

STRUGGLE

A MARXIST APPROACH TO AOTEAROA/NEW ZEALAND

No: 123 : \$1.50 : December 2006

All Capitalism's Politicians are Hollow Men

As Brash falls on his sword, all the while denying that Nicky Hager's revealing of his lies and duplicity had anything to do with it, the capitalist media has fallen over itself to limit culpability to him on his own. Thousands of column centimeters have been devoted to the exposure of Brash's links with the Exclusive Brethren and his misrepresentations as to the extent of those links. Hardly any to the real issues raised by the book.

Hager reveals that Brash was installed in the National Party leadership basically to implement Act policy – they want to kick in the extreme neo-liberal economic reforms, including introducing a voucher system into education, and undertaking "real" welfare reform (which included such policies as the compulsory adoption of children born to woman under 18 that weren't supported by the mother's family). According to the book, much of the parliamentary wing resented this approach



together with 'Brash's heavy reliance on a cabal of right-wing outsiders'.

On the other hand, Brash's highly influential party professional advisers in his office at Parliament talked of the need for inoculation from claims of extremism. For example Peter Keenan, the frank and cynical policy adviser and speechwriter whose emails provide the most entertaining extracts in Hager's book, is quoted as advising that "The secret of success is sincerity and conviction. Once you can fake that you have got it made." This is stunning and classic cynicism. Keenan also reminds his colleagues that they are playing a political game rather than meaningful politics, and that the parliamentary team should act accordingly: "please everybody we are talking about the electorate's perceptions here not the reality (unfortunately they vote on the former)".

The pragmatists succeed in watering down the representation of Brash's politics, by axing his

INSIDE: STRUGGLE ON...

Foreign Investment	3	Revolutionary Ideas	11
Tonga	4	North Korea	16
42 Below buyers.	6	Hungary 1956	17
Lebanon	7	Sutch	19
Sison.	8		

COVER STORY CONT.

'more radical and less popular economic ideas', and instead crafting a repackaging plan based around 'highly populist, anti-PC speeches on race, welfare and law and order'.

While the story is about the intrigue of special advisers and party professionalisation, it's also one of media duplicity. Michael Bassett, the ex-Labour Party minister turned Act party supporter and supposed 'independent writer and commentator' seems to have played a special role as adviser and public cheerleader. For example, when Bill English was National leader, Bassett closely advised Brash on how Brash might topple English, even writing him a five-page campaign plan for the task, and then on the day of the leadership vote, published a column in the Dominion Post entitled "Time to stand aside, Bill" which promoted Brash as the 'only credible option'. So much for being an independent commentator; Bassett then contributed to Brash's famous Orewa speech, which Bassett then applauded in his column.

What Hager reveals is that the National Party, and their corporate backers, have a anti-people programme of privatization, welfare slashing, and racism – all serving the interest of imperialism. Further he reveals that the party's apparatiks are well aware that if their programme was exposed and tested – even in the bourgeois circus called elections and with the advantages they offer the capitalist parties - that they

would never get to implement it.

But this is the truth of the capitalist electoral system in its entirety. Parliamentary elections provide no more than an opportunity for the capitalist class to test their ability to deceive the masses of the people. Every three years we are asked to choose between capitalist parties offering minor variations of the same diet of falling wages, reduced social services, poverty and desperation for many, and support for imperialist wars.

The working class has made repeated attempts to elect representatives to parliament but the capitalists have been adept at co-opting and corrupting these. After all, parliamentary democracy is a fundamental capitalist institution; the capitalists created parliaments to secure their power after the defeat of feudalism centuries ago. They set the rules and know the game backwards.

The world's emancipation lies not in the opaque buildings of parliament but through organizing and taking our political demands to the streets!

THE HOLLOW MEN T.S. ELLIOT

We are the hollow men
We are the stuffed men
Leaning together
Headpiece filled with straw. Alas!
Our dried voices, when
We whisper together
Are quiet and meaningless
As wind in dry grass
Or rats' feet over broken glass
In our dry cellar
Shape without form, shade without
colour,
Paralysed force, gesture without
motion;
Those who have crossed
With direct eyes, to death's other
Kingdom
Remember ...

**Do you want to
contribute to
Struggle?**

All submissions welcome.

Send submissions to: PO Box 6724, Wellington, 6141

Foreign Buy-up of \$16bn in Assets

Foreigners have bought up nearly \$16 billion worth of New Zealand assets – including half the supermarket sector and four valuable South Island rural properties – since overseas ownership rules were relaxed last year.

Since its creation in August last year, the Overseas Investment Office has approved the sale of \$15.8b worth of businesses, assets and property to overseas companies or individuals.

The office is acting as a doorman serving foreign companies, when the country actually needs a bouncer to protect its assets.

Yet the office says it is simply following Government policy.

In just over 13 months, the office approved 194 applications and refused only four.

The successful applications included about 170,000ha (1680sq km) of freehold land, as well as some of the country's biggest companies.

The majority of foreign investors were from Australia, the United States or Britain – and accordingly hasn't brought so much as a squeak of complaint from Winston Peters and his 'New Zealand First' party. That party has always played on the racism inherent in a society based in settler-colonialism, and raised the false-flag of an 'Asian Takeover' but has been disinterested in the real issue of foreign control of the New Zealand economy.

In four cases, all details were kept secret. For another 31 cases, including four purchases by the partially US-owned TrustPower, the price tags were confidential.

The Overseas Investment Act 2005 replaced the 32-year-old Overseas Investment Commission with a specialist office within Land Information NZ. The act's declared intention was to encourage and attract foreign investment while preserving "sensitive" New

Zealand assets.

It tightened the rules around the sales of some land – such as foreshore and seabed, or heritage land – but removed the requirement for other large land purchases to be approved and increased the threshold to \$100 million before corporate transactions would need consent.

While the number of applications processed by the office has held steady, their gross value has increased – at least partly due to many transactions that would previously have been included in the statistics no longer require official oversight and accordingly those that do are necessarily related to larger amounts.

In 2004, its last full year of operation, the commission approved \$6.9b in foreign sales, down from \$13b the previous year, and declined 10 applications.

Campaign Against Foreign Control of Aotearoa spokesperson Murray Horton said the legislation was promoted as a tighter control on foreign ownership, but actually served to make it considerably easier.

"We see the role of the Overseas Investment Office as essentially that of a doorman and ... what this country needs is rather more of a bouncer," he said.

While foreign investment could potentially enrich New Zealand, if it involved technology transfer and investment in industries that New Zealand capitalists were reluctant to invest in themselves, much of that taking place only served to suck profits, jobs and resources out of the country.

Showing she's the wrong person in the wrong job Overseas Investment Office manager Annelies McClure claimed her job was a difficult one. Government policy, she claimed, set the office "a delicate balancing act" between protecting national assets and

encouraging foreign investment that brought economic gains. She noted that 'many thought the system was too restrictive' clearly referring to those corporates that regularly and successfully lobby her office to approve their activities and not the workers who suffer increased job insecurity in the face of foreign ownership.

Horton said land sales, such as that of Young Nick's Head to American millionaire John Griffin in 2002, had "emotional resonance" and although held up by Michael Cullen as a reason for the change in the legislation, they were dwarfed in significance by corporate transactions.

Struggle agrees with Horton when he points out that recent industrial disputes at Progressive Enterprises supermarkets – bought by Australia's Woolworths in October 2005 for \$2.8b – showed what could happen when foreign shareholders were valued over New Zealand's best interests.

In another example a clearly second-best takeover offer by Godfrey Hirst for Feltex assets wasn't even considered by the Office – ignoring that there was an offer that would keep all the workers in place and the assets in New Zealand ownership. In that case the Feltex receiver, being dictated to by the Australian banking interests who were supporting the cherry-picking of Feltex's assets, were demanding an Australian solution.

Huge American forestry-investment corporation, Hancock Group, has bought the former Carter Holt Harvey owned trees in the central North Island in a deal worth upwards of \$1.5 billion. Although some fifty thousand acres that the trees stand on are accepted, even by the Crown, as belonging to local Maori, the new US owners are refusing to discuss arrangements with the owners of the land. In the US pesky issues such as indigenous ownership can be resolved through State Troopers.

Stand in Solidarity with the Tongan Revolution

The New Zealand and Australian governments have sent soldiers and cops to Tonga in an attempt to crush the resistance. While the capitalist media has been trying to convince us that the people are “welcoming” the troops Tonga’s democracy movement has condemned the intervention. The current regime and the monarchy have failed and can no longer maintain law and order. These troops are serving the interests of the feudal class in Tonga, while crushing people’s desire for change. They need to get out of the way and allow the natural process of revolution to take its course.

Riots broke out in Tonga’s capital Nuku’alofa after a pro-democracy demonstration. About eight hundred people had marched onto parliament with banners slogans calling for immediate reform; others attacked public figures, while another labelled the current structure a “deadly virus”. At night, protesters set fires to businesses in the city centre and turned cars over. Windows were smashed in the Prime Minister’s Office Parliament House, the Magistrates Court, and the Public Service Commission Office, the Ministry of Finance and three vehicles overturned and government cars smashed in government parking lots. One company targeted was power company Shoreline, owned by the King. The aristocratic class control the economic and political aspects of life against which the people have been resisting for years. The protests and riots are part of the struggle against the feudal system which is oppressing the Tongan people.

The King and his government then declared martial law. An excerpt reads: “Any person authorised by Cabinet, and every member of the Tonga Police Force and the Tonga Defence Services, shall for the purposes of preserving public order and securing the public safety, have power to order a meeting, procession of any assembly of five or more persons held in a place or building (whether public or private) to disperse; order every person to

remain indoors between certain hours; regulate the movement or conduct of a person or class of persons; search or detain for the purpose of searching a person; detain any arrested person for a period not exceeding 48 hours.”

New Zealand and Australian troops have been deployed to uphold these oppressive rules and to buttress the Tongan elite from the powerful democratic forces that are sweeping the island nation. The people no longer regard the mon-

archy as legitimate. The monarchy has used its power to exploit the people to enrich itself and its big power partners. The people want genuine democracy and a sharing of the economic wealth.

steps to reform its economy and government, while Tonga has not. As living standards in Samoa have steadily risen, they have declined in Tonga.

The potential of the Tongan economy has been wasted by a monarchy and “nobility” who have become wealthy by retaining a feudal social structure while the majority of the population has emigrated into economic exile in the US, New Zealand and Australia.



archy as legitimate. The monarchy has used its power to exploit the people to enrich itself and its big power partners. The people want genuine democracy and a sharing of the economic wealth.

