerable against industrial accidents that cause and cripple workers for life, the working class has its own particular form of bourgeoisie dictatorship - against the incursion of ruling class ideas and propaganda into its consciousness through trade unions, through the political parties and the Right and revisionists (false friends). To further develop its own class consciousness, unity, solidarity and determination to fight - building on positive achievements - in the best defence against bourgeois rule, patient and persistent mass work is a constant requirement in conducting this campaign.

In individual workers we often find a combination of politically backward and politically advanced ideas. It is nothing surprising in this, one divides into two. The advanced and backward exist together everywhere without exception (including within the party).

Unity

Unity is strength. When workers are united in struggle against the boss and basic mass consciousness develops, "my fellow worker is my friend!" How to achieve unity and achieve more. A very important task of the workers is to take the lead with the help of the workers in the building of unity amongst the different types of workers. This means getting unity amongst the conventional "militant" image (in some cases) and the conventional "worker" image (in some cases). The usual union sellout, is no small feat. For the usual union sellout, it is no small feat. For example, if it is at a working class to organise and to define the issue (in the face of increasing attacks) is no small feat.

There seems to have been a greater emphasis on these questions in the early stages of the periods. A classic like "Some Ideological Questions" can be repeated today to great advantage.

How do we set about overcoming the problems of the job (listed above) so that unity is structured against the boss occurs? To answer this, we have to look at the
experience. There are 2 factors:

(1) Backward attitudes by workers may not be deeply held. Often they are learnt more from the media than from life. Life is stronger, experience is stronger. No worker has only backward ideas. There is advanced and backward in everything and in certain circumstances (e.g., an act of bastardry from the boss) one can transform into the other.

(2) Backward attitudes are deeply held by the boss, especially the imperialists. On occasions the multinational boss will lie, cheat, break his own laws and procedures, display incredible arrogance, tribe, blackmail, sack workers etc. And these things often come out into the open.

In these circumstances the workers will unite in action against the Company. The politically advanced, middle and backward will unite. The situation arises where the consciously politically advanced - though numerically in a minority - can smart a decisive influence by correct leadership - and bring new people into the leadership. Initially the workers may take action such as strike, overtime ban or work to rule.

But this sort of unity will be generally short lived. It will last while the Company remains intact. When the company breaks up and grants a few little concessions then the politically backward break off and the middle wavers. It is important to recognize this when it happens, otherwise the "radical" (especially if they are affected by dogmatism) if they still charge forward "bull at a gate" will very quickly become isolated, allowing the company to counter attack (e.g., sack one of the leaders).

Trade Union Politics v. Class Struggle

And here lies the importance of consciously striving to introduce more advanced anti-imperialist and socialist politics into the workplace. Only when the masses grasp this politics - class struggle - will we achieve a higher form of unity, a longer lasting unity. . . .

{To be continued} . . .

Anna Triaboli

(Tang Hsien-Ping is exculpated from the article written by a veteran cadre last year. Apparently and unaccountably he seems to have changed his views on Tang and other matters since then).

Tang Hsien-Ping was Lin Shao-Chi's deputy. Along with Liu Shao-Chi he was criticized by the masses in the cultural revolution. He admitted that he had committed the crime of pushing the revisionist line to restore capitalism and vowed: "I'll mend my ways" and "I'll never reverse the verdict" He referred to the achievements of the cultural revolution in restoring the working class occupied leading positions in the superstructure of society. More about the superstructure later.

But not long after Tang resumed work he threw off his disguise formulated a program and began to prepare public opinion for an organized and planned attack on the party with the behind direct这一刻 Chairman Mao's attack toward the revisionist program of "taking the three directives as the basic line and oppose the setting up of revolutionary leading groups of three-in-one combination (comprising the young, middle-aged and veteran).

He also tried to reverse decisions regarding education. He wanted to put an end to allowing the sons and daughters of peasants, workers and soldiers entering universities. He clung to the notion that the higher education institutions must be elitist. This is the capitalist outlook.

Tang Hsien-Ping lasted less time than Lin Piao who once again is indicative of the rising political consciousness of the great mass of the Chinese people. In the course of the Cultural Revolution hundreds of millions of Chinese people have studied Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought on an extensive scale and in a deep-going way. Their study has not just been an academic exercise. It has been linked directly with problems arising from the development of the Cultural Revolution itself. The Cultural Revolution has become a class-revolution.

