LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

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 the R.A.A. go around visiting people to have discussion and debate in what circles is it done? In working class circles? Not. Instead in intellectual realms........Revolutionaries are not masstutors, It's about time we realised this.

The Australian working class exists in its vast numbers. The Red Sunara movement must involve itself in that class........This can and must be done. Instead of finding ourselves babbling about intellectual issues we must 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 also 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 of my thoughts on this revolutionary material "Excellent" as I can say.

"Rebel" has stirred me on. It has refreshed and invigorated my whole being, as I hope it will others or geniuses, and at times this irritates me, mainly... But comrades, believe me when I say that I have a deep respect for. Capitalism, fascism, religion etc must be rooted hatred inside me, against all that capitalism destroyed forever, never to emerge again on the face of the earth. Revolution is, and can be the only answer, and buried deep (the bosses, fat cats, uniform). They are the target for the people to destroy.

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

FROM THE EDITORS

The Rebel editorial group thanks all contributors to 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 apologize 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 using 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.

I would like to thank the comrades who have sent contributions for Rebel, criticisms and other correspondences, as well as donations. With continued active participation of our readers, Rebel should improve. Remember, Chairman Mao's words from "Introduction to 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 Sunara Movement...
17 The Ridge,
Blackburn, 3130
Victoria
STUDYING INFLATION

Everyone in Australia 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, of the class struggle, of the problems of the working class, and of the capitalist class. The capitalist class is the real problem, and not the "solutions" advocated by the bourgeoisie. The bourgeoisie has put forward a number of "solutions", but these are only temporary measures, and do not solve the fundamental problems.

The Marxist theory is the only one that can explain the real situation. It is necessary to study the history of capitalism and the development of the class struggle. The working class must organize itself and fight for its rights.

The capitalist economy is based on the exploitation of the working class. The bourgeoisie, through the capitalist state, expropriates the workers and their right to own property. The capitalists exploit the workers by forcing them to work for wages and by charging high prices for their goods and services.

The bourgeoisie must be overthrown. A socialist society must be established, where the means of production are owned by the people and not by a few capitalists. The working class must take control of the means of production and distribute them among the people, according to their needs.

The bourgeoisie is threatened by the Marxist theory, which is the only one that can explain the real situation.

In conclusion, the bourgeoisie must be overthrown and a socialist society must be established, where the means of production are owned by the people and not by a few capitalists. The working class must take control of the means of production and distribute them among the people, according to their needs.
August 21, 1977 marked the 30th anniversary of the Soviet imperialist invasion of Czechoslovakia in 1948. 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 mobilise 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 massive 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 claimed agreement 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, blocked 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 hand, like Nazi Germany, its inferior position compels it towards militarism and it relies on the illusory hope of a blitzkrieg victory, provoking that its enemies must in real life and disarmed.
satellites in Eastern Europe are rebelling, and it is
as if a volcano at home. There are difficulties in places like
India and Bangladesh. If all the countries threatened by
Soviet aggression unite in 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 so-called
"strength" or imply that strategically it is anything but a
paper tiger.

The Soviet invasion of Czecho-Slovakia may be compared to
Hitler's invasion of Czecho-Slovakia, or perhaps more accurately,
to the "Anschluss" in Austria. If this sort of thing is allowed
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
Czecho-Slovakia.

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
Czecho-Slovakia 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, as 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 Tse-tung'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 Taetung 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 "Oliveden set" and Lord 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 1930s, 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 Bureka 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 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", "Don'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 focused 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 rumour, publish innuendos, 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
For Angola, it would be new 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 aiding this play 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

that there are more relevant examples to show.
imperialism. What these far more relevant examples 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”, New Tung-wah society.
"What is scientific never fears criticism, for science is truth and fears no refutation. But those who write subjectivist articles and speeches in the form of Party stereotypes are very cowardly, and therefore are very much afraid of criticism. They rely on pretentiousness to overawe others, believing that they can thereby silence people and ‘win the day’.

Preciosity 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 and manipulation 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 Scare 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 none 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 none 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
conclude the whole question is being "overemphasized" and should be played down a bit. But it is not being "overemphasized", it is being crudely distorted. 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, p580, Moscow, 1964)

If we are really revisionists, Trotskyites, disruptors, scum, Soviet agents and so forth, then there are some obvious organisational 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 discredit 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 rumble about it impotently and make innuendos, 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.
"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.A. general meeting and other statements in similar vein have been 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 Faustian conspiracy stretching from the C.I.A. and KGB to the Red Front Movement.

"Of course Soviet social-imperialism can peacefully replace U.S. imperialism," we are told. "There are no longer 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 Comintern in 1926 Comrade Stalin went to the heart of the matter. He said: "That are the basic elements of the new 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 acquire new markets and sources of raw materials, 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 economic outstripping of many countries by others, the outstripping 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 new distribution of spheres of influence and the new correlation of forces, periodic redictions of the world by means of imperialist wars are necessary.

"Hence the growing intensity and severity 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 unsustainability of Kautsky's theory of ultra-imperialism which presumes the possibility of a peaceful settlement of these conflicts."

(On The Opposition pp515-616)

Comrade Stalin is expanding the basic and fundamental principles of the Leninist theory of imperialism, but anyone expanding these same principles in Australia has been variously describing 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 expanding 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 "soviets agent" charge, which is a reflection of the peculiar notion that everybody must be somebody's flunky, it hardly deserves a serious answer. Perhaps a question is more appropriate: Since when do Soviet revisionists 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 imperialism and the rising German, Italian, and Japanese imperialism 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 imperialism 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 take over Albania, Germany, Austria, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Yugoslavia, Belgium, France, Greece, Norway or North Africa.

Between 1939 and the end of 1941, fascist imperialism lost its sphere of influence through military conquest. British imperialism lost a large slice of its sphere 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. That was their play.


The U.S. imperialists at first were partially successful. They put eastern Europe, Britain, Japan and Yugoslavia "on ration" 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 for any Australian, and when Australian troops were busy defending British 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 REMEMBRANCE

It has been said that those who put forward the Leninist thesis of imperialism have short memories. Of course the Soviet Union can peacefully take over other imperialist spheres of influence as 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 or "open" communists to publicly claim that the Socialist Republic of Vietnam is a satellite of social imperialism. But what 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, so 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 wrecked 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.I.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.R.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 West European traitor class were 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 Touloosooloo 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 MBEEL and in the current General programme of the CPA (II-IV) 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” communist line. By their OGL003 OGL003 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?

END

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 nurturing 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 imperialist war into a just liberation war.”

MARTIN CONWAY
The following poem, which is taken from the Black Rock Yacht Club Journal, is reproduced for the benefit of all members and supporters of the Red Paws Movement. The editorial committee of the RPRCL hopes that all readers get some inspiration from the poem and so become active contributors to the REDP. To run the RPRCL 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 criticize 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?

.................................