BEHIND THE PEOPLE’S RAGE – ECONOMIC OPPRESSION

Tonga’s economic problems are longstanding. Agricultural output has fallen below its 1980 level. Since 1991, gross domestic product has fallen 1.1 per cent per year, compared to a growth rate of 3.1 per cent in Samoa during the same time. The reason for this difference is straightforward: Samoa has taken some

The royal family continues to dominate economic life, owning strategic monopolies and crowding out the public sector. The newly appointed King Tupou V controls Tonga’s electricity generation, its beer company, half its unexplored oil supply, one of its mobile phone companies, a cable television company and the rights to Tonga’s internet domain name, earning a multi-million dollar income annually. The King’s enterprise instincts are so insatiable that he even attempted to sell the genetic information of his subjects to an Australian biotech company. King Tupou V has made noises about divesting his business interests but taken no action. His subjects are not convinced.

The economy cannot grow without changes to land tenure. Three-quarters of land is owned by the "nobility" and much of the rest lies idle. Until recently, women could not inherit land unless they had no brothers and could prove their celibacy.

The King's and the nobility's wealth must be divested and distributed to the masses. Land reform is urgent to make decent living standards possible for Tongan families.

END THE RULE OF THE MONARCHY AND ITS PUPPET PARLIAMENT!

Tonga has enjoyed continued sovereignty since many thousands of years ago, and to bring in the foreign troops and to look to the palangi governments of New Zealand and Australia is a disgusting break in that continuity. This constitutes an act of treason against the people of Tonga and the troops must immediately leave and the King should be held accountable for this act of treason.

The subsequent actions of Fred Sevele as Prime Minister in his rapid conversion to an upholder of the feudal order, and the civil servant strike, confirm the marxist law about the passing over of the capitalist class to the counterrevolution, since they are tied economically and politically to the monarchy, and also the law about the working class becoming, from a class in itself, to a class for itself (or, growth of the working class means the

growth of class consciousness). In Tonga this process is still in the early stages.

Now the government will try to restore order with the help of NZ and Australian troops. Right now these foreign troops have a certain level of mana with grassroots people in Tonga. But they are imperialist troops serving imperialist interests.

REVOLUTION TARGETS ITS ENEMIES

The morphing of the feudal aristocracy into Tonga's capitalist class has served to further consolidate the revolutionary forces in the completeness of their mission. What the media in New Zealand have called "riots" has been an organised assault on the business interests of the Tongan elite. The interests of the King, other members of the royal family opposed to reform and that associated with corrupt politicians was targeted and burnt.

The capitalist press in New Zealand has been outraged that New Zealand business interests have also been destroyed, wheeling out (white) New Zealand business people based on Tonga to complain. Yet the destruction was not random, New Zealand and Australian businesses have been targeted because of their links to the corrupt regime and as a rejection of imperialist interests. Despite their overwhelming firepower, the troops on the ground will soon find the same.

For the imperialists of Australia and New

Zealand, the aim is to get stability under a friendly regime that gives them access to the resources and markets of the country. Their immediate plan is to prop up the monarchy (ie status quo), restoring order, while trying to convince the King to make some reforms to diffuse the instability.

But even abolishing the current set-up for the most democratic constitution is not going to solve the problems as long as the economy still runs on capitalism. The people want to put an end to corruption and nepotism, and use the resources of Tonga to benefit the people as a whole. But the only way to run the industries for the benefit of all if the whole productive economy is under a democratic plan - socialism.

This is obviously the last thing that the monarchy, business class, and imperialists want anything to do with. The enemy is already anticipating this kind of trouble when they accuse the pro-democracy movement of "communism". The main task for revolutionaries will be to present the programme that can show the way forward - the history of workers all over the world show that through experience they will come to the correct conclusions, but also that a revolutionary party will be needed to facilitate the process.

Tonga - Behind the Beautiful Images

Tonga is remarkable amongst Pacific islands. Settled for some 3,000 years, its people are unusually homogeneous culturally, religiously and linguistically. Never fully colonized, they have forged a proud, independent and stable oasis in a sometimes unstable region.

In the 19th century, a powerful chief from the central island group of Ha'apai saw which way the colonial winds were blowing. Converting to Christianity and securing himself some key British supporters, Taufa'ahau Tupou managed through bloody conquest to unite the 170 islands of the Polynesian archipelago under his rule. He established a parliamentary monarchy and renamed himself George I after the British King.

Monarchical power in Tonga is almost absolute, with the Tupou dynasty at the

helm for the last 150 years. Most famous was the loved and revered Queen Salote (1918-65). Her son, Tupou IV, ruled for 38 years. The new King, Tupou V only recently came to power. As Prince Tupouto'a he earned only the ridicule of the majority of population for his fawning embrace of the trappings of colonialism. His favoured outfits date from Cecil Rhodes missions in Africa and he travels around in a London cab.

The King initiates and vetoes legislation, and appoints the Premier and all the ministers with nepotistic flair. Nobles dominate the modest, weatherboard parliament building, while only a third of MPs are democratically elected.

Within a hybrid system of feudal capitalism, Tongans pay burdensome 'tributes' to their noble landlord, while most

Tongans are poor and rely on the support of relatives abroad. The size of the diaspora, concentrated mainly in New Zealand/Aotearoa, Australia and the US, now equals if not exceeds the domestic population of some 106,000.

After remittances, tourism is Tonga's second-biggest source of hard-currency earnings. Humpback whales are a holiday highlight, yet the Government has opposed the creation of a whale sanctuary in the Pacific. Tonga denounced nuclear testing in the region, but sought to join the 'coalition of the willing' which littered Iraq with depleted uranium. This tiny nation currently has troops stationed in the Solomon Islands, and Australia is paying for the expansion of the Tonga Defence Force.

What You Should Know About Bacardi

Although the capitalist media has been euphoric at the riches heading the way of 42 Below founder Geoff Ross some information about the company provides some deflation. Perhaps though the companies involved deserve each other. 42 Below has never made a profit and has promoted itself largely through the offensive behaviour of its Chief Executive, most famously refusing to supply 42 Below to bars considered to have a gay clientele. While the \$138 million Bacardi has paid for 42 Below (reaping Ross a personal \$30 million) sounds like a lot – until you consider that two years ago Bacardi paid US\$2.3 billion for the very similar Grey Goose vodka brand.

In advertising its lead brand white rum, Bacardi plays on its Cuban roots, misleading drinkers into believing that Bacardi still has some links with the island. In fact the Bacardi empire is based in the Bahamas and the Bacardi company broke all ties with Cuba after the Revolution of 1959, when its cronies in the hated Batista dictatorship were overthrown by a popular guerrilla movement led by Fidel Castro and Ernesto 'Che' Guevara.

Since then the Bacardi company has backed illegal and violent attempts to undermine the Cuban Revolution, including funding the Cuban-American National Foundation (CANF), a virulently anti-Castro right-wing exile organisation based in Miami, which has been responsible for systematic acts of terrorism against Cuba. Bacardi's lawyers also helped draft the US Helms-Burton Act, which extends the United States' blockade of Cuba to third countries, in breach of international trade law. So central was the role of Bacardi's lawyer, Ignacio E Sanchez (a CANF member) in establishing Helms-Burton that US Senator William Dengue said the law should be renamed the Helms-Bacardi Protection Act.

The Helms-Burton Act was designed to tighten still further the United States blockade of Cuba. The blockade prevents the sale of food, medicines and other essential supplies to Cuba and threatens other countries if they trade with Cuba. It has been estimated that the blockade has cost Cuba over \$40 billion in lost production and trade. Every year the US blockade is overwhelmingly condemned

by the United Nations.

The blockade is responsible for severe shortages and suffering among the Cuban people. For instance, the prestigious American Association for World Health (AAWH) reported in 1997 that the US blockade is contributing to malnutrition and poor water quality in Cuba and that Cuba is being denied access to drugs and medical equipment which is causing patients, including children, to suffer unnecessary pain and to die needlessly. The AAWH gave examples of a heart attack patient who died because the US government refused a licence for an implantable defibrillator, of Cuban children with leukaemia denied access to new life-prolonging drugs and of children undergoing chemotherapy who, lacking supplies of a nausea-preventing drug, were vomiting on average 28 times a day.

The AAWH concluded that a humanitarian catastrophe had been averted only because the Cuban government has maintained a high priority for a system designed to deliver primary and preventive care to all its citizens. It is worth recording that, despite the effects of the blockade, Cuba received a World Health Organisation (WHO) award for meeting all the WHO targets for all countries by the year 2000 - the only country so far to have done so.

Through its support for the blockade and its funding of CANF, Bacardi shares the responsibility for the suffering imposed on Cuba over the last 40 years by those who refuse to accept the path chosen by the Cuban people. At the beginning of June 1999, the courts of Cuba issued a lawsuit against the US government and its representatives for human damages as a result of aggression perpetrated against Cuba for the last 40 years, based on witness statements and recently declassified US government papers. These crimes include the destruction of ships and civilian aircraft, biological and guerrilla warfare, the firebombing of factories and crops, assassination and the Bay of Pigs invasion of Cuba by US-trained mercenary troops in April 1961. The death toll from these activities is set at at least 3,400 Cuban citizens. These are the sort of terrorist acts supported by the Bacardi empire.

Not content with this, Bacardi then resorted to stealing the Havana Club label. Although the blockade means that Cuban rum cannot be sold in the USA, in 1974 Cubaexport registered the Havana Club trademark there to prevent its use by other companies. The rights to the trademark were bought by the French company Pernod Ricard when it set up a joint venture with Havana Club Holdings in 1994 - in the face of threatening letters from Bacardi.

In 1996, Bacardi started illegally marketing its own Havana Club. Pernod Ricard sued. But, thanks to a section (section 211) hastily tacked onto a US budget after frantic lobbying by Bacardi's lawyers, Bacardi won. Section 211 arbitrarily stipulates that no court in the USA may recognise or in any way validate any claim regarding trademarks and commercial names related to properties 'confiscated' by the Cuban government. Bacardi claims Havana Club uses former Bacardi assets nationalised by Cuba in 1960. Section 211 contravenes international trade law, and Pernod Ricard is taking the case to the World Trade Organisation. As Castro pointed out, 'I hope no one will now complain if we start marketing a Cuban Coca-Cola'.

BOYCOTT BACARDI!

The Boycott Bacardi campaign calls upon consumers not to buy Bacardi. Get Bacardi off Cuba's back.