Now we pass to discussing the Cultural Revolution in a more general way. We will see that China is putting into practice the advice of the founders of the Communist movement, Marx and Engels. Foreign commentators with little understanding of how social progress is achieved often write lurid stories about the disorder and disarray of Chinese society. Nothing of course is further from the truth.

These commentators see struggle as disorder. Of course there is disorder in a sense, but the disorder is not collapse. It is disorder that is well understood by the Chinese people a disorder that leads to a higher stage of order. Engels long ago pointed out: "The development of the proletariat proceeds everywhere amidst internal struggles." Marx stated: "Has had to fight forever stop forward in the course of its life. Chairman Mao teaches: "History tells us that correct political and military lines do not emerge spontaneously and tranquilly, but only in the course of struggle." (Combating erroneous, non-proletarian ideas).

In Australia today there is great social disorder. Many people who could not be called communist or even sympathisers of communism openly talk about the pending collapse of capitalism. But within this disorder there is developing and growing the order of the ordinary people. They make and fight for demands which correct the disorder of the capitalist. This will continue. The Chinese understand how history develops. They know that there would be no development
THEORY OF THE TRAITOR CLASS

At present there is a truly remarkable "creative development" of Marxian-Leninism being pedaled in various publications called the theory of the traitor class. It seems to have made its appearance as a form of the "creative development" of Marxian-Leninism - taking super-power contention as the "key link".

What exactly is this "traitor-class" which now appears to play such a decisive role in Australia? Unfortunately we cannot discover the answer by referring to the current General Programme of the C.F.A., for in the section on "traitors and enemies" the traitor class doesn't take a mention. Are we to assume that it is an entirely new class which has only recently arrived on the stage of history?

We have been told (although not in the Party Programme of course) that "the essence of the traitor class is national betrayal," we can only calculate from this oft-repeated statement that this "traitor class" must be a brand new class because the history of the world has never yet revealed a class whose essence was national betrayal. It will now the essence of all classes has been their relationship to the means of production and distribution.

The Party Programme does talk about collaborators of the imperialist bourgeoisie and classifies them correctly as enemies of the revolution. But collaborators come from all classes and strata and have never been known to constitute a separate social class.

And this "traitor class" can't mean the Australian monopoly capitalists because they are an integral part of the imperialist bourgeoisie and the world imperialist system whose essence is the ownership of the means of production and the expropriation of surplus value created by the proletariat.

Perhaps this term "traitor-class" is really a new expression for compradors? But this is a likely possibility but let's be sure what a comprador is before we jump to a hasty conclusion. According to a footnote in comrades' Man [sic] Tsung's article "Analysis of the Classes in Chinese society":

A comprador in the original sense of the word was the Chinese manager or the senior Chinese employee in a foreign commercial establishment. The comprador served foreign economic interests and had close connection with imperialism and foreign capital.

(Selected Works, VI, p.19)

Ah ha! It seems we might be finally getting somewhere. But wait! Let's first see what we had to say about the Chinese compradors. He pointed out in the introduction to his article that...

To distinguish real friends from real enemies, we must make a general analysis of the economic status of the various classes in Chinese society and their respective attitudes towards the revolution.

Note that he says "the revolution", not "the motion".

He pointed out that the compradors are wholly appendages of the international bourgeoisie, depending upon imperialism for their survival and growth. He says "their existence is utterly incompatible with the aims of the Chinese revolution." Why? Is it because their essence is national betrayal? No. It is they represent the "most reactionary relations of production in China and hinder the development of her productive forces."

So whatever the "traitor class" may actually be it seems obvious that their essence can't be "national betrayal". Pseudo-scientific bourgeois-nationalist concepts and catch-phrases are no substitute for Marxist-Leninist class analysis.

So what is the reason for inventing this new and thoroughly groundless theory? I suggest that it is designed to be a very profound sounding justification for the totally erroneous argument that the Soviet social-imperialist bourgeoisie are about to step into the Australian shoes of the U.S. imperialist bourgeoisie in an exactly similar way that the U.S. took them over from the British imperialist bourgeoisie.

This rather astounding argument will be dealt with in a future article in The Rebel.

by MARTIN CONNELL.