Carlos Marighela in his *Minimanual* discusses the seven sins of the urban guerrilla. While the contexts are vastly different the “seven sins” can be considered in an Australian setting too. He lists inexperience, boasting, vanity, exaggerating one's strength, precipitous action, attacking the enemy when he’s most angry and failure to plan and organise.

In Australian (and US) circumstances the trends towards elitism are cause for concern. No elite, no small band of determined men can substitute for mass revolutionary action nor manufacture or impose a revolutionary situation. As the Negro ex-G.I. Andrew Pulley observed: “Some people say the American working class is not radical, and so they try to make a revolution for them by holding a weekly insurrection”.

Revolutionaries need political organisation, a political party embracing workers, students, academics, etc., whose influence can be widely exerted and reach circles which no elite group can hope to do, whose main purpose, as posed by Christopher Lasch, is to “introduce socialist perspectives into political debate, to create broad consciousness of alternatives not embraced by the present system, to show both by teaching and by its own example that life under socialism would be preferable . . .”

Such a party Martin Oppenheimer (*Urban Guerrilla*, Penguin) suggests “must reflect a genuine movement from the bottom up. It cannot be slapped together by an ad hoc group at the top. It must represent, in a genuine way, local, neighborhood, campus and work-place groups which are already functioning along anti-establishment lines. Furthermore it must seriously orient itself to the problems of white and blue collar workers, for these are the only classes which, due to their relationship to the functioning of modern society, have the potential for making a revolution and the capability of carrying it through on a democratic basis”.

If such points are taken into account the *Minimanual* provides an interesting source of study and information.

**JOHN SENDY**

**AUTHOR’S CHALLENGE**

WITH REFERENCE to Mr. Teichmann’s review of *A New Britannia* (*ALR*, 30) there are a number of points I would like to make in reply but in order to secure attention on his allegation of plagiarism I will not do so at this time. Instead I want to say two things about this allegation.

One, it is completely untrue.

Two, I challenge Mr. Teichmann to present to a committee of three of our academic peers a fully documented case demonstrating which ideas I took from the B.A. (Hons.) thesis of Dr. J. B. Dalton. In turn I will present a rebuttal and all relevant material. The membership of this committee would be subject to mutual agreement, but (without having consulted them) I nominate Robin Gollan, Russel Ward and Ian Turner.

I would expect this offer to be taken up immediately or for a full retraction (I do not care for an apology from Mr. Teichmann) to appear in *ALR* 32.

**HUMPHREY MCQUEEN**

Due to the late receipt of the above, any replies and comments will have to be made in subsequent issues.—Ed.