Already a number of student bars and pubs have decided to make a stand against Bacardi's activities by no longer stocking Bacardi and replacing it with Havana Club, a genuine Cuban rum whose sales bring much-needed hard currency into the Cuban economy. The challenge from Havana Club worldwide has left Bacardi sales down an estimated \$35 million since 1990.

Don't drink Bacardi – it'll leave a bad taste in your mouth!

Who are the Gernayels?

by Stan Goff

In order to deconstruct the assassination of Pierre Gemayel in Beirut last month we need to go back in history, to 1982.

September 15, 1982. Israeli occupation forces in Lebanon, commanded by Defense Minister Ariel Sharon, surround two large Palestinian refugee camps in Beirut. The names of the camps are Sabra and Shatila. No one is allowed in or out.

Israeli forces are allied with one faction of Lebanese, the Maronite Christian Phalangists, who have maintained an Israeli-supported militia along Lebanon's southern border.

Lebanon, formerly an enclave of Syria, was under direct French control from the end of WWI until 1943. By the time it received its tentative independence from France, the French has guaranteed the domination of the then-majority Christians over the government, its administrative apparatuses, and the economy. As greater and greater numbers of Muslims populated Lebanon, driven significantly by mass expulsions of Palestinians from Palestine (Israel) and Jordan (where many Palestinian refugees originally went after being pushed out by the Israelis), this control was contested.

Those attempts at resolving inequalities between Christian and Muslim resulted in sometimes violent reaction from the Christians, who clung jealously to their power. The close cultural ties between Syria (the Muslim-majority portion of the former French Mandate) and Muslims in Lebanon led directly to strong ties between Muslims under attack from Christian rightists (organized as early as 1938 into the Kataeb Social Democratic Party, "Phalange" for short, by a Lebanese Christian strongman named Pierre Gemayel), and to Syrian intervention in the affairs of its former enclave.

Pierre Gemayel was a big fan of Spain's fascist dictator, Francisco Franco, and organized the Phalangists in a nearly identical structure to the Spanish Phalange. This is the Party that the US government, CNN, and both US political parties now tout as the hope of Lebanese democracy.

Pierre's son, Bachir Gemayel, continued the Phalangist legacy, and organized Phalangist militias. In August, 1982,

Bachir had just been elected president, in Christian-run elections that Muslims boycotted, at the height of a bloody civil war, now involving Lebanese Muslims, Christians, Druze, Palestinians, the Israelis, and the Syrians.

Gemayel had "run" for election on the promise to smash the Palestinian Liberation Organization (PLO).

September 14, 1982, nine days before Bashir Gemayel was due to take office, he was assassinated with a bomb, ostensibly by a Lebanese Christian working for the Syrians, named Habib Tanious Shar-touni.

But the Phalangists' enemies were the Palestinians.

There was a swift reaction obviously coordinated with Sharon's Israeli military. That brings us back to:

September 15, 1982. Israeli occupation forces in Lebanon, commanded by Defense Minister Ariel Sharon, surround two large Palestinian refugee camps in Beirut. The names of the camps are Sabra and Shatila. No one is allowed in or out. Revenge was on the minds of the Phalangists, and in coordination with the Israeli cordon sanitaire around the Sabra and Shatila camps, the Phalangists entered on the afternoon of September 16th.

For the next two days, until 8 PM, September 18th, they rampaged through the camps, dragging men, women, and children from their shanty-houses and hiding places and killing them.

Israeli troops, who were part of the cordon, would claim that even though they knew the circumstances after Gemayel's assassination, even though they had allowed the Phalange militia to enter, even though they heard the screams and shots for over 36 hours, they had no idea what was happening in Sabra and Shatila.

During hours of darkness, at the request of the Phalangists, Israeli troops fired parachute flares over the camps to assist the Phalangists with illumination.

Phalange Commander Elie Hobeika was overheard by an Israeli soldier telling a subordinate who had asked what to do with the women and children, "This is the last time you're going to ask me a question like that; you know exactly what to do."

This reply was accompanied by laughter from other Phalangist militiamen.

Palestinians who tried to flee the camps were turned back by Israeli troops.

Israelis claim that 700-800 were killed. The BBC put the number at 800. Later researchers put the number closer to 1,300.

Among Lebanese Muslims, who constitute a majority (55%), in addition to around 200,000 displaced Palestinians, the Phalange tradition embodied by Industry Minister Pierre Gemayel, nephew of Bachir Gemayel, is perceived as anything but democratic. Industry Minister Pierre Gemayel was assassinated in Beirut, and now we hear the outcry from UN Ambassador and world-class asshole John Bolton about Gemayel being part of some longstanding struggle for Lebanese democracy, and nary a mention of how the Phalange tradition has been one of support for the US-Israeli axis against Muslims.

Instead, we hear the same drumbeat, the same demonizations of the only allies Lebanese Muslims have been able to count upon in defence against these imperial-comprador depredations: Syria, on behalf of the Lebanese Sunnis in the North, Hamas and the PLO on behalf of the Palestinians, and Southern Shia Hezbollah - perhaps the most authentic grassroots Lebanese popular formation in the country, which has now committed the unforgivable sin, defeating Israel in combat.

That this assassination comes just as the immensely popular Hezbollah is mounting a successful campaign to take down the US-"supported" government in Lebanon should not go unnoticed. And the possibility of a "false flag" operation should not yet be discounted, as Syria and Iran - next on the US target list (if they can ever extricate themselves from the ongoing defeat in Iraq) - are being promoted in the US media and by the US government as the heavies.

Global Trends, Challenges and Opportunities after 9-11

by Prof. Jose Maria Sison (abridged)

BRIEF BACKGROUND

The US has enjoyed the position of sole superpower since the disintegration of the Soviet Union and end of the Cold War. It is the No. 1 imperialist power in economic and military terms. It still dictates the policies governing the world capitalist system through the Group of 8, OECD, the IMF, World Bank, WTO, NATO, the UN Security Council and numerous bilateral and regional treaties and agreements with other countries.

Since the collapse of the Soviet Union, the US has become more rapacious and aggressive. Under the policy of "free market of globalization", it has accelerated the flow of foreign funds to the US, it has reaped superprofits on certain exports and investments and has imported cheap the products of other countries. Manifesting the brutal character of imperialism, it has waged wars of aggression against Iraq (twice) Yugoslavia and Afghanistan and engaged in military intervention elsewhere in order to tighten its grip on sources of oil and other natural resources, on markets and fields of investment. It has taken advantage of the weaknesses of the former Soviet bloc countries before Russia can offer any significant kind of economic competition to further cramp the world for imperialist profit-taking.

CONTRADICTIONS WITHIN THE US

For a while, Bush has been benefited greatly by 9/11. This has given him the chance to stir up war hysteria in order to capture bipartisan support for his role as wartime commander-in-chief and thus to consolidate his political position against charges of cheating in the elections of 2000 and 2004. He has used the war hysteria and the fear of terrorism to justify bigger government spending for military production and for wars of aggression against Afghanistan and Iraq and to push state terrorism both within the US and on a global scale.

It has seemed for a while that military Keynesianism could revive the US economy. But contracts with the military industrial complex for military production in the US and for other war requirements

in the field employ only a few people and provide a limited amount of income for US workers and consumers. So, the US economic planners have encouraged the "housing bubble". The rapid appreciation in value of private homes has allowed many people to use these as collateral for further borrowing for the purpose of consumption.

US imperialism has expected to benefit greatly from its invasion and occupation of Iraq by taking over its oil wealth and all kinds of enterprises. But the problem of the US is the resistance of the people of Iraq. The resistance keeps on blowing up the oil facilities and pipelines and cutting down oil production to a low level. The American people observe that the US easily spends USD 250 billion for the war but appropriates only USD 3 billion for the victims of the Katrina disaster and even releases this in dribbles.

The "housing bubble" has begun to burst. This is expected to further harm the US economy in a big way. Those who have been encouraged to engage in high consumption will pay dearly. This is the second huge financial disaster for American families in less than a decade. The preceding disaster was the bursting of the "high-tech bubble" and the widescale loss of pension funds in stock market speculation.

The American people in their millions have opposed the US war of aggression against Iraq before it even started. Their opposition is fast growing and is fast isolating the Bush regime. The American people denounce Bush for spouting lies to push the war. They cannot accept the heavy casualties suffered by both the American troops and Iraqi people as well as the huge amounts of resources expended.

The US has overreached and overextended itself in the world in the vain hope of expanding the scope of its political hegemony and economic territory. The conditions of socio-economic and political crisis in the US are worsening and are pushing the American working class and the rest of the people to rise in resistance.

CONTRADICTIONS BETWEEN THE US AND OTHER COUNTRIES

TRIES

In the wake of 9/11 the imperialist powers easily united behind the US to wage a war of aggression against Afghanistan, because the Taliban government was held responsible for coddling al Qaeda. But France, Germany and Russia together with China objected to the war of aggression instigated by the US and United Kingdom against Iraq in 2003.

There are contradictions among the imperialist powers with regards to economic, trade, financial, political and security issues. But the imperialist powers can still make compromises among themselves so long as these can be made at the expense of the proletariat and people of the world and the semi-colonies and dependent countries. The various frameworks for imperialist compromise and agreement are still intact and operative. If for a time no agreement can be arrived at, the imperialist powers simply postpone the resolution of the problem, let the status quo remain and work around the problem.

But the crisis of the world capitalist system and the crises in each imperialist country are worsening. The economic and financial crisis is relentlessly driving the imperialist powers to redivide the world and expand their respective sources of materials and cheap labour, markets, fields of investments and spheres of influence. What appear to be constant amicable relations among the imperialist powers can eventually break after a period of imperceptible changes in the balance of strength among the imperialist powers.

The European Union has a growing economic interest that is at odds with that of the US in the entire of Europe, Africa and elsewhere in the world.

In Latin America, Cuba, Venezuela and Bolivia have anti-US governments and mass movements and are encouraging other countries to follow suit. Even in the Middle East, the US is far from being able to stop the initiatives of Syria and Iran in cooperation with Russia and China. It has penetrated South Asia in a big way but it has difficulties in gaining complete control over the region.

The imperialist powers can still dictate on most countries. They have been suc-

cessful in undertaking neocolonialism. But there are countries and governments which are driven by bourgeois national motivations or socialist aspirations and assert national independence in order to fend off the unacceptable impositions and threats of the US and other imperialist powers.

The sharpest and most dramatic contradictions resulting in war have arisen between the imperialist powers and certain countries whose governments refuse to accept imperialist dictates.

Under pressure of the crisis of the world capitalist system, imperialist countries can engage in proxy wars among their client states or back different conflicting parties within a client state. Another major potential cause for hostility among imperialist powers would be the rise to power of fascist forces within any or some of them. The severe socio-economic and political crisis of imperialism and the currency of the so-called global war on terror have laid the ground for fascism and inter-imperialist wars.

THE RESISTANCE OF THE PROLETARIAT AND THE PEOPLE

Throughout the world, the broad masses of the people have engaged on varying scales in protest mass actions and strikes to resist imperialist plunder and aggression. The largest mass mobilizations on an international scale have involved tens of millions of people in hundreds of cities against the US war of aggression in Iraq. In various countries at different times, millions of people have risen up against the exploitative and oppressive policies and practices of their rulers.

In the US, Western Europe and elsewhere, strikes and protest marches have broken out against attacks on the rights of working people, deteriorating working conditions, racial and minority discrimination, the criminalization of migrant workers and discrimination against the youth in employment. In the former Soviet bloc countries, struggles between the exploiting and exploited classes and between the dominant nationality and the minorities are intensifying.

In the imperialist countries, certain factors check the continuous vigorous development of anti-imperialist mass movements. The monopoly bourgeoisie erodes the rights and social benefits of the workers and people but in a gradual or surreptitious way so as not to provoke revolt. The major bourgeois parties, mass media, trade union bureaucracy and schools cloak big

bourgeois interests with petty bourgeois rhetoric. There are yet no Marxist-Leninist parties and revolutionary mass movements that are large and strong enough to challenge the monopoly bourgeoisie and its agents.

The peoples of Iraq, Afghanistan, Palestine, Lebanon and other countries have waged armed resistance against US imperialism and its lackeys. The war of national liberation in Iraq is of great significance and has far reaching consequences in weakening US imperialism. The people's resistance in Afghanistan is growing and is delivering lethal blows to the US and NATO forces. The people of Palestine and Lebanon and other Arab peoples have successfully combated the US-directed and US-supplied Israeli Zionists.

There are many armed conflicts of different types in Asia, Africa and Latin America. There are those between the imperialists or the reactionary state on the one hand and the revolutionary movements for national liberation and democracy on the other hand, as in Iraq, Palestine, Afghanistan, Nepal, India, Turkey, Peru, Colombia and the Philippines. There are those between the reactionary state and the oppressed minorities fighting for self-determination.

The Marxist-Leninist and Maoist parties that are waging the new democratic revolution through protracted people's war play a signal role in bringing about the world proletarian revolution. They hold high the torch of armed revolution. They illumine the road of revolution for the peoples in the underdeveloped countries, in the retrogressive countries of former socialist countries and in the imperialist countries. They encourage the formation of Maoist parties where these do not yet exist.

CURRENT MAJOR CONTRADICTIONS IN THE WORLD

In the epochal struggle of the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, the fundamental contradictions to reckon with are those between labour and capital, among the imperialist countries and between the imperialists and the oppressed peoples and nations. From time to time, the arrangement of these contradictions changes according to concrete conditions.

At this time, these fundamental contradictions may be seen as four major contradictions and may be arranged according to current world reality. These are contradictions between the imperialist powers and the oppressed peoples and nations, between the imperialist powers

and countries upholding national independence, among the imperialist powers and between the proletariat and the monopoly bourgeoisie in imperialist countries.

The contradiction between the imperialist powers and the oppressed peoples and nations ranks first because within it armed revolutionary movements have arisen, even if still few, and the central question of revolution is being answered through the serious endeavour to seize state power. Every day that these armed revolutions for national liberation and democracy exist and develop, they demonstrate that the US and other imperialist powers do not have enough power to suppress them and pacify the entire world.

The contradiction between the imperialist powers and countries invoking upholding national independence has in fact resulted in wars that are even more dramatic for a certain time than the revolutionary wars of oppressed peoples and nations. The governments of Saddam and the Taleban have fallen. But the people continue to wage a war of liberation against the occupation and have pushed the US into a quagmire.

Individually, China, North Korea, Cuba, Iran and Syria invoke national independence and take a stand against the dictates of US imperialism on certain outstanding issues, like Taiwan, nuclear research and development, economic sanctions and Israeli Zionism, to cite a few. Politically, economically, financially and militarily, there are limits to US imposing itself on any or all of the aforementioned countries. It is already in serious trouble even only in Iraq. Together with its NATO allies, it is increasingly faced with armed resistance in Afghanistan.

The contradiction among the imperialist powers has long been cushioned since the end of World War II by their anti-communist alliance against the socialist countries, the national liberation movements and the proletariat and people. But it can easily take the No. 1 position when it results in war among the imperialist themselves, as in World War I and World War II. Such a war is always of high significance because it is the most devastating to the people, it is self-destructive to world capitalism in general and gives the people the opportunity to turn the war into a revolutionary civil war for national liberation and socialism. No direct inter-imperialist war has arisen since the end of World War II because the imperialist powers have developed various frameworks for settling their differences at the

ANALYSIS

expense of the proletariat and people.

The contradiction between the proletariat and the monopoly bourgeoisie can be looked at first within the imperialist countries. It can develop rapidly only after the other contradictions develop first. The revolutionary potential of the proletariat can arise from the internal economic and political crisis of imperialist countries. But before the monopoly bourgeoisie resorts to the use of fascism, it uses its superprofits from the rest of the world to counter and delay the rise of a revolutionary movement of the proletariat with the use of reforms and concessions.

We can reckon with the contradiction of the proletariat and the monopoly bourgeoisie on a global scale. The proletariat has a global presence. Outside of the imperialist countries, there are varying degrees of modern industrial development. On the basis of this, the trade union movement and revolutionary party of the proletariat can arise. As the most advanced political and productive force, the proletariat can amplify its strength by uniting with and leading the peasant masses in the people's democratic revolution in countries like the Philippines and Nepal.

The people's democratic revolutions through people's war on the basis of the worker-peasant alliance and under the leadership of the revolutionary party of the proletariat are very crucial today in keeping alive the hope of the broad masses of the people to defeat imperialism and its lackeys, free themselves from op-

pression and exploitation and enjoy a life of freedom, democracy, justice, plenty and progress in socialism.

Professor Jose Maria Sison has been the Chief Political Consultant of the National Democratic Front of the Philippines (NDFP) in its peace negotiations with the Manila government, 1990 - present. He was Founding Chairman of the Communist Party of the Philippines from 1968-1977. From Novem-

ber 10, 1977 to March 5, 1986 he was a torture victim and political prisoner. He currently lives in exile in the Netherlands. He is on the US list of terrorists and is fighting attempts by the US and its allies to reject his refugee status and extradite him to the Philippines where he would face further persecution, if not murder.

Close the Waihopai Spybase



- **It is New Zealand's most important contribution to the American global war machine.**
- **It is an American spybase in all but name.**
- **It compromises New Zealand's independence.**
- **It leaves us with blood on our hands.**

Waihopai Spybase Protest January 19 to 21 2007

For details about both Waihopai and the protest, contact:
Anti-Bases Campaign, Box 2258, Christchurch
e-mail: cafca@chch.planet.org.nz
Website: www.converge.org.nz/abc

phantom
billstickers Ltd.

Where do Revolutionary Ideas Come From?

Reading *The Manifesto of the Communist Party*, there is an air of inevitability to the end of capitalism and its replacement by socialism, in the same way that capitalism replaced feudalism before it. If this is the case, why should we worry about the problems in the world? Surely we can just lie back and wait for socialism?

This way of thinking is not as uncommon as you might believe.

- It was the explicit belief of the European socialist movement at the end of the 19th century, under the influence of Bernstein and Kautsky.

- It was the thinking of a large part of the Russian Social Democratic Workers Party, the Mensheviks, through the Russian Revolution and even beyond it.

- It underlies the thinking of the Socialist International, to which the NZ Labour Party belongs.

- It is also implicit in the idea that revolutions are most likely to occur amongst the most impoverished people; that if people are desperate enough, they will rebel.

This is a mechanistic, determinist view. Something outside, such as the economy, causes or determines events. This is the outlook or way of thinking of the orthodox (bourgeois) natural sciences; external causation.

It seems odd to find this sort of thinking in Marxism, which as we discussed earlier, draws from a different view of change; dialectics, which sees change arising from internal conflicts. An in other works we find Marx explicitly stressing the central role of human activity, not economic determinism, in social change.

"[P]eople make their own history, but not of their own free will; not under circumstances they themselves have chosen but under the given and inherited circumstances with which they are directly confronted. The tradition of the dead generations weighs like a nightmare on

the minds of the living" (Marx, 1869, p. 146)

ALIENATION OF FORCES OF PRODUCTION

Marx and Engels argue that social forms, or the "social structure", are forged continuously by the activity of people as they produce their livelihoods. People must be in a position to live to be active members of society and so the production of material life is the continual precondition of society (Marx & Engels, 1846, pp. 41, 47).

Production is a natural and social process, natural in that it involves a relationship between people and nature and social in that it is undertaken in co-operation with other individuals. Against technological-determinist conceptions, which see production determined by the tools and techniques available to people, Marx and Engels define this relationship between people and nature and people with each other as the "productive forces" of society (Marx & Engels, 1846, pp. 62). Productive forces are a form of human activity; material things only become productive forces in a particular social context (Avineri, 1969, p. 76; Sayer, 1987, pp. 26-27). The productive forces available make possible what can be undertaken in society, so any written history of humanity must be treated in relation to the history of these productive forces (Marx & Engels, 1846, p. 49). But the conceptualisation of productive forces as "things", separate from the social relations they are situated in, is to mystify or make a fetish of the way these social relations are experienced by individuals. The productive power of society appears to individuals not as their own productive power in unity with others but as an alien force outside them and independent of their will (Sayer, 1987, pp. 40, 44).

"Relations of production" are defined as the social relations between people

in production: "the economic structure of society", or "the same thing in legal terms" - property relations (Marx, 1859, p. 20-21). Rather than being sharply analytically distinguished, these social relations of production, then, are as much part of the productive forces of society as the tools and people involved in production. Marx's concept of old relations of production becoming a fetter on the development of productive forces can be seen as new forms of organisation of production coming into conflict with older ones, the stuff of class struggle (Sayer, 1987, p. 35).

Avineri argues the distinction between "material base" and "superstructure" is not between "matter" and "ideas", object and subject, but between two types of conscious human activity; one directed at the provision of conditions of human life and the other at the legitimisation of the specific forms of that activity (Avineri, 1969, p. 76).

So, it is not external necessity that constrains us from a better way of life, free from the horrors of capitalism, but rather it is the internal "traditions of the dead generations" that bind us. But what prevents us from simply shaking off these old ideas and reorganising society on a more humane basis? Marx argues that the normal operation of capitalist society generates false consciousness or a muddled idea of society, in which relations of oppression and domination are hidden.

ABOLITION OF THE WAGES SYSTEM

Marx discusses the ideological nature of the wages system in *Wage, Labour and Capital*. If you ask a group of workers, he says, how much wages they get paid, they will identify different pay from different employers, different industries, or different tasks. But they will agree that wages represent payment for an amount of time worked or an amount of work.

Yet, Marx argues, this apparent trade of money for work is an illusion. What the capitalist actually purchases is labour-power, or ability to work. The capitalist purchases the worker's labour-power for a week or month. Then the capitalist makes the worker labour for that specified time. The more the worker produces during this period, the more the capitalist profits.

To the capitalist, the purchase of labour-power is a commodity, just like purchasing raw materials, electricity, oil, photocopy paper. Wages are the price of labour-power. Like any commodity its price is determined by the labour necessary to produce and maintain it (food, clothing, shelter, education or training, a moral element), adjusted by the forces of supply and demand. Immigration, unemployment increases supply relative to demand, pushing wages down. Unionisation reduces supply relative to demand, pushing wages up. The introduction of more productive techniques reduces demand relative to supply.

Thus, despite face appearances, wages then, are not an exchange for work done, and are not a share of the workers in the commodities produced by them. "The labourer receives the means of subsistence in exchange for his labour-power; the capitalist receives, in exchange for this means of subsistence, the productive activity of the labourer, the creative force by which the worker not only replaces what he consumes, but also gives to the accumulated labour a greater value than it previously possessed." (Marx, 1847)

Thus wage labour creates the alien power that dominates it, the toil of the worker enlarges the wealth and power of its master. Capital and wage labour are two sides of the same coin. "As long as the wage-labourer remains a wage-labourer, his lot is dependent upon capital. That is what the boasted community of interests between worker and capitalists amounts to." (Marx, 1847).

"Let us suppose the most favourable case: if productive capital grows, the demand for labour grows. It therefore increases the price of labour-power, wages." But the growth of capital will at the same time be much greater than the growth in wages. Even in this best case, the relative position of the working class will diminish; the power of capital over their lives will grow. Even if, through trade union solidarity, workers can obtain a wage increase relative to profits, the underlying antagonism does not diminish and the position will likely soon be reversed.

Thus, Marx's argument is that the normal operation of capitalism generates an appearance of equal exchange in society; wages are exchanged for labour performed. Worker's combination to gain a greater share of wages at the expense of profits appears to be a viable strategy for advancement. But beneath the surface of appearances we have seen that such a strategy can only have a temporary influence on the supply and demand equilibrium. While capitalist production relations remain, the power of capital over labour grows. Thinking that is restricted to surface appearances and the wages struggle is trade union consciousness or reformism.

"Trade Unions work well as centres of resistance against the encroachments of capital ... They fail generally from limiting themselves to a guerrilla war against the effects of the existing system, instead of simultaneously trying to change it, instead of using their organized forces as a lever for the final emancipation of the working class, that is to say, the ultimate abolition of the wages system" (Marx, 1865).

TRADE UNION CONSCIOUSNESS

Lenin developed this notion that the spontaneous development of the workers movement can only lead to a trade union consciousness, the struggle for higher wages and reforms to the capitalist system. Much of Lenin's discussion can be found in *What is to be Done*, where he used synonymously the terms trade union consciousness and "economism", ie. restriction to the economic struggle.

Lenin argued that in a society divided into classes there are only two ideologies; capitalist or bourgeois ideology and working class or proletarian ideology. Capitalist ideology is dominant in society. While the media and the education system add to this, these are not the reasons for the dominance of capitalist ideology. Capitalist ideology is dominant simply because it emerges spontaneously all the time from the immediate appearances of everyday life in a capitalist society; we are all free and equal in society, wages are paid in exchange for work done and so on. Trade union thinking and reformism, then are capitalist ideologies. They are widespread amongst the working class because these ideas have not been criticised as shallow.

From where can this proletarian criticism come? From organised groups of revolutionaries who have thought through the limitations of capitalism.

Lenin argued that while exposure of economic issues, comparing wages and conditions in one factory with those in another, could provide a starting point for political organisation, this was essentially merely trade-union work, teaching workers to sell their commodity on better terms.

Lenin argued that Political education was the critical component to the development of revolutionary proletarian consciousness. Political education should not be restricted to the political oppression of workers but the oppression of all classes and walks of life needed exposure. Nor did this have to follow agitation around economic issues. "Any and every manifestation of police tyranny and autocratic outrage" was the basis for education and mobilisation. In fact, Lenin argued that it was only possible to "raise the activity of the working masses" when this activity was not restricted to an economic issue, ie. when it involved "comprehensive political exposure." (Lenin, 1902, pp. 412-17).

"Working-class consciousness cannot be genuine political consciousness unless the workers are trained to respond to all cases of tyranny, oppression, violence and abuse, no matter what class is affected ... unless the workers learn, from concrete, and above all from topical, political facts and events to observe every other social class in all the manifestations of its intellectual, ethical, and political life; unless they learn to apply in practice the materialist analysis ..." (Lenin, 1902, pp. 412-17).

"In order to become a Social-Democrat, the worker must have a clear picture in his mind of the economic nature and the social and political features of the landlord and the priest, the high state official and the peasant, the student and the vagabond; he must know their strong and weak points; he must grasp the meaning of all the catchwords and sophisms by which each class and each stratum camouflages its selfish strivings and its real "inner workings"; he must understand what interests are reflected by certain institutions and certain laws and how they are reflected. But this "clear picture" cannot be obtained from any book. It can be obtained only from living examples and from exposures that follow close upon what is going on about us at a given moment; upon what is being discussed, in whispers perhaps, by each one in his own way; upon what finds expression in such and such events, in such and such statistics, in such and such court sentences, etc., etc. These comprehensive political exposures are an essential and funda-

mental condition for training the masses in revolutionary activity." (Lenin, 1902, pp. 412-17).

Why do workers not respond to these sorts of issues to the same degree as to struggles over wages and conditions? Lenin argues this is a symptom of weaknesses in organising by the RSDLP, failing "to organise sufficiently wide, striking, and rapid exposures of all the shameful outrages. When we do that (and we must and can do it), the most backward worker will understand, or will feel, that the students and religious sects, the peasants and the authors are being abused and outraged by those same dark forces that are oppressing and crushing him at every step of his life. Feeling that, he himself will be filled with an irresistible desire to react ..." (Lenin, 1902, pp. 412-17).

The key here is effective mass mobilisation, rather than armchair sloganeering, or tailing the wake of the masses. Lenin shuns paper "calls to action" in favour of "live and striking exposures". "To catch some criminal red-handed and immediately to brand him publicly in all

places is of itself far more effective than any number of 'calls' ... Only those who themselves go into action, and do so immediately, can sound such calls (Lenin, 1902, pp. 412-17).

With biting polemic Lenin rounds off the idea that revolutionary agitation should be limited to the wages struggle:

we are not children to be fed on the thin gruel of "economic" politics alone; we want to know everything that others know, we want to learn the details of all aspects of political life and to take part actively in every single political event. In order that we may do this, the intellectuals must talk to us less of what we already know and tell us more about what we do not yet know and what we can never learn from our factory and "economic" experience, namely, political knowledge. You intellectuals can acquire this knowledge, and it is your duty to bring it to us in a hundred- and a thousand-fold greater measure than you have done up to now; and you must bring it to us, not only in the form of discussions, pamphlets, and articles (which very often -- pardon our frankness -- are rather

dull), but precisely in the form of vivid exposures of what our government and our governing classes are doing at this very moment in all spheres of life. Devote more zeal to carrying out this duty and talk less about "raising the activity of the working masses". We are far more active than you think, and we are quite able to support, by open street fighting, even demands that do not promise any "palpable results" whatever. It is not for you to "raise" our activity, because activity is precisely the thing you yourselves lack. Bow less in subservience to spontaneity, and think more about raising your own activity, gentlemen!

WHAT IS TO BE DONE?

What is to be Done provides an organisational plan for building proletarian ideology that has been enormously influential in the Communist Movement. It was the explicit plan of the Bolshevik with of the RSDLP from 1903 to 1918 and it was used by much of the Communist International thereafter, and the ML resurgence in the 1960s and 70s.

continues on next page...

The Class Basis of Ideas

One important function of the State in Aotearoa/New Zealand and around the capitalist world is to ensure that the ideology of the ruling capitalist class remains the dominant ideology.

This dominant ideology is the product of the capitalist economic and social base.

The ruling capitalist class uses the mass media, education system, culture, religion, etc to impose its whole system of values and ideas to reinforce and maintain its rule.

Remember the attacks on 'closing the gaps' and Brash's Orewa speeches releasing a torrent of racism and attacks on beneficiaries.

National MPs and their allies claimed that 'political correctness' got in the way of people feeling able to speak more freely about what they felt. Being able to 'talk about certain things without living in fear of being branded a bigot or a racist' naturally enough means that it is easier for bigots and racists to spread their poison. The term 'political correctness' got turned and instead of protecting those in need became a term used to attack those who oppose the official line.

TWO LINES OF THOUGHT

Whatever they may think, the mouthpieces of capitalism and colonialism, Don Brash, John Key, Michael Bassett, Gerry Brownlee, Rodney Hide and their type cannot escape the truth of what Mao Zedong wrote in his 1937 essay On Practice, "In class society everyone lives as a member of a particular class, and every kind of thinking, without exception, is stamped with the brand of a class."

Marx put it very well when he wrote in the preface to A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy, "In the social production of their existence, men inevitably enter into definite relations, which are independent of their will, namely relations of production appropriate to a given stage in the development of their material forces of production. The totality of these relations of production constitutes the economic structure of society, the real foundation, on which arises a legal and political superstructure and to which correspond definite forms of social consciousness. The mode of production of material life conditions the general process of social, political and intellectual life. It is not the consciousness of men that

determines their existence, but their social being that determines their consciousness."

This means that both the workers and the capitalists have their own forms of thought and action that are determined by the place they occupy in the production relationship. Ethical beliefs and morality also have a similar class basis. They either justify the domination of a ruling class or represent the revolt of an oppressed class against this domination and the future interests of the oppressed.

Engels discussed the question of two sorts of thinking, two sorts of ethics and two sorts of morality in his 1878 work Anti-Duhring where he wrote, "But when we see that the three classes of modern society, the feudal aristocracy, the bourgeoisie and the proletariat each have a morality of their own, we can only draw the conclusion that men, consciously or unconsciously, derive their ethical ideas in the last resort from the practical relations on which their class position is based -- from the economic relations in which they carry on production and exchange.

STUDY

What was often overlooked when this plan was reproduced were the conditions in which the Bolsheviks developed and applied this. The early 20th Century was a period of immense spontaneous workers struggle for economic and political reforms, culminating in the 1905 Revolution. The task facing revolutionaries at that time was of establishing and maintaining contact with these vast number of struggles and of wielding this into a coherent force that could strike blows against the regime.

Agitation was critical in these conditions. Lenin describes the impact of "exposure literature":

The "leaflets" were devoted mainly to the exposure of the factory system, and very soon a veritable passion for exposures was roused among the workers. As soon as the workers realised that the Social-Democratic study circles desired to, and could, supply them with a new kind of leaflet that told the whole truth about their miserable existence, about their unbearably hard toil, and their lack of rights, they began to send in, actually flood us with, correspondence from the factories and workshops. This "exposure literature" created a tremendous sensation, not only in the particular factory exposed in the given leaflet, but in all the factories to which news of the, revealed facts spread. And since the poverty and want among the workers in the various enterprises and in the various trades are much the same, the "truth about the life of the workers" stirred everyone. Even among the most backward workers, a veritable passion arose to "get into print" – a noble passion for this rudimentary form of war against the whole of the present social system which is based upon robbery and oppression. And in the overwhelming majority of cases these "leaflets" were in truth a declaration of war, because the exposures served greatly to agitate the workers; they evoked among them common demands for the removal of the most glaring outrages and roused in them a readiness to support the demands with strikes. Finally, the employers themselves were compelled to recognise the significance of these leaflets as a declaration of war, so much so that in a large number of cases they did not even wait for the outbreak of hostilities. As is always the case, the mere publication of these exposures made them effective, and they acquired the significance of a strong moral influence. On more than one occasion, the mere appearance of a leaflet proved sufficient to secure the satisfaction of all or part of the demands put forward. In a word, economic (factory) exposures were and remain an important lever in the eco-

omic struggle. And they will continue to retain this significance as long as there is capitalism, which makes it necessary for the workers to defend themselves. Even in the most advanced countries of Europe it can still be seen that the exposure of abuses in some backward trade, or in some forgotten branch of domestic industry, serves as a starting-point for the awakening of class-consciousness, for the beginning of a trade union struggle, and for the spread of socialism. (Lenin, 1902, pp. 398-402).

Much of What is to be Done is directed polemically at the overemphasis of the RSDLP in this economic agitation at the expense of political education.

It also contains plans for the creation of a Russia-wide newspaper to provide the means of centralising and channelling all the disparate threads of the great spontaneous upsurge in Russia. The party newspaper has been a central tool of Communist Parties ever-since, even where spontaneous movements have not been so widespread. In these latter cases, the paper has often become the central goal of the organisation, rather than organising and education work itself.

AGITATION AND PROPAGANDA

Lenin distinguishes two methods of political education, agitation and propaganda. He notes the traditional emphasis in the RSDLP on propaganda – presenting many ideas in an integrated manner to a relatively few people, eg. When discussing unemployment, the capitalist nature of crisis, their inevitability and the necessity of socialism will be explained. Printed material tends to be used.

By contrast, agitation is the presentation of a single idea to large numbers. Using the same example, the agitator will draw from an example, the death of an unemployed worker to hammer a central point – the inhumanity of the gap between rich and poor, striving to rouse discontent and indignation against the injustice. The spoken word is normally the most effective in this case.

The two methods are complimentary. Propaganda provides more extensive information to back up the emotive call; agitation moves large numbers. Both have a mobilising effect.

Lenin saw the all-Russian party newspaper as providing the basis for consistent, systematic, all-round propaganda and agitation, to reinforce the dispersed, fragmented, individual action, local leaflets

and local pamphlets. This was needed because "the revolutionary proletariat ... has demonstrated its readiness, not only to listen to and support the summons to political struggle, but boldly to engage in battle. We are now in a position to provide a tribune for the nationwide exposure of the tsarist government, and it is our duty to do this ... The Russian working class ... displays a constant interest in political knowledge and manifests a constant and extensive demand (not only in periods of intensive unrest) for illegal literature. When such demand is evident; when the training of revolutionary leaders has already begun, and when the concentration of the working class makes it virtual master in the working-class districts of the big cities and in the factory settlements and communities, it is quite feasible for the proletariat to found a political newspaper."

The newspaper was only one method by which the Bolsheviks pursued their agitation and propaganda however. Another arena of "tremendous importance" was organising in trade unions.

WORKING CLASS STRATA

It is a principle of dialectical change that there are contradictions in all things. This includes the working class. Marx had made various observations along these lines but it was Lenin who gave systematic attention to the division between advanced and less advanced strata.

Lenin noted in 1899 that "The history of the working-class movement in all countries shows that the better-situated strata of the working class respond to the ideas of socialism more rapidly and more easily... [These] "can win the confidence of the laboring masses, ... devote themselves entirely to the education and organisation of the proletariat ... accept socialism consciously, and ... even elaborate independent socialist theories." (Lenin, 1899, pp. 280-85). He argued that communist agitation and propaganda must be pitched not only at the level of this "working-class intelligentsia" but must seek to raise this level consciously, raising all tactical, political and theoretical problems of the communist movement.

Secondly, "After the numerically small stratum of advanced workers comes the broad stratum of average workers. These workers, too, strive ardently for socialism, participate in workers' study circles, read socialist newspapers and books, participate in agitation" but fall short of a full grasp of intricate theoretical or practical problems, tending to be absorbed by local practical work, the events of the

working class movement and immediate problems of agitation. Lenin argued that while the mass of communist agitation and propaganda will be directed to this strata, the level should not be lowered to the average understanding of the strata but should be designed to raise the level of understanding of the strata, to promote advanced workers from the middle. Agitation and propaganda should connect socialism and the political struggle with ever local and narrow question.

Lastly, a backward strata, the mass of workers are likely to find communist agitation and propaganda incomprehensible, even though they may support demonstrations or vote for the communists. This strata is more likely to be both enthused and demoralised, and more subject to reformist sops. Rather than lower the general level of communist a&p to the understanding of this group however, Lenin argued that there must be different forms developed to supplement the general a&p. For example, pamphlets written in popular language, oral agitation, and leaflets on local events, legal educational activities. "Agitation must be individualised, but our tactics, our political activity must be uniform" (Quoting Kautsky).

MASS LINE

We noted above that the revolutionary newspaper was only one tactic for carrying out a&p amongst the masses of workers and that the Bolshevik insistence on this was a product of particular circumstances and that work in trade unions was also particularly important to them. Lenin saw work in trade unions as even more important in the advanced capitalist countries:

"If you want to help the "masses" and win the sympathy and support of the "masses", you should not fear difficulties, or pinpricks, chicanery, insults and persecution from the "leaders" (who, being opportunists and social-chauvinists, are

in most cases directly or indirectly connected with the bourgeoisie and the police), but must absolutely work wherever the masses are to be found. You must be capable of any sacrifice, of overcoming the greatest obstacles, in order to carry on agitation and propaganda systematically, perseveringly, persistently and patiently in those institutions, societies and associations -- even the most reactionary -- in which proletarian or semi-proletarian masses are to be found. The trade unions and the workers' co-operatives (the latter sometimes, at least) are the very organisations in which the masses are to be found." (Lenin, 1920, pp. 50-56).

The underlying principle being emphasised here is known as the "mass line"; the need to centre agitation and propaganda wherever the masses are to be found, remembering the stratification discussed above. Mao wrote extensively on this point:

"In all the practical work of our Party, all correct leadership is necessarily "from the masses, to the masses". This means: take the ideas of the masses (scattered and unsystematic ideas) and concentrate them (through study turn them into concentrated and systematic ideas), then go to the masses and propagate and explain these ideas until the masses embrace them as their own, hold fast to them and translate them into action, and test the correctness of these ideas in such action. Then once again concentrate ideas from the masses and once again go to the masses so that the ideas are persevered in and carried through. And so on, over and over again in an endless spiral, with the ideas becoming more correct, more vital and richer each time." (Mao, 1943, 119-20).

REFERENCES

- Avineri, S., 1969. *The Social and Political Thought of Karl Marx*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
Cohen, G. A., 1988. *History, Labour and*

Freedom: Themes from Marx. Oxford, Clarendon Press.

Dobb, M., 1970. Introduction, in *Marx 1859*, pp. 5-16.

Lenin, V., 1899. *A Retrograde Trend in Russian Social Democracy*. Collected Works, Vol. 4, 1972 edn. Moscow: Progress Publishers, pp. 255-85.

Lenin, V., 1902. *What is to be Done?* Collected Works, Vol. 5. Moscow: Progress Publishers.

Lenin, V. 1920. *Left Wing Communism – An Infantile Disorder*, Collected Works, Vol. 31. Moscow: Progress Publishers.

Marx, K., 1847. *Wage, Labour and Capital*. Moscow: Progress Publishers.

Marx, K., 1865. *Wages, Price and Profit*. Moscow: Progress Publishers.

Marx, K., 1859. *A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy*, 1970 edn. Moscow: Progress Publishers.

Marx, K., 1869. *The 18th Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte*. *Surveys From Exile: Political Writings*, Vol. 2, ed. D. Fernbach, 1973 edn. Harmondsworth, Penguin in association with New Left Review, pp. 143-249.

Marx, K. & Engels, F., 1846. *The German Ideology*, 1976 edn. Moscow: Progress Publishers.

Mao Zedong. 1943. *Some Questions Concerning Methods of Leadership*, *Selected Works*, Vol. 3, Beijing: Foreign Languages Press, pp. 117-22.

Sayer, D., 1987. *The Violence of Abstraction: The Analytic Foundations of Historical Materialism*. Oxford, Basil Blackwell.

Marxist-Leninist Literature Available:

Books by Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin, Mao Zedong.

Full catalogue available, Write to:

Books, PO Box 6724, Wellington 6141.

North Korea's Nuclear Test

by Stephen Gowans

There were immediate reasons, and more distant causes, that compelled north Korea to undertake a nuclear test in October. All of them are related to the need of north Korea to deter the United States from carrying out its threats of war.

North Korea has been trying for over 50 years to arrive at some kind of peaceful co-existence with Washington, and its overtures of peace have been repeatedly spurned.

So, Washington declares north Korea to be part of an "axis of evil," invades and occupies another of the declared "axis of evil" countries, Iraq, and then John Bolton, at the time US undersecretary of state for arms control, warns north Korea and Syria and Iran to draw "the appropriate lesson."

North Korea did draw the appropriate lesson - only it wasn't the one Washington wanted it to draw, though it was one history predisposed north Korea to make.

NO DANGER

The only danger north Korea poses is the danger of disrupting US plans to attack the country. It is not an offensive threat.

First, it's not clear that Pyongyang even has a workable nuclear device. There's some question the nuclear test was successful. Second, it has no reliable means of delivering a warhead. Its ballistic missile tests have not been particularly successful. Third, it faces the considerable technical challenge of making its bomb, if it is workable, small enough to fit into a missile warhead or an artillery shell or aerial bomb.

Still, there's sufficient ambiguity about north Korea's nuclear capabilities to make Washington think twice about an attack.

North Korea is very weak militarily. The US military budget is somewhere around \$500 billion per year. North Korea's is somewhere around \$5 billion per year - one percent of the US budget.

The latest United Nations Security Council Resolution seeks to make north Korea weaker still, by banning the sale to north Korea of military equipment - battle tanks, artillery systems, warships. That's not to undermine north Korea as an offensive threat, because it isn't one, but to

make it ripe for an easy invasion.

CONSEQUENCES

The US will use the nuclear test to bolster its missile defense shield plan, which will increase the profits of the corporate rich in the US, and Japan will use the nuclear test to shred its pacifist constitution towards resurrecting its militarist past.

It's clear Japanese Prime Minister Shinzo Abe would like to make-over the Japanese military from a self-defense force to one capable of operating beyond its borders, in the manner it used to. He's whipping up fear over north Korea to put the military apparatus in place to build a robust Japanese imperialism.

CRISIS AUTHORED IN WASHINGTON

Washington has repeatedly subjected north Korea to nuclear threat. After the Korean War, it introduced battle-field nuclear weapons into south Korea, to be used in the early stages of any war against the DPRK.

North Korea withdrew from the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty in the early 90s (but later re-joined) after the US announced that it was re-targeting some of the strategic nuclear missiles it once had targeted on the Soviet Union on north Korea.

In 1998, the US simulated long range nuclear attacks on north Korea. At the same time, a Marine General said Washington was planning to overthrow the north Korean government and install a south Korean puppet regime in its place, possibly using a pre-emptive strike.

In its 2002 Nuclear Posture Review, Washington announced it reserved the right to use nuclear weapons against north Korea.

One of the cardinal rules of non-proliferation is that nuclear countries don't threaten non-nuclear countries with nuclear weapons. The US has repeatedly broken the cardinal rule.

THE SECURITY COUNCIL

The United Nations Security Council resolutions against north Korea are formulated to disarm and weaken the country, so it can be easily subjugated and plundered. In fact, you can generalize to

other weak countries. UNSC resolutions don't benefit the world as a whole; they benefit the permanent members of the UNSC, usually at the expense of the bulk of humanity.

BEYOND HYPOCRISY

If the US, Britain, France and others can have nuclear weapons, why can't north Korea? The answer, of course, is that the rich countries want to preserve their nuclear monopoly so they can easily push around weaker countries. Other countries can't have nuclear weapons, because that creates the threat of potential self-defense. US-led anti-proliferation efforts are all about safeguarding Washington's ability to intimidate and get its way by force.

Moreover, Washington isn't really against proliferation, only proliferation involving countries that refuse to be subjugated. The US has transferred nuclear technology to India, and India isn't part of the non-proliferation treaty. France transferred nuclear technology to Israel. Washington wants to use India as a proxy against China, and Israel acts as a US proxy in the Middle East, so it's all right, from Washington's perspective, to proliferate in favour of these countries.

THE REAL THREAT

The real threat is not north Korea. Indeed, the idea that north Korea is a danger is laughable, if not, in its tenuous connection with reality, insane.

The real threat is the whole rotten system of imperialism, by which a handful of rich countries seek to dominate the majority of countries representing the bulk of humanity for the benefit of oil companies, investment bankers, defense industry contractors and the corporate rich.

The longer north Korea holds out, the better for the rest of us. For this reason, north Korea deserves our solidarity and support, in the same manner Belgium, the Netherlands, France, the Soviet Union and so on deserved our solidarity and support when they were menaced by another serial aggressor hell-bent on dominating the world.

Revolution and Counter-Revolution

The Real Lessons of the 1956 Uprising in Hungary

Adapted from Socialism and Liberation Magazine

On June 22, President Bush traveled to Hungary to join a commemoration of an uprising that occurred there 50 years ago, in October-November 1956. He went there as chief representative of U.S. imperialism presiding over a ceremony marking its greatest victory—the collapse of the socialist camp in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe.

The January 1957 Time “Man of the Year” showed where U.S. imperialism stood on the 1956 Hungarian uprising.

After he and Laura Bush laid a wreath at the 1956 Memorial Monument, he addressed the people of Hungary. “In 1956,” he said, “the Hungarian people suffered under a communist dictatorship and domination by a foreign power. That fall, the Hungarian people had decided they had had enough and demanded change.

“In 1989,” he continued, “a new generation of Hungarians returned to the streets to demand their liberty, and boldly helped others secure their freedom. ... Because you had the courage to lead, Hungary became the first communist nation in Europe to make the transition to democracy.”

That version of the 1956 events in Hungary has been so often repeated in big business media and academia that it is accepted as gospel. Yet any class-conscious worker would be skeptical that the uprising was really so positive. The same capitalist politicians, media and academia never portray genuine uprisings of working people in their own interests in such glowing terms.

Of course, the 1956 events in Hungary were dramatic. Thousands of people, including wide sections of the working class in Budapest and other cities, were in the streets. The infant workers’ state, formed after the defeat of Hungary’s brutal pro-fascist World War II regime, was on the brink of collapse. Besieged elements of the Hungarian Communist Party appealed to the Soviet Union for aid, and on Nov. 4, 1956, Soviet troops moved to put down the rebellion.

Using the same language Bush uses today, the Hungarian uprising of 1956 was

cloaked under the veil of “freedom and democracy.” Few of the demonstrators called openly for the restoration of capitalism and landlordism. But the imperialist politicians and press knew where it was heading; they knew “on which side they were.”

Today, 50 years later, there has been a restoration of capitalism, after the 1989 demonstrations—inspired by the 1956 rebellion—succeeded in toppling the government. The defeat of the workers’ state was greeted euphorically as the victory of “freedom and democracy.”

The reality has been much different.

POST-1989 HUNGARY

Unemployment and poverty, unknown in socialist Hungary, are now part of everyday life. While the official unemployment rate is around 7 percent, almost 40 percent of the workforce is not even counted in the figures, and that is according to the 2006 CIA World Factbook.

Of course, as in every capitalist economy, these scourges hit the most vulnerable the hardest.

The Roma people, derogatively referred to in the West as “gypsies,” have historically been discriminated against in Hungary. The European Roma Rights Center Executive Director, Dimitrina Petrova, submitted the following statement to the U.N. Human Rights Committee on March 22, 2002:

“[P]ost-1989 Hungary is a place where Roma are in a state of undue exposure to violations of their basic human rights. Protection provided to Roma by Hungarian authorities against human rights violations is often inadequate or unavailable, and the Hungarian government has undertaken little to reduce anti-Romani sentiment.”

“Indeed,” Petrova said, “Hungarian officials have tacitly or explicitly appealed to racist sentiments to garner support, arguably contributing to the creation of a public culture in which abuses of the fundamental rights of Roma are tolerated.”

“In Hungary, Slovakia, and the Czech Republic, skinhead groups regularly roam

villages and city neighborhoods looking to beat up Roma, Jews and foreigners. They also distribute hate literature and music.” (Cultural Survival Quarterly).

Racist and skinhead groups were banned in socialist Hungary.

CLEARER IN RETROSPECT

But it is much easier to see these consequences in retrospect. At the time, there was widespread confusion about the nature of the 1956 rebellion, both in the Hungarian working class and within the world socialist and progressive movement.

The roots of the rebellion can be traced to the way in which capitalism was uprooted in Hungary after World War II. While the defeat of Nazi Germany opened the door for a number of Eastern European communist-led movements to victorious revolutions, like in Yugoslavia, Albania and Czechoslovakia, the working-class movements in Hungary and several other Eastern European countries were weak. Capitalism was abolished primarily due to the Soviet Red Army.

Before liberation by the Soviet Red Army in 1945, Hungary was led by the fascist Arrow Cross Party.

Contrary to Western propaganda, the overturning of the rule of reactionary landlords and capitalists—many of whom were enthusiastic backers of the fascist Arrow Cross regime and its anti-Semitic and anti-Roma pogroms—was welcomed by many Hungarian workers and peasants. But enthusiasm for the social gains made in the revolutionary overturn of capitalist property relations were tempered by virtual civil war conditions immediately after the war.

The Soviet government had imposed heavy reparations for the great damage and casualties Hungary’s wartime regimes had inflicted as an ally of Nazi Germany in the invasion of the Soviet Union. Hungary paid additional reparations to Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia, and it also paid for Soviet troops that were stationed on its territory to deter another invasion from the capitalist West. All this caused real hardships for the Hungarian working class.

There was also the political weakness

HISTORY

of the Erno Gero regime in Hungary in 1956, which failed to inspire solid support in the working class and the spirit of sacrifice needed under the circumstances. Like the Matyas Rakosi government that preceded it, Gero relied as much on party-controlled security forces as on sections of the working class itself to shore up its base of support.

All this meant that legitimate grievances of the Hungarian working class found no adequate expression in a revolutionary, organized manner. When workers did form councils as part of the rebellion, their demands for democracy and the withdrawal of Soviet troops were hijacked by counterrevolutionary forces fueled by widespread propaganda aimed at the Hungarian masses by the U.S.-sponsored Radio Free Europe.

ABSENCE OF REVOLUTIONARY LEADERSHIP

Under the immense pressure of imperialist propaganda and the anti-communist hysteria prevailing in the United States at the time, many ostensibly socialist groups in the United States and Europe felt that these councils were progressive or even played a revolutionary role in Hungary, especially in relation to the politically contradictory Soviet leadership.

These groups failed to recall the experience of the Bolshevik Party in the revolutionary events of 1917 in Russia. After the czar was deposed in February, workers' councils—known in Russia as soviets—sprang up in factories, fields and barracks across Russia. But without the fusing of this new form of organization with a revolutionary leadership, the soviets actually buttressed the political rule of the bourgeoisie. (Lenin, "Dual Power," April 9, 1917)

There was no Bolshevik-type party in Hungary in 1956. The only party that stood firmly for the overturn of capitalist property relations was the Hungarian Communist Party—and even sections of that party wavered.

Potentially the most influential party at the time was the bourgeois, anti-communist Smallholders' Party. It had won a large majority in the first post-war election, and was later dissolved. Also dissolved was the reformist Social Democratic Party, which had outpolled the Communists by a small margin in the same election. During the 1956 uprising, both parties regained legal status and joined a new coalition government formed by Imre Nagy, a member of the Communist Party who favored major

concessions to the demands of the rebellion.

The political character of the coalition government was clear from the outset. In the streets, crowds lynched communists, destroyed Soviet war memorials and burned socialist books. The new government released from prison the extreme reactionary Catholic prelate József Cardinal Mindszenty, who immediately assumed a prominent role in leading the demonstrations. He made a radio broadcast praising the anti-communist actions of the uprising.

Nagy also announced that Hungary would withdraw from the Warsaw Pact, the defensive alliance of Eastern European states organized to prevent a NATO invasion.

Under the circumstances, were it not for the intervention of Soviet troops, counterrevolution would surely have been the outcome. This was, in fact, the outcome some twenty-five years later, after Mikhail Gorbachev withdrew Soviet troops.

After the Soviet intervention, Mindszenty fled into the U.S. embassy. Appeals from anti-communist demonstrators for U.S. intervention went unheeded, despite repeated Radio Free Europe broadcasts that the West stood behind the demonstrations. Apparently the Pentagon did not consider counterrevolution in Hungary worth the risk of nuclear war or a Europe-wide confrontation with the Soviet Union.

ONE OF MANY ATTEMPTS

The 1956 uprising in Hungary was one outcome of a long series of attempts—some successful, some not successful—by the U.S. rulers and their allies to bring about reactionary "regime change" in countries that had undergone social and political transformations unfavorable to their interests. Such attempts go back at least to 1918 in Russia, when a major imperialist operation was launched to overturn the new Bolshevik government.

During the civil war that followed the 1917 revolution, the United States joined with 13 other imperialist and allied powers to send troops in support of the counterrevolutionary "White" armies. Some 10,000 U.S. troops were sent to Siberia. All the invading troops were later withdrawn after the Soviet Red Army defeated the White armies.

Other instances took place in Czechoslovakia in 1968, Poland in 1981 and

China in 1989, for example. Ultimately, such movements precipitated the collapse of the socialist camp in Eastern Europe from 1989 to 1991.

While each of these instances had particularities, they shared a common feature. In all cases, legitimate grievances on the part of the working classes were exploited and channeled into counterrevolutionary movements. Absent a clear anti-capitalist and anti-imperialist leadership, such a degeneration is inevitable in a world dominated by imperialism.

STILL A HIT LIST

The lessons are not just historical. They are important for any partisan of the working class who genuinely seeks to defend the gains of the world working class against imperialism.

U.S. imperialism is committed to its policy of unending war—the guarantee of its survival as an empire. Bush's visit earlier this year to Hungary should be seen as a threat to Cuba, Korea, Venezuela, China and any other country trying to build socialism or follow an independent course.

But as the resistance of the Palestinian, Lebanese and Iraqi people shows, that threat can be challenged.

Hungary itself has a revolutionary tradition, which cannot be erased from the workers' consciousness despite anti-communist propaganda. In 1918, Hungarian workers and peasants, led by Bela Kun, established the first soviet republic following the revolutionary victory of 1917 in Russia.

The socialist revolutions in the Soviet Union and other oppressed countries inspired hundreds of millions of workers around the world with the reality that capitalist oppression was not inevitable. Today, it is the special duty of the multinational working class in imperialist countries to end capitalist and imperialist plunder.

Speaking Ill of the Dead

by Murray Horton

Dr William Ball Sutch, economic nationalist, writer, intellectual, public figure and top civil servant, died in 1975 just months after he became the only person ever to stand trial under the espionage provisions of the former Official Secrets Act. He was accused of passing unspecified information to a Russian spy from the Soviet Embassy, at an allegedly clandestine meeting in Wellington.

Sutch was acquitted but suddenly it's all being regurgitated again, nearly 32 years later. Kit Bennetts, one of the SIS agents involved in the case has written a book, "Spy", baldly accusing Sutch of having been one.

Media coverage of the book matter of factly accepted its conclusions and branded Sutch a spy and a traitor. Bennetts called Sutch a "liar", "traitor" and "turd" (Press, 30/9/06; 'Sutch labelled liar', Dan Eaton).

The fact is that Bill Sutch stood trial and was acquitted by a jury. Not on some technicality but because the jury found him to be innocent. He exercised his right not to give evidence and called character witnesses only. Following the prosecution's humiliating courtroom defeat, the media mouthpieces of the SIS set about viciously libelling Sutch, led by the misnamed Truth which ran a concerted campaign trying to goad him into suing, so that the whole case could be re-heard. But Sutch never rose to the bait.

Sutch was asking for trouble by meeting a Soviet diplomat under such circumstances. But there is a whole other explanation that has never been mentioned this time around – namely that he was set up. This was the conclusion of a 1970s' TV current affairs documentary. Specifically, that the Russian diplomat/spy wanted to defect and the US Central Intelligence Agency, who had long targeted Sutch, asked him to do the SIS a favour. But they couldn't make it stick.

Bennetts stated that the prosecution failed because the Police and SIS could not find the package that he said Sutch was seen to hand to the Soviet diplomat. But former Wellington lawyer, Hector MacNeill, wrote to the Listener (14/10/06): "... In the transcript of evidence from the Supreme Court proceedings, no evidence

was given by anyone saying that they saw Sutch meet (the Soviet diplomat). Additionally, although under observation by a Police officer when (the Russian) spoke to his driver, Sutch was not seen to have handed over a package. Both of these incidents were vital aspects tending to discredit the prosecution case".

The real reason why the powers that be, both in NZ and the US, hated Sutch's guts and wanted him discredited, were stated by Christchurch historian, Harry Evison, in a letter to the Press (12/10/06): "...Besides visiting Russia and reading Marxism, he outrageously questioned whether selling New Zealand's economic assets to transnational corporations was good for the country. Worse still, he was a Leftwing historian...Yet two of Sutch's books, "Colony Or Nation" and "Takeover New Zealand" actually deplore the loss of New Zealand's economic independence through the foreign acquisition of our assets. Sutch even claims that New Zealand would be better off standing on its own feet economically...".

I never had any contact with Bill Sutch but his books and political and economic views were inspirations to those who founded the Campaign Against Foreign Control of Aotearoa (CAFCA) in the same year as his arrest. His warnings of what would happen if New Zealand allowed itself to be conquered by transnational corporate recolonisation remain even more valid today than when he wrote them in the 1960s and 70s.

Bennetts' claims that Sutch was a talent spotter for Soviet Intelligence. He also thinks that the late Jack Lewin, who died in 1990, was a possible traitor and/or Soviet spy. Lewin was a friend and colleague of Sutch, long time Labour supporter, former President of the Public Service Association, and retired a departmental head in the public service. CAFCA has an extensive collection of declassified historic US Embassy files. There is a 1959 State Department report which reads: "Mr John P. Lewin has been appointed Assistant Secretary in the Department of Industries and Commerce. Reports reaching the Embassy indicate that Mr Lewin has a history of fellow traveller and Communist association. This is of special interest in connection with the history of the Secretary of the Department, Dr WB Sutch..".

I never met Lewin and he was never a CAFCA member. But when we were fund raising in 1974 for our first activity, which targeted the Comalco smelter, he sent a donation and letter of support. He was then the head of the Department of Trade and Industry.

We waited until after Lewin's death, before publishing his letter, which is still very relevant today. "Speaking personally and not for the Departmentyou could not find a more perfervid opponent of foreign capitalist penetration of New Zealand than myself.. I fought the Comalco crowd in negotiations for ten years. My position was that I wanted at all costs to prevent their even starting up, but all that my obduracy and arguing power did was marginally to improve the position for New Zealand and enable the politicians to present the swindle more positively.

"In fact when it comes to an outfit like Comalco, the operations of which I genuinely believe represent a net reduction in New Zealand Gross National Product ...I think that there should be published each year not only a financial accounting which shows the tax take to New Zealand but also an economic accounting which shows how we are bleeding for the multinationals. I would, of course, take this position for every foreign-owned company..."

Those who are being posthumously condemned as spies and traitors can no longer defend themselves, so others have to. I'm pleased to have the opportunity to remind New Zealanders of the debt that we owe to Bill Sutch and Jack Lewin, who were both New Zealand patriots and progressive nationalists. Obviously, that was their greatest "crime".

Murray Horton is spokesperson for the Campaign Against Foreign Control of Aotearoa. This article was originally published in the Christchurch Press and is abridged from a longer piece to be published in the December issue of Foreign Control Watchdog.

Strive to Unite!

Ka Kohi Te Toe Ka Whai Te Marama Tanga

(through the sharing of knowledge, enlightenment will follow)

Struggle is published quarterly representing the viewpoint of the Organisation for Marxist Unity. Struggle aims to provide a Marxist analysis of class struggle, politics and economy of Aotearoa/New Zealand.

The immediate task is to encourage working people and all possible forces to unite in a Patriotic and Democratic United Front led by the working class to remove the stranglehold of foreign monopoly capitalists and their local agents, by establishing a People's Democratic State System. This stage of the advance to Socialism is determined by the objectively exist-

ing class contradictions, classes and laws of social development. The more comprehensive the competition of this stage, the more favourable will be the situation for the further advance to a socialist society.

Struggle emphasises the necessity of studying the history of class struggle in Aotearoa/New Zealand from the stand-point of the revolutionary working class science of Marxism-Leninism, in which the writing of Mao Zedong have made a major contribution. Struggle works for the building of a Communist Party based on the ideology of Marxism-Leninism,

a party that develops its strategy, tactics and methods corresponding to the needs of the situation in Aotearoa/New Zealand by concrete analysis: a party free from doctrinaire Marxism, sectarianism and the influence of social democracy, a party whose members are committed to serving the people.

PLEASE NOTE: Send all editorial material, opinions, criticisms (with date and source) to OMU, Box 6724, Wellington 6141.

Published by Struggle Publications, ISSN 07 10-7623.

Subscriptions:

**Post this coupon to Books, PO Box 6724, Wellington 6141.
Rates: Individual \$8.00, Institutions \$10.00, Overseas \$12.00.
Please make cheque payable to Struggle Publications.**

I enclose \$ _____ for 12 months subscription (4 issues).

Name: _____

Address: _